

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #24

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

Unless one thoroughly understands the significant consequences of Genesis 3:15, he simply cannot comprehend the main theme of the Bible. Without this crucial passage, one has no hope in our Redemption. The major tenets of our Faith depend on our understanding thereof. It is paramount we fathom that Yahweh came in the **flesh**; dwelt among us in the **flesh**; was **BRUISED** in the **flesh**; died in the **flesh**; was resurrected after three days in the **flesh**; ascended to heaven in the **flesh**, and will return again to us in the **flesh**. Those who deny the truth of the serpent-seed of Genesis 3:15 disavow Yahshua's being **BRUISED** in the **flesh**. It's as simple as that. To understand His **BRUISING**, one must be able to comprehend who the "serpent's" seed are. Failure to do this is tantamount to treason. Therefore, we have many unscrupulous traitors (Judas-goats) among us today. Those teaching Israel Identity and denying the truth of Genesis 3:15 are among the most detrimental of all, for it is their unscrupulous desire to remove the element of the **BRUISING** by their fallacious position. And if Cain and his descendants are not the "seed of the serpent" of Genesis 3:15: pray-tell who might they be? It would seem that if we could find the people who took the **LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY** for crucifying our Messiah, we would, without reservation, understand who the "seed of the serpent" were and still are. Thus, the anti-seedliners, by denying the "**bruising**" of Genesis 3:15, wittingly or unwittingly have taken an "**ANTICHRIST**" position.

As I have stated before, unless one understands the Two Seedline message of Genesis 3:15, one can only comprehend the significance about 5% of the Scripture, if that. Let's consider the passage in Acts 8:23, for instance, which says: "**For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.**" This was shortly after the stoning and burial of Stephen due to the persecutions led by Saul, later called Paul. After the followers of Yahshua became scattered, Philip went to Samaria and ran into a group of people who were into witchcraft, big-time, and possessed with demons which, by Philip's preaching, were cast out of them. But there was also in Samaria one Simon who practiced sorcery, and who was probably the one that got them into witchcraft in the first place. Then Simon himself decided to join the followers of the Nazarene — they had "Jews for Jesus" in those days too. Simon, after observing the miracles of the apostles, deciding they had some kind of power superior to his, asked to purchase their trade secrets on how they did it — they had Benny Hinns in those days

also. When Peter recognized he was dealing with a Canaanite variety of “Jew”, fittingly he put his finger on the problem, pointing out that this Simon was a descendant of Cain and was in the “gall of bitterness.” To prove that Simon was a Canaanite-Jew, you will notice that when instructed to pray and repent, **not** having the Spirit breathed into Adam, he was unable to pray for himself, but requested the apostles to do it for him, (verse 24). Simon had the same “gall of bitterness” spoken of in Deuteronomy 32:32. The “grapes of gall” in that passage represent the “testes” (apple) and seed of Satan through Cain (refer to *Special Notice # 23*).

TWO SEEDLINE UNDER ATTACK AGAIN

The latest attack on Two Seedline doctrine came in an article from the publication *Facts For Action*, Winter, 2003, subtitled “Christian Research”, P.O. Box 385, Eureka Springs, Arkansas [72632], entitled *The Foundational Myth Of Judaism*, written by Dan Gentry. In addition to his own name, he claims the founder of the publication was the late Gerda Koch. In the middle of page 1, he shows a color depiction of some devils with pitchforks, evidently a sneering stab to all who believe Scripture speaks of real devils and a literal Satan. Of course, if there is no Satan, there was no seduction of Eve in Genesis 3:15, and thus no “seed of the serpent”, and in turn no one to **BRUISE** Messiah’s “heel.” Yet he claims to believe in both seeds, while strangely quiet on who the “seed of the serpent” might be. Maybe, he would answer like the late anti-seedliner Earl Jones when confronted: “Oh, we all have bad seed in our families.” That is nonsensical, for we pure Israelites don’t have any of Cain’s genetics! (Matthew 7:16-20)

One of Gentry’s tricks is to quote Genesis 4:1 in an English translation to prove that Cain was Adam’s son. I sent documentation to Gentry and said to him: ‘When you quote Genesis 4:1 in English, you are quoting from a corrupted form of Hebrew.’ To show everyone this again, I will repeat the verifying evidence which I used in *Special Notice #20: 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 mothe r’s words **I have gotten a man.** **[period] 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 ...”

