

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #22; February, 2000 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY

AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE

AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is the twenty-second teaching letter since I started to publish them in May of 1998. The first twenty-one letters were on the subject "Just Who Is This Patriarch, Judah?" The reason I continued that series so long is because there is more confusion on the subject of Judah than almost any other particular subject in Scripture. John Wilson and Edward Hine, the founders of Israel Identity, were not able to distinguish the difference between a member of the Tribe of Judah and a "Jew." That same confusion has continued down to this very day. If you are one of those who are still bewildered on this question, you really need to contact me and request teaching letters #1 through #21. Once you study these comprehensive presentations, you will never again have any problem knowing who the true Judahites are.

THE DEADLY DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSALISM

With this lesson, we are going to explore the unscriptural doctrine of "universalism." We are going to start by examining a passage of Scripture which many point out as authenticating such a tenet. This passage is found in Isaiah 56:4-8:

"4 For thus saith Yahweh unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose *the things* that please me, and take hold of my covenant; 5 Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. 6 Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to Yahweh, to serve him, and to love the name of Yahweh, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; 7 Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices *shall be* accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people. 8 Yahweh *simgular*-Elohim which gathereth the outcast of Israel saith, Yet will I gather *others* to him, beside those that are gathered unto him."

Except for the underlined clause, "*taketh hold of my covenant*", it would appear from this passage, at least on the surface, that somehow Yahweh wants to bring

everyone regardless of race into His House of worship. Being translated, “*for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people*”, it would seem to be the gist or essence of what is being said. Before we leap to a conclusion, let’s take a better look at the word “all.” Before we consider the word all, let’s examine one commentary which suggests that it is an invitation for all other races to join in with the Israelites. *Believer’s Bible Commentary*, by William MacDonald says this of this verse on page 982:

“The Temple will then be a house of prayer for all nations, not just Israel. God will gather Gentiles (heathen) to His fold in addition to the house of Israel.”

I don’t know about you, but it sounds like universalism to me. Universalism is now taught in almost every church, Catholic or Protestant alike. Let’s now return to that word “all.” It is the word #3605 in the Strong’s Concordance. It seems that the word “all” doesn’t mean all, in every case, in Hebrew. *Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* says this on page 396:

“... English *all* and *whole* ... In western languages it has to be rendered by adjectives ... in English this has to be expressed either by *whole* preceded by **the article**, or by *all* followed by it; when the noun is made definite by a pronoun suffixed, it must be rendered in English by *all* without the article, or else by *the whole of* ... the whole earth, all the earth, Genesis 9:19; 11:1; ... the whole people, Genesis 19:4; ... the whole flock, Genesis 31:8; ... the whole circuit of Jordan, Genesis 13:10; ... all my people, Genesis 41:40; ... all of him, Genesis 25:25; ... the whole vision, Isaiah 29:11; ... all the wicked, Psalm 145:20; ... all those who fall, Psalm 145:14 ...”

In other words, if this passage meant all people regardless of race, it should have been rendered, “*a house of prayer for all [the] people [or the whole people]*”. #3605 is the same Strong’s number found in Genesis 3:20 where it says:

“ And Adam called his wife’s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.”

Therefore, if it meant that Eve was the mother of all the races, it would have said, “*because she was the mother of all [the] living.*” In Israel Identity, from overwhelming evidence long accumulated, we know that Eve was not the mother of all the races. The only child that Eve mothered besides those of the Adamic race was Cain who was fathered by Satan through seduction. Now we can know for sure that Yahweh didn’t want all other races in his “house of prayer.” Now that we have resolved the word “all”, let’s consider the word “people” like in: “*mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people.*” The word “people” is the word #5971 in the Strong’s Concordance which says:

“ 5971 ... ‘**am**, am; from 6004; a *people* (as a congregated unit); specifically a tribe (as those of Israel); hence (collectively) troops or attendants; figuratively a *flock*;—folk, men, nation, people.”

From this definition of the Hebrew word #5971, it is obvious that the phrase “all people” neither means “all” nor just any kind of “people.” The word people in this verse is speaking of a particular kind of people, “a people”, “a congregated unit”, “a

specific people”, “an Israel people”, “troops, as a collection of a particular kind of people”, “flock, as a group of like-kind.” Plain and unmistakably, the phrase “all people” doesn’t mean the same thing in English as it does in Hebrew! The Ferrar Fenton translation renders Isaiah 56:7 as follows:

“ For My House, a House of Prayer, Shall be called for every tribe.”

