

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #25; May, 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 my twenty-fifth monthly teaching letter and begins my third year of publication. It is my striving goal to make each succeeding letter to transcend, eclipse and outshine the ones preceding it. It is a very rigorous, difficult and demanding goal to try to meet each month. I established in the last lesson that Canaan, the son of Ham, was born of incest and pointed to a couple of scriptures to prove the point. It was a case of Ham looking upon his father's nakedness which turns out to be his mother's nakedness. It was hard to find anything of value in the various commentaries on the subject, as the writers seem to want to dance a jig around the topic trying to suppose it means a stepmother or a concubine, and in some instances this is what is intended. They also try to insinuate that these prohibitions were for the prevention of disease, and in some cases this might also be the purpose. In other cases they will just generalize that it was an immorality of some kind, or just skip over the verse as if it weren't there.

I only found one comment from *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, page 99, which was worth quoting and I will repeat it here:

**“The nakedness of thy father.** These laws were addressed to men. Hence this verse contains a prohibition not against incest between father and daughter, but against incest between son and mother only. The shame brought upon the mother was brought also upon the father. As they were of one flesh (Gen. 2:24), any act committed against the mother could be considered to have been likewise committed against the father.”

There still may be some of you who are not convinced that Ham had incest with his mother. For those of you who are not convinced one way or the other, I will quote every passage in Scripture referring to such an incident between son and mother. You may be surprised at how much is said in Scripture along this line:

**KJV** Genesis 9:22: **“And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without.”**

**KJV** Leviticus 18:7-8: **“The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she is thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: it is thy father's nakedness.”**

- KJV** Leviticus 20:11: “ **And the man that lieth with his father’s wife hath uncovered his father’s nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them.**”
- KJV** Deuteronomy 22:30: “ **A man shall not take his father’s wife, nor discover his fathers skirt.**”
- KJV** Deuteronomy 27:20: “ **Cursed *be* he that lieth with his father’s wife; because he uncovereth his father’s skirt.**”
- RSV** Ezekiel 22:10: “ **In you, men uncover their fathers’ nakedness; in you they humble women who are unclean in their impurity.**”
- KJV** 1 Corinthians 5:1: “ **It is reported commonly *that there is* fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles (pagans), that one should have his father’s wife.**”
- KJV** Amos 2:7: “ **That pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek: and a man and his father will go in unto the *same* maid, to profane my holy name.**”
- KJV** Genesis 35:22: “ **And it came to pass, when Israel dwelt in that land, that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father’s concubine: and Israel heard *it*.**”
- KJV** Genesis 49:4: “ **Unstable as water, thou (Reuben) shalt not excel; because thou wentest up to thy father’s bed; then defiledst thou *it*: he went up to my couch.**”
- KJV** 1 Chronicles 5:1: “ **Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, (for he *was* the firstborn; but, forasmuch as he defiled his father’s bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph the son of Israel: and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright ...)**”
- KJV** 2 Samuel 16:22: “ **So they spread Absalom a tent upon the top of the house; and Absalom went in unto his father’s concubines in the sight of all Israel.**”

*Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 1, page 236, says the following concerning Leviticus 18:7:

“ Here it notes that *the nakedness of the father, and the nakedness of the mother, are one and the same thing*, because they two are one flesh, and therefore her nakedness is his also; which further appears, because the mother only is mentioned in the following words, which contain the reason of the law. *She is thy mother*; and therefore even nature teacheth thee to abhor such incest. Yet the Persians used to marry their mother; therein worse than the very camels, whom no force will drive to that act with their dams.”

Since I am doing a series on Esau, you might wonder what all of this has to do with him. **This is a foundation to understand Esau!** It is imperative that we go back and pick up all the pieces of the story so we can put it all together in a very comprehensible package. If we don’t do all this, we will not understand the end product. If we can understand why the curse of Noah was placed on Canaan as a result of a deed committed by Ham, then we can understand this same curse was upon the

Canaanite wives of Esau, and as a result, was passed on to Esau's progeny. Curses in the Scripture are not to be taken lightly as they follow the genealogy of that person unremittingly, and as a result, the "Jews" of today have this very same curse by Noah upon Canaan, also on all of them. You may wonder why I use quotation marks around the words "Jew/Jews." *The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary*, page 1926 says, "Quotation marks are used to set off words or phrases that the writer does not wish to claim as his own." Because Revelation 2:9 and 3:9 designate the "Jews" as false Judaites, I choose to disclaim the term, and I do not, in any way, desire to elevate them by doing this! I have been trying to think of another way to designate the term, but this is the only ethical way I can find to write this erroneous term under the circumstances. When I am quoting someone else, though, I have to reproduce it as written.