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)**. His younger brother was named Abel, which suggests the Hebrew word for breath.”

If Genesis 4:1 is “unintelligible” and “can scarcely be translated, still less understood”, how can Gentry prove anything by quoting it? Additionally, if the words

are a gloss, where is the foundation of his premise? But I would like to key-in on the last sentence of the last quotation: “**His younger brother was named Abel which suggests the Hebrew word for breath.**” I had not quoted this last part before, but on closer examination I realized it was enormously significant. It came to me that the “breath” breathed into Adam was the Spirit of the Almighty, and that Abel’s name was indicating he had that same **Spirit-breath**. My first intuition was that “breath” = Spirit. My second intuition was that Abel = **breath of El**. With Cain that was not so, for his name means to “acquire” or “get.” In other words, a scavenger like all the “Jews” are yet today! Cain was a scavenger-bum from the beginning! The meanings of Cain’s and Abel’s names alone should establish that they were not full-blooded brothers. I also sent Gentry this evidence about Abel’s name. Let’s now wait to see if he answers this testimony, or if he stubbornly continues to broadcast his damnable lies. “Damnable” inasmuch as his position promotes race-mixing among our Race. If you want some mamzers (bastards) in your family-tree, continue to support him!

Upon realizing that the name Abel meant “breath”, I continued to verify that this was the true definition in Hebrew. After checking the *Strong’s* number, I found Abel was #1893. Checking with *Gesenius’* on page 214, I discovered #1891, #1892 & #1893 were all under the same general Hebrew root-word, #1891 indicating: “to breath, to exhale ...” Also it can mean to exhale vain words. #1892 says: “(1) *breath, breathing*, used of a gentle breeze ... More often used of *the breath of the mouth* ... (2) *exhalation, vapor, mist, darkness* ... (3) Abel ... the second son of Adam.” The name of Abel falls under #1893, but also is the third definition under #1892.

I believe the reason more people haven’t discovered that Abel’s name means “breath” is because *Strong’s* only shows the meaning “to be vain ... *to lead astray ... emptiness or vanity ... transitory ... unsatisfactory ... etc.*” Therefore, *Strong* only seemed to understand the secondary meaning of the word. As you can observe, with *Gesenius’* it is an entirely different matter. Every serious student of Scripture should have a *Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*. A lot of people have *Strong’s*, but very few have *Gesenius’*. Additionally, *The New Hebrew And English Lexicon* by Francis Brown et al., on the same root-word shows “breath” as does *Gesenius’*. What it all amounts to is that Abel had the Spirit that was breathed into Adam by Yahweh, and Cain didn’t. Cain had the inherent spirit of Satan, although Eve was mother of both Cain and Abel. What this all boils down to is, the anti-seedliners should really reconsider their position, for where does it say that Cain was in the “image” of Adam, or had Adam’s “Spirit”? Cain wasn’t and he didn’t! Also, see *Strong’s* Greek #4151 which basically means “breath”, yet everywhere else is used to denote “Spirit.”

That shows that Abel, unlike Cain, had the Spirit breathed into Adam. We are told at Galatians 4:29-30 that Isaac had the Spirit, but Ishmael didn’t. That passage reads: “**29 But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. 30 Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.**” In like manner, Abel, being a son of Adam had the Spirit, but Cain being the son of the serpent was after the flesh. Therefore, when an

Adamite dies in the flesh, his spirit continues to live, but not so with the other races or Cain's mamzer progeny. If you're under the delusion that there will be other races including the Canaanite variety of "Jews" in the Kingdom, I have to burst your bubble.