This is quite a contrast to the KJV which says: “*for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people.*” Naturally, Israel was divided into tribes, and thus, “My House shall be called a House of Prayer for all the tribes of Israel.” It’s not talking about bringing the heathen into Yahweh’s House!

YAHWEH DIDN’T PROMISE TO GATHER “OTHERS”

The next verse we are going to consider in this passage is verse 8 (Isaiah 56:8) which reads:

“Yahweh *singular*-Elohim which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather *others* to him, beside those that are gathered unto him.”

The first important thing to notice in this verse is that the word “*others*” is not in the text, as it is in italics! It was inserted in there by the translators! Evidently, the translators were biased toward the false doctrine of universalism or they would not have put it there. The best rendering I have found on this verse is from *The New English Bible With The Apocrypha*. According to the information presented on the cover:

“*The New English Bible* is a fresh and authoritative translation of the Bible into modern English. It is a complete translation from the original tongues, enriched by the most recent biblical scholarship and enlivened by a fluent literary style which is clear, vigorous and often majestic. The work began more than twenty years ago (twenty years before 1970) and has been carried out under the authority of a Joint Committee on which are representatives of the major Protestant churches of the British Isles. In the later stages the Committee was joined by observers representing the Roman Catholic Church.”

This translation was planned and directed by representatives of: The Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland; The Church of England; The Church of Scotland; The Congregational Church in England and Wales; The Council of Churches for Wales; The Irish Council of Churches; The London Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends; The Methodist Church of Great Britain; The Presbyterian Church of England; The British and Foreign Bible Society; and, The National Bible Society of Scotland. With this kind of a lineup, you can be sure that each faction was watching the others to see to it there was no hanky-panky going on concerning the Scriptures. I believe it is quite interesting how they translated Isaiah 56:8:

“ This is the very word of Yahweh *singular*-Elohim, who brings home the outcast of Israel: I will yet bring home all that remain to be brought in.”

This properly translated verse hardly leaves room for “*others*” besides Israel to be “gathered” (#6908, to take, to grasp with the hand). If they had translated it

“Yahweh” instead of “Lord GOD”, it would have been even a better translation. It’s not talking about bringing “others” besides Israel, it’s talking about bringing Israelites, and then more Israelites until all the Israelites are brought or gathered in. There isn’t any room for universalism here! I believe I will set my copy of *The New English Bible* along side of my *Ferrar Fenton!*

Amazingly enough, I have another modern version which I sometimes consult called “*God’s Word, Today’s Bible translation that says what it means.*” I am sure there are many passages in this translation that might not be trusted, but guess how they translated Isaiah 56:8? Let’s take a look:

“The Almighty Yahweh, who gathers the scattered people of Israel, declares, ‘I will gather still others besides those I have already gathered’.”

The implication being that Yahweh will gather more Israelites besides the Israelites He has already gathered. Taking the context and the time period of this verse into account, this is being addressed to the remnant House Judah that were still gathered to Him at Jerusalem, while the House of Israel, along with rest of the House of Judah captured by Sennacherib, had already been scattered into Assyria. This verse is simply speaking of gathering back these scattered Israelites, and not particularly to Jerusalem. Its not speaking about heathen!

THE TIME FRAME

It is always well to take notice of the approximate date at which something is written. If you have a KJV with a center reference there is usually a date for each chapter (although some have them and others don’t). Sometimes Bibles other than the KJV have the dates listed for each page of each chapter. That is why it is nice to have more than one Bible. The KJV I use most was printed by The World Publishing Company in the mid 50’s and has the proper center reference to prove Two Seedline and also has the dates listed for each page of each chapter. I also have a Southwestern Bible with large print which is the same as my World Bible. In my two KJV’s every chapter in Isaiah from and including chapter 38 to and including chapter 56 is dated B.C. 712. That is 19 chapters in all. This is the approximate date for the writing of these chapters. Although the writing time is approximately B.C. 712, the prophecy’s fulfillment can be dated many years (10’s, 100’s and 1000’s of years) later. For instance, Cyrus, king of Persia, is spoken of in Isaiah 44:28 (dated B.C. 712) who began his reign about 560/559 B.C., or approximately 153 years after Isaiah’s writing. For the chapter of Isaiah we are considering (Isaiah 56) it would be about the time of the return of the Judean captives from Babylon which happened about 538-529 B.C. When we understand these dates, it accounts for some of the many seeming discrepancies we find in this particular chapter.

For instance, we need only to back up to verse 3 in Isaiah chapter 56 to see a couple of very glaring discrepancies. It reads thus:

“Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to Yahweh, speak, saying, Yahweh hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I *am* a dry tree.”

For a “eunuch”, this would seem to be a contradiction according to Leviticus 21:18-21 and Deuteronomy 23:1 which say respectively:

Leviticus 21:18-21: **“18 For whatsoever man *he be* that hath a blemish, he shall not approach: a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or any thing superfluous, 19 Or a man that is broken-footed, or broken-handed, 20 Or crookbacked or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy, or scabbed, or hath his stones broken; 21 No man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of Yahweh made by fire: he hath a blemish; he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God.”**

Deuteronomy 23:1, **“He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off, shall not enter into the congregation of Yahweh.”**

When we consider these passages which are seemingly in conflict with Isaiah 56:3, we have to consider the time frame and conditions under which they were written. It is almost certain that Daniel was a eunuch, at least, according to Herodotus. No doubt, all of Daniel’s Hebrew companions in the high offices of Nebuchadnezzar were all eunuchs. This would account for a change in disposition toward a eunuch at this time. For more information on “eunuchs”, I will quote from *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, pages 179-180:

“EUNUCH [... to emasculate]. Alternately: OFFICER; CAPTAIN. A CHAMBERLAIN for the woman’s quarters in the royal household; usually a castrated male person. There are married eunuchs (Gen. 39:1), but Potiphar may not be literally a eunuch, as the word may indicate his office only. However, if he were a eunuch, his anger against Joseph would have more force. Usually the word implies sterility (1 Sam. 8:15; Isa. 56:3) in Israel (cf. in Babylon [Dan. 1:3]; in Persia [Esth. 2:3]; in Ethiopia [Jer. 38:7; Acts 8:27]).

“These men could be high officials (Gen. 39:1; Acts 8:27). But in Israel they were excluded from the covenant congregation, as were all impaired and defective persons (Lev. 22:24; Deut. 23:1). This made the threat of exile calamitous (Isaiah 39:7):

“And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shall beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon.”

“There is no certainty that this prophecy was carried out, or that Daniel was a eunuch (II Kings 20:17-18), although Herodotus suggests that captives were commonly made eunuchs. The Tyrian Jezebel used eunuchs (I Kings 22:9; cf. II Kings 8:6; 9:32). David had such officers (1 Sam. 8:15; 1 Chr. 28:1). The last kings of Judah knew them (II Kings 24:15; Jer. 41:16). Herod the Great used a eunuch for cupbearer (Jos. Ant. XV, viii. 4; XVI, viii. 1). The law-abiding eunuch is praised (Wis. Sol. 3:14); and in the messianic kingdom, despite Deuteronomy, these castrated outcast will rank before the unfaithful of Israel (Isa. 56:3-5). ...”

There is evidence in Jeremiah 41:16 that Zedekiah had made eunuchs of his people for his harem of wives and children. This may have been one of the reasons

Yahweh was so angry with him. It was also an Ethiopian eunuch by the name of Ebedmelech which rescued Jeremiah from a dungeon. This Ethiopian was a Cushite, no doubt of the same tribe as Moses' wife came from, who was a White woman. Therefore, the "stranger" spoken of along with the "eunuch" in Isaiah 56:3 are more than likely also Ethiopian Cushites. There were two different peoples who were referred to as Cushites and to understand the "stranger" and "eunuch" of Isaiah 56:3, we are going to have to know the difference. For this I am going to use a short quote from Bertrand L. Comparet's complete works of radio sermons entitled *Your heritage* under the title, "Whom Did Moses Marry?", page 67. If you don't have this book of Bertrand L. Comparet's complete works of radio sermons entitled *Your heritage* (354 large pages in all) you can get it from me for \$20 plus 10% handling. This complete works of radio sermons is much larger and comprehensive than an earlier 54 page small stapled booklet titled by the same name, *Your heritage*.