At this point I will quote two passages which Gentry claims are "Jewish" sources. First, in the *Aramaic Targum* (the Aramaic was one language which Messiah and his disciples knew), called pseudo-Jonathan, on Genesis 3:6 which is unique inasmuch as it identifies the angel Sammael as the "serpent": "**And the woman saw Sammael, the angel of death, and she was afraid and knew that the tree was good for food, and that it was a remedy for the enlightenment of the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise. She took of its fruit and ate and also gave (it) to her husband and he ate.**"

Secondly, Gentry quoted the *Aramaic Targum* pseudo-Jonathan, on Genesis 4:1: "**And Adam knew that his wife Eve had conceived from Sammael the Angel (of death) and she became pregnant and bore Cain. And he was like those on high and not like those below. And she said: 'I have got a man from the angel of the LORD'.**" This rendition of Genesis 4:1 is interesting for it speaks of the "angel of death" plus "like those on high" and "like those below." This seems to accord with John 8:23 where Yahshua told the Canaanite variety of "Jews": "... **Ye are from beneath; and I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world.**" Satan was on high until his fall, when he fell like lightning, Luke 10:18. We will now evaluate Gentry's article after which we will have a grand finale.

ASSESSMENT OF GENTRY'S ARTICLE

In Gentry's article *The Foundational Myth of Judaism* for Winter, 2003, it would be comical if it were not so serious. It is certainly a tragedy. He's likely deceiving many innocent and ignorant lost-sheep of the House of Israel and the House of Judah. His motto "Christian Research" is an inappropriate name for what he claims he is doing.

The first serious flaw evident in Gentry's reasoning is that he puts all the various writings found in the *Talmud* on an equal footing, having equal authority. He then uses this scheme to discredit everything found in those books. Evidently, Gentry is not aware of the fact that the "Torah" is the first volume in the *Talmud*. If that's the case, using Gentry's irrational reasoning, we would have to discard our entire Old Testament in the process because they are, in his words, "Jewish." (Gentry didn't tell you that, did he?) That kind of tactic shows the cunning of a charlatan. When are we ever going to recognize the sly **method of operation** (MO) of such deceivers using the old shell-game? The writings of the *Talmud* are simply a collection, many from wicked sources, but not all. Many are from innocent sources (like the Torah) that the "Jews" have preserved there. Gentry's flawed premise is that all these sources are wicked! Once understanding Gentry's underhanded maneuvers, they can see how they can be deceived. And if you bought hook, line and sinker, Gentry's contrived conclusions, you were an Eskimo in need of a refrigerator—you were sold a bill-of-goods !

Pointedly, in assessing Gentry's newsletter, many pages (even chapters or books) could be spent discussing his perverted attack on what he calls "Jewish" and "Two Seedline", interpretational gymnastics. Gentry insists that the term "generation"

at Matthew 16:4 and 3:7 should mean just that, and not “race” or “nation” simply because of, as he states, “... the fact [?] that a race or ethnic sub-group may fairly be called a generation of sly, serpentine men because of their ‘tradition of the elders’ ...” Yet Gentry totally ignores, or avoids, Matthew 23:29-36! In Gentry’s world, Greek and Hebrew words simply can’t be taken literally if they would thereby conflict with his twisted theology! He would disconnect the primary meaning of the words γέννημα (that which is born or produced) found in Matthew 23:33, and γενεά (race, stock, family) from their context, which is directly related to “fathers” in 23:30 and “sons” (A.V. “children”) in 23:31 where surely γέννημα is “produce” and γενεά is “race!” For “sons” are “produce” of the “fathers”, and combined as a unit are a “race” as we (and the Greeks) know the word! Not simply “generation”!

For a moment, analyzing Gentry’s position to its lowest common denominator on Genesis 3 & 4, the second flaw evident in his reasoning is his bone-headed statement that “... the concept of a ‘fallen angel, Satan’ migrated into the camp of Israel-Judah in the 5th century B.C.” Here, Gentry not only denies some aspects of the Book of Job, and its great antiquity, and ignores or misinterprets the 12th chapter of John’s Revelation along with most of Jude, but he is more seriously attempting to discredit the prophet Isaiah by denying his antiquity and inspiration of his words (which are the words of the Almighty) found at Isaiah 14:12. Even worse than that, Gentry also would have one call into question the words of our Redeemer Himself at Luke 10:18-19! In short, Gentry, in the ‘philosophical’ or ‘religious’ sense of the word, is neither learned nor a “Christian.”