"When you think you have found some discrepancy in Yahweh's word, some contradiction which can be used as the foundation for conflicting doctrines, you can never safely rely upon what you find in the English translation, until you have [at least] checked it in a good lexicon. The best references are the Hebrew and Greek dictionaries included in the Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, which is more thorough than most of the others. You often find that defective scholarship in early translations, has become accepted as doctrine. It is continued, although the original word will not support the meaning given it in the translation. Let's get back to Moses and his wife. In Numbers 12:1, the Hebrew does not say Ethiopian, it says Cush, a descendant of Cush, or a resident of the land of Cush. Remember that Noah had three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth. Genesis 10:6 tells us the sons of Ham were Cush, Mizraim, Phut and Canaan, Noah and his wife were both white, so their children naturally were of the same race. ... (Also Gen. 6:9 says Noah was perfect (pure) in his generations as were (the sons he generated.)

"There were two different countries named Cush in Bible times, one was Ethiopia, lying south of the Sudan in Africa. However, there was another Cush in ancient times, it was in eastern Mesopotamia, or what at other times was part of the Babylonian empire. These people were certainly not a black race at any time. This Cush flourished about 1500 B.C., during the time of Moses, the exodus from Egypt occurred in 1486 B.C. Who can we expect to find living in this Cush, on the east of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, and from what people that lived there did Moses take his wife? In the first place, note there is absolutely nothing anywhere in the Bible which says, or even hints, that Moses was ever in Ethiopia or any place else, where he could have found a negro woman to marry. The Bible does tell us where Moses got his wife, and who she was. Remember Moses had killed an Egyptian who was beating an Israelite."

From this, you can see we can drop the word "Ethiopian" in the above references, and replace it with the word Cushite, as the word Ethiopian only confuses the issue. You should be beginning to see this passage in Isaiah 56:1-8 has nothing whatsoever to do with universalism, but quite the opposite. You should also be beginning to see how dangerous it is to read any of the English versions of the Bible without consulting the original languages they are written in!!! You simply cannot understand the Bible message otherwise!

A SIMILAR PASSAGE IN THE APOCRYPHA

There is a similar passage in the Apocrypha like the eunuch of Isaiah 56:3. It is found in the Wisdom Of Solomon 3:14 and reads:

“ And *blessed* is the eunuch, which with his hands hath wrought no iniquity, nor imagined wicked things against Yahweh: for unto him shall be given the special gift of faith, and an inheritance in the temple of Yahweh more acceptable to his mind.”

This passage, like Isaiah 56:3, is not speaking of universalism either. To show you this, I will quote the entire 3rd chapter of the Wisdom Of Solomon. I will add explanations in brackets as I go along. I will use brackets [] so you will understand my explanations are not part of the text. This is a very outstanding passage when understood in the proper light. I believe you will be surprised:

“1 But the souls of the righteous [Yahweh’s sons and daughters] are in the hand of Yahweh, and there shall no torment touch them. 2 In the sight of the unwise [other races] they seemed to die: and their departure is taken for misery, 3 And their going from us to be utter destruction [no life hereafter]: but [truly] they are in peace. 4 For though they [Yahweh’s people] be punished in the sight of [enowsh] men, yet is their hope full of immortality. 5 And having been a little chastised, they [the sons and daughters of Yahweh] shall be greatly rewarded: for Yahweh proved [tested] them, and found them worthy for himself. 6 As gold in the furnace hath he tried them [sons of Adam], and received them as a burnt [purified] offering. 7 And in the time of their [future] visitation they shall shine, and [with a glorified body] run to and fro like sparks among the stubble [‘ Jews ’ and others]. 8 They [the saints of Israel] shall judge [reprove] the [Israel] nations, and have dominion over the [Israel] people, and their Mighty One shall reign for ever. 9 They that put their trust in him [Yahweh] shall understand the truth: and such [of them] as be faithful in love shall abide with him: for grace and mercy is to his saints, and he hath care for his elect [Israel]. But the un-Yahweh like [the literal descendants of Satan] shall be punished according to their own imaginations, which have neglected the righteous, and forsaken [repudiated] Yahweh. 11 For whoso despiseth wisdom and nurture, he is miserable, and their [the ‘ Jew’s ’] hope is vain, their [the Jew’s ’] labours unfruitful, and their [the Jew’s ’] works unprofitable: 12 Their [the Jew’s ’] wives are foolish, and their children wicked. 13 Their [the Jew’s ’] offspring is cursed. Wherefore blessed is the barren that is undefiled [by another race], which hath not known the sinful [race-mixing] bed: she shall have fruit [children] in the visitation of [living Adamic] souls. 14 And *blessed* is the eunuch, which with his hands hath wrought no iniquity, nor imagined wicked things against Yahweh: for unto him shall be given the special gift of faith, and an inheritance in the temple of Yahweh more acceptable to his mind. 15 For glorious is the fruit of good labours: and the root of wisdom shall never fall away. 16 As for the children of adulterers [race-mixers], they shall not come to their perfection, and the seed [children] of an unrighteous [race-mixing] bed shall be rooted out [destroyed]. For though they live long, yet they shall be nothing regarded: and their last age [future generations] shall be without honour. 18 Or, if they die quickly, they have no hope [of resurrection], neither comfort in the day of trial. 19 For horrible is the end of the unrighteous [race-mixed] generation.”

If you think this is something outstanding, just consider the following six verses of chapter 4:

“ 1 Better it is to have no children, and to have virtue [purity of race]: for the memorial thereof is immortal [life]: because it is known with Yahweh, and with [Adamic] men. 2 When it [race purity] is present, men take example [notice] at it; and when it is gone, they desire [grieve for the loss of] it: it [pure race] weareth a crown, and triumpheth for ever, having gotten the victory [of racial purity], striving for undefiled [racial] rewards. 3 But the multiplying brood [progeny] of the un-Yahweh [non-Adamic] like shall not thrive, nor take deep rooting from bastard [mamzer hybrid] slips [grafting of another race], nor lay any fast [racially sound] foundation. 4 For though they flourish in [our family] branches for a time; yet standing not fast [not racially sound], they shall be shaken with the wind, and through the force of winds they shall be rooted out [of our family tree]. 5 The imperfect [racially-mixed] branches shall be broken off, their fruit [offspring being] unprofitable, not ripe to eat [not suitable to offer as mates to others of our kind], yea, [they are] meet [fit] for nothing. 6 For children begotten of unlawful [race-mixing] beds are witnesses of wickedness against their parents in their trial [ordeal].”

You may not agree with the comments I have included in brackets [] with the above passages from the Wisdom of Solomon from *The Apocrypha*, chapters 3 and 4, but you cannot take away the terms “bastard slips”, “children of adulterers” and “unlawful beds.” Anyway, getting back to the subject of eunuchs as priests in the temple, we have to consider that this was an instruction only to the children of Aaron, for Leviticus 21:17 says:

“ Speak unto Aaron, saying, Whosoever *he be* of thy seed in their generations that hath *any* blemish, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God.”

Inasmuch as this offering of bread (communion as we would call it) represented the body of Yahshua the promised Messiah to come, at that time it was needful to have priests who were perfect in health and appearance. The *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 171, says this concerning verse 17:

“ Never was a wiser, a more rational, and a more expedient law enacted relative to sacred matters. The man who ministers in holy things, who professes to be the interpreter of the will of God, should have nothing in his person nor in his manner which cannot contribute to render him respectable in the eyes of those to whom he ministers.”

While this is a very good comment, I would rather believe that this law was enacted for the respect of the body of the promised Messiah. It was a token on the part of the Aaronic priesthood to expect a perfect sacrifice as the future Redeemer of Israel, and otherwise could only be flawless in nature. Thus, these priests of Aaron, perfect in health and appearance, represented Yahshua who Himself would be perfect in His Priesthood and His body a perfect sacrifice. The other Aaronic priests with physical defects were allowed to perform lesser duties in the temple. It is simply amazing, sometimes, what some read into these passages! I could only find one commentary which really spelled it out (not being a long extended observation), and it was *Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Bible*, volume 1, page 244:

“... The reason hereof is partly typical, that he might more fully represent Christ, the great High Priest, who was typified both by the priest and sacrifice, and therefore both were to be without blemish ...”

Thus, we can conclude that a castrated male would not and could not represent a priest or sacrifice without blemish, and therefore not suitable to represent the perfect Redeemer Messiah. To represent the perfect Sacrifice in Yahshua, it had to be a male of the family of Aaron with zero blemishes, which included non-castration. When we understand these things in their proper light, they make a lot of sense. To propagate the doctrine of universalism from Isaiah chapter 56, verses 1 through 8, is simply fallacious!