In Luke 10:17-19, Gentry may disconnect the ideas of “devils” (10:17), “Satan” and “fallen from heaven” (“as lightening”, 10:18) and “serpents and scorpions” (10:19). Here, Gentry can’t see that these are all the same connected entity! I guess Gentry (as he said himself) “wouldn’t know a metaphor if it smacked him on the head”! He should take a long, hard look at Revelation 12:9; Colossians 2:18; John 8:44 and Matthew 13:36-43. Gentry wouldn’t know a devil if one smacked him either. He’d probably turn the other cheek! Until Gentry realizes that there are Devil-Children-Seed and Yahweh-Children-Seed in the world and in opposition to each other (Matthew 13:36-43), he will never be able to abide in the truth!

GRAND FINALE ON GENTRY’S ARTICLE

The paragraph in Gentry’s article that really shows he didn’t do his homework, proving he’s not the “Christian Research[er]” he claims to be, is on page 1, which reads thus: “Judaism is today the product of ancient Babylon, both culturally and spiritually. Babylon and much of Assyria had dualistic religions, that is, a belief in ‘good gods’ and ‘bad gods’, whose Herculean struggle resulted in an uneasy balance. Zoroastrianism, whose gods *Ahura Mazda* and *Anga Mainyu* typified this dichotomy, had a large impact on Judaism’s formation, and explain how the concept of a ‘fallen angel, Satan’ migrated into the camp of Israel-Judah in the 5th century B.C.”

Notice how Gentry speaks about Satan as if he was created in the minds of the prophets in the 5th century B.C., and contrary to Gentry’s assertion, Zoroastrianism was a Persian religion. Any good history book on Persia will explain that! As for

Babylon, they had two major religions: (1) Marduk, under Nebuchadnezzar II, and (2) The moon-god, Sin under Nabonidus (the pseudo-“Nebuchadnezzar” of Daniel 4). If “Judaism” is a “product of ancient Babylon”, as Gentry claims, why doesn't he name which one of those two religions it is by name? Since he speaks in general terms, it is doubtful he knows anything about Babylon's religions. From this, it should be quite clear that Gentry isn't qualified to speak on this subject, for he is neither a student of the Bible nor secular history. Not only that, but the *Babylonian Talmud* is called “Babylonian” because it was the old “traditions of the elders” (Matthew 15:2) correlated and written down at the city of Babylon sometime after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

As for “Zoroastrianism”, Gentry rushes into that subject like a bull in a porcelain ware shop, and categorizes it as “dual theistic”, as he states “good gods and bad gods.” This shows that he hasn't thoroughly researched the subject, and I will quote from: Hodge, C. 1997. *Systematic Theology*, originally published 1872. (Vol. 3, Page 787-788), verifying opposing evidence: “In the religion of Zoroaster there is a far nearer approach to the doctrines of the Bible. As the Scriptures teach that God at first created all things good, and made man after his own image, and placed him upon probation in Eden; so Zoroaster taught that Ormuzd created all things good, and that all were sinless and happy, and fitted for immortality. And as the Bible teaches that through the seduction of Satan man fell from his original state, and became the subject of sin, misery, and death; so in the religion of the ancient Persians it is taught, that Ahriman, the personal principle of evil, co-eternal with Ormuzd the principle of good, effected the ruin of man for this world and the next. Such was the origin of evil; such was the beginning of the conflict between good and evil, of which our earth has been the theatre. Both systems teach the ultimate triumph of the good, and the redemption of man; both teach a future state, the resurrection of the body, and the renewal of the earth, or, that there are to be a new heaven and a new earth. It is certain from the teachings of the New Testament that the Hebrews did not derive these doctrines from the Persians; it is, therefore, in the highest degree probable that the Persians derived them from ... the family of Shem, who were the depositaries of the revelations of God.” Note: Hodge, in his article, failed to realize that the Persians, like their neighboring dispersed Israelites, were also descended of Shem (i.e. “Elam”, Genesis 10:22; Isaiah 11:11; 21:2).

Additionally, the similarity of the religion of the Hebrews to that of Ahura Mazda, shows they both had the same angel-beings such as “Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel, Suriel” and others. Pray tell, what are we going to do with such passages as Daniel 10:13, 21; 12:1; Jude 7 & Revelation 12:7 on Michael, and Daniel 8:16; 9:12; Luke 1:19, 26 on Gabriel? It should become quite clear that Gentry is preaching, wittingly or unwittingly, an **ANTICHRIST** religion by denying Michael & Gabriel. Furthermore, it should be abundantly apparent that both true Hebrew and Ahura Mazda were dualistic in nature, with the forces of Yahweh struggling against the forces of evil (Genesis 3:15). I have given some of my sources on Ahura Mazda; why doesn't Gentry identify his? It would also appear that Gentry is quite confused on history, as he dubs Persian history as “pagan Babylonian!”