SOME SAY THERE WERE TWO DIFFERENT ISAIHNS

Because there is seemingly so great a disparity in the style of writing between the early chapters of Isaiah and the latter chapters, many comment with the premise that there must have been more than one writer, or two different Isaihs. For a more positive view concerning this, I will quote from *The Post-Captivity Names Of Israel* by Rev. Wm. Pasco Goard, page 16:

“So great is the difference of tone and viewpoint between the first section which deals with the breakdown of the nations in the B.C. period and the restoration described as coming at the end of the prophetic period that many have supposed that there were two Isaihs. However this may be, the theme is one.”

SOME MISLEADING COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH 56:1-8

Every once in a while it is my displeasure to have to quote from a source which, by its very nature, is not the best. This time it is from a book called *The Institute of Biblical Law* by Rousas John Rushdoony. Whatever else he might have written for the better, his comments on Isaiah 56:1-8 leave much to be desired. I even hesitate to use this quote for fear of causing confusion among those who are not well established. Nevertheless, it is a very good example of a miscarriage of interpretation concerning a vitally important subject. For an exercise in mental adeptness, see how many misplaced statements you can detect as we proceed with this one. It is found on pages 84-85:

“Not only death and disease were to be separated from the people of life, but also eunuchs and bastards (Deut. 23:1-2). Various forms of self-mutilation (Deut. 14:1, 2; Lev. 19:27) were forbidden, as was tattooing (Lev. 19:28) ... With respect to the ban on eunuchs and bastards, i.e., their being barred from the congregation, it is to the tenth generation. According to one editorial footnote in the Talmud, entering in to the congregation of the Lord meant ‘eligible to intermarry with Israelite’, and according to another editorial note, the expression ‘to his tenth generation’ meant ‘the stigma is perpetual.’ The ban on intermarriage was probably a real factor; certainly the penalty would work to make intermarriage difficult. But this does not get to the root of the matter. The ban was not on faith; i.e., it is not stated that the bastards and eunuchs nor, in Deuteronomy 23:3, that Ammonites and Moabites, cannot be believers. There is, in fact, a particularly strong promise of blessing to believing eunuchs in Isaiah 56:4, 5, and their place as proselytes was real even in the era of hardened Phariseism (Acts 8:27, 28). The Moabitess Ruth intermarried twice, first with a son of Naomi, then with Boaz, to become an ancestress of Jesus

Christ (Ruth 1:4; 4:13, 18-21; Matt. 1:5). There is no reason to doubt that eunuchs, bastards, Ammonites, and Moabites regularly became believers and were faithful worshipers of God ... All the integrity and honesty required by the law was due to every ‘stranger’ (Lev. 19:33, 34), and it was certainly not denied to a man’s illegitimate child, nor to a eunuch, an Ammonite, or a Moabite ... There is some ground for such an interpretation in terms of Deuteronomy 23:7, 8, where the Edomites are given entrance into ‘the assembly of the LORD’ on the third generation.”

I hope you were wide awake on this one! You should have readily recognized several anomalies in this short portion presented here. Sometimes it doesn’t take very many words to expose just what a man is thinking. Did you notice how he made our Redeemer a descendant of a Moabite? He is far from being alone on this one, as almost everyone else assumes the same thing. And this man is writing a 900 page book on Bible Law? Did you notice how he groups the bastards, eunuchs, Ammonites and Moabites all into one basket and treats them all alike, and even suggested that Edomites were to be allowed into the congregation? In one place he groups the eunuchs with the bastards together, and makes the remark *their being barred from the congregation, it is to the tenth generation*. I was wondering, how do you get a eunuch to the tenth generation inasmuch as he cannot have any children? Obviously, he didn’t get anything remotely like this from Scripture! Actually all of these topics should be treated separately, and this is a good illustration to show you why. Did you notice how he uses the term “stranger” as an all inclusive word, while the Hebrew in the *Strong’s Concordance* uses the numbers 1616, 4033, 5235, 5236, 5237, 2114, 8435, 1121 and 376 for various types of strangers? If he is using the biblical word “stranger” wrongly in the general English sense, how many other words has he taken out of context? I really hate to point someone out as an example, but we are going to have to learn to scrutinize all books, and every man’s work should be open for critical review. We dare not even trust any of the Bible translations as being 100% correct. Did you notice how he treats the eunuchs of Isaiah 56:4, 5 as proselytes, as if they were of some other race and being accepted because they are “believing eunuchs?” From this remark, it is detectable that he believes in universalism, that any race can be in the Kingdom if they just believe. And while speaking of Ammonites, did you know the Japanese of today’ are the modern day Ammonites? Alan Campbell wrote a small booklet called *The Kings of The East* to this fact. Also Thomas E. Plant wrote a booklet, *The Japanese, Who Are They?* on this very subject. In other words, it was Ammonites which attacked Pearl Harbor. The booklet by Plant tries to say the “Jews” are of Israel on page 15, otherwise his Japanese premise is quite interesting. While we are considering the various groups that could not mingle with Israel, we should include the Edomites which Rousas John Rushdoony mentions above.

EDOMITES FORBIDDEN TO MIX WITH ISRAEL FOREVER

I know instantly you are going to quote me Deuteronomy 23:7 which reads:

“Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he *is* thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land.”

I have four reasons for believing the above passage was either added or modified from the original. All of Esau's children were bastards (mamzers), and, therefore, verse 2 of this chapter applies to them. There is simply no way, according to verse 2, that the Edomites could qualify for entry into Yahweh's House. Secondly, the Edomites were just as hostile to Israel as were Ammon and Moab when Israel was on the march to Canaan. For this, Ammon and Moab were forbidden forever from entering Yahweh's House (v. 4). Edom's hostility is recorded in Numbers 20:18, 20-21:

“ 18 And Edom said unto him (Israel), Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword ... 20 And he (Edom) said, Thou shalt not go through, And Edom came out against him with much people, and with a strong hand. 21 Thus Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border: wherefore Israel turned away from him.”

It is obvious, from this, that Edom had treated Israel just as badly as Ammon or Moab had done. Not only this, but the Amalekites (an Edomite tribe) were the first to oppose Israel and were prophesied to be at war with Israel from generation to generation throughout history which is still going on to this very day. It is downright ludicrousness and nonsense that Israel should incorporate any Edomites among them (Exodus 17:16)! Not only this, but Saul, first king of Israel, was commissioned to kill every Amalekite (Edomite) man, woman, child and all their cattle (1 Samuel 15:3). This hardly sounds like brotherly love for the Edomites to me! This is the third reason I believe Deuteronomy 23:7 was added to or altered by some scribe later on (some “Jewish” scribe, no doubt). Fourthly, the Edomites had mixed with the descendants of Cain by the time period of Deuteronomy 23. In Genesis 15:19-21 are listed ten Canaanite tribes, and among them is listed an Edomite tribe of the Kenizzites. The Kenizzites are indeed of Esau. The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, volume 3, page 782, has this to say of Kenaz and the Kenizzites:

“KENAZ Singular form of the clan name Kenizzite, son of Eliphaz and grandson of Esau (Gen. 36:11; 1 Chron. 1:36), one of the chieftains of Edom (KJV Dukes) (Gen. 36:15,42; 1 Chron. 1:53).”

TEN NATIONS BECOME SEVEN

This is interesting and important, it seems that Esau has mixed his blood with this group of ten nations too! Now in Genesis 15:19-21 are listed ten nations and they race-mixed so much that in Deuteronomy 7:1-2 there are only seven. The Kenites, Kenizzites and Rephaïms were completely absorbed by the other nations of this group from which the “Jews” are extracted. The Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 38, has this to say:

“*The Kenites.* Here are ten nations mentioned, though afterwards reckoned but seven; see Deut. vii. 1; Acts xiii. 19. Probably some of them which existed in Abram's time had been **blended** with others before the time of Moses, so that seven only out of the ten then remained.”

In the *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, page 116 we find the following about this mixed group of nations spoken of in Genesis 15:19-21:

“When the Israelites entered Canaan they found there a **very mixed** population generally designated by the term Amorite or Canaanite.”

I have just recently found the discrepancy concerning the word “Edomite” in Deuteronomy 23:7, and I will explain and document the problem in the next teaching letter. Once I explain the problem, you’ll never again be confused with this passage. What we might think this verse says, and what it really is saying, are two different things. Once this verse is cleared up, it should create quite an explosive bomb throughout all Identity circles. It is amazing, once things like this are straightened up, how much more sense they make!