GENTRY'S MOTIVES

Quite dangerous are the ideologies that some unscrupulous men promote. This is evident with Gentry's opening statement on page 1 of his article, where he says: "It's ironic that those who'd have you believe mother Eve had sexual intercourse with a 'fallen angel', producing a son, Cain, who allegedly fathered the Jews (to be responsible for all sin in the world), choose a Jewish 'source' (*Targum & Midrash*) to supposedly prove their point. If they hate the Jews so much, why do they consistently cite them as authorities?" **Do you see what Gentry just intimated? He just pardoned the Canaanite variety of "Jews" for the Crucifixion of our Messiah, as the Roman Catholic Pope recently did when Gentry implied that the Jews were not responsible "for all the sin in the world"! Therefore, Gentry's statement does not square with Scripture!**

Then, in the next paragraph Gentry says: "**Truth will win out, despite self-serving attempts to explain away the origin and nature of evil in this world.**" By that totally irresponsible statement, Gentry just condoned the "Jews" including their **AGENDA** to crossbreed out of existence the White Israel Race. From that statement by Gentry, it is quite evident he is aiding and abetting the "Jews" in that **AGENDA!** It would seem, if Gentry is any kind of man at all, he would reconsider his position! But don't hold your breath! Under these circumstances, are we Two Seedliners to sit idly by and say and do nothing to counter these ridiculous accusations? I've been told by some unenlightened, and perhaps well-meaning individuals, that that's what we should do! In other words, let our children mate with the other races in order to keep peace! What the **hell** kind of peace is that! Whether Gentry (and all of his backslapping buddies) realize it or not, by their position they are **contributing** to our present-day problem of miscegenation!

Then in a paragraph on pages 1 & 4, Gentry says, speaking of good and evil: "In contrast, the Israelites, prior to this, had no such cosmology, and their view of the Creator as sole sovereign and originator of good and evil (Isaiah 45:5-7; Amos 3:1-8, et al). Right cannot be manifest, save in the presence of wrong. Light cannot be manifest except by the presence of darkness. By these we see YHVH's divine purpose in commanding both good and evil. Some may say (as they did in Rom. 3:8) why not commit evil, so that good may result? Mainly for two reasons: 1) We cannot control evil for good as can YHVH, and 2) We cannot logically do evil, if we have truly 'been saved' (experienced spiritual renewal & repentance)." [*Garbage piled on top of garbage!*]

Let's take a look at this and see how really dangerous this turkey is! Gentry is taking the same position as the early "Christian" heretics Marcion, Valentinian and other Gnostic sects (*Believer's Bib. Com.*, p 972). Gentry's false premise is he is attributing all evil to YHWH in spite of James 1:13. Then he cites Isa. 45:7 and Amos 3:1-7 in a vain attempt to prove his point. In the process he takes the entire chapter of Isaiah 45 out of context. The true context is: YHWH is predicting light (life) and prosperity for Persia and darkness (death) and disaster for Babylon (not evil) as in the KJV; cf. Amos 3:6. Gentry's motive here is to show there was no "enmity" in Genesis 3:15 between two opposing seedlines. By making YHWH the author of all evil, he is intimating

YHWH Himself “bruised” the Son, and therefore was responsible for the (Crucifixion) of the Redeemer. Since Yahshua was both Father and Son in one person, this is implying our Savior committed suicide.

You may wonder when I’m going to stop taking all these false-teachers to task. The answer is: when I see school buses filled entirely with unmixed White children; when I go past playgrounds where unmixed White children are playing with White playmates; when I see graceful unmixed young White girls dating fine, polite young White boys; when I see young White unmixed ladies marrying young White unmixed gentlemen; when going to a restaurant I see unmixed White families in all the booths; when going to maternity wards and I see them all filled with pure unmixed White babies, that’s when!