### THE DEMISE OF EDOM

To start establishing the groundwork for this series of Esau-Edom, we need to take into account some secular history. Really, secular history is very much compatible with Bible history if we understand them both correctly. As I have said before, we need a Bible on one side of our lap and a history book on the other. I have an excellent history book entitled *The Dawn Of History*, edited by C. F. Keary, M.A. F.S.A. published in 1889. We have to take into account this book was written before a lot of important archeological discoveries were unearthed and long before the discovery of carbon-dating. Still, in spite of this, this book spells out racial history better than most. Not only this, but it is written in a very concise and comprehensive way. The author of this book makes a very interesting statement early in his book in the preface: "*We still hear the Russians described as Tartars: and the notion that we English are descendants of the lost Israelitish tribes finds innumerable supporters.*" Inasmuch as John Wilson started to declare the Israel message in the 1840's, it should not be surprising to find this observation in a book written in 1889. Especially interesting is the comment concerning the Russians being described as Tartar. By the way, if this man were writing in our day, he would be considered very "politically incorrect." I will now be quoting from this book, pages 118 to 121:

"**The White Race.** From the results of the previous chapter we see that to the yellow race must be attributed all those peoples of Europe and Asia which speak agglutinative (gather into a clump or group) languages, and therefore that for the white race are left the inflected (change in the pitch of loudness of the voice) tongues. These, it will be remembered, we divided into two great families, the Semitic and the Aryan or Japhetic. We thus see that from the earliest times to which we are able to point we have living in Europe and Asia these three divisions of the human family, whom some have looked upon as the descendants of Ham, Shem, and Japhet. What relationship the other excluded races of mankind, the black and red, bear on the Hamites, Shemites, and Japhetites, has not been suggested. It seems more reasonable to consider Noah as merely the ancestor of the white races, and, therefore, so far as our linguistic knowledge goes, of the Semetic and Aryan families of speech only. But outside the pure Semites there lived a race of a less pure nationality, springing, probably, from the mixture of Semites with earlier black and yellow races. These people [the mixed ones] we may distinguish as Hamites. A division of

this race were the Cushites, the stock from which the Egyptian, the Chaldæan, and many of the CANAANITE nations were mainly formed.

“But though from the earliest times there were probably in Asia these three divisions of mankind, their relative position and importance was very different from what it is now. At the present time the Turanian races are everywhere shrinking and dwindling before the descendants of Japhet. At the moment at which I write it is the Aryan Slavs who are pushing the yellow-skinned Tartars farther and farther back in Siberia and Central Asia, and are endeavouring to push the Mongolian Turks from their foothold in Europe. The Tartar races have had their era of great conquest too, for to them belong those races — Huns, Avars, Magyars — who have spread such devastation in Europe, to them belong such conquerors as Attila, Genghis Khan, and Tumûr Lenk (Tamerlane). In the first few centuries after Mohammedism was introduced among them, the Turanians of Central Asia rose into power. Several different Tartar races in succession — Seljûks, Ayyubites, Mongols (Moghuls), etc. — rose upon the ruins of the Arab Chalifate, and invaded India, Persia, Africa, and Europe. The last of these is the race of the Osmanlîs, or, as we call them simply, the Turks. Their days of conquest are past, and therefore, great as is the space which the Turanian people now occupy over the face of the globe, there is reason to believe that in early prehistoric times they were still more widely extended. In all probability the men of the polished-stone age in Europe and Asia were of this yellow-skinned Mongolian type. We know that the human remains of this period seem to have come from a short and round-skulled people; and this roundness of the skull is one of the chief marks of the Mongolians as distinguished from the white races of mankind.

“We know, too, that the earliest inhabitants of India belonged to a Turanian, AND THEREFORE TO A YELLOW RACE; and that Turanians MINGLED with one of the oldest historical Semitic peoples, and helped to produce the civilization of the Chaldæans. And as, moreover, we find in various parts of Asia traces of a civilization similar to that of Europe during the latter part of the polished-stone age, it seems not unreasonable, in casting our eyes back upon the remotest antiquity on which research sheds any light, to suppose an early widespread Turanian or Mongolian family extending over the greater part of Europe and Asia. These Turanians were in various stages of civilization or barbarism, from the rude condition of the hunters and fishers of the Danish shell-mounds to a higher state reigning in Central and Southern Asia, and similar to that which was afterwards attained toward the end of the polished-stone age in Europe. The earliest home of these pure Turanians was probably a region lying somewhere to the east of Lake Aral. ‘There’, says a writer from whom we have already quoted, ‘from very remote antiquity they had possessed a peculiar civilization, characterized by gross Sabeism [maybe the Sabeans of Job 1:15], peculiarly materialistic tendencies, and complete want of moral elevation ... This strange and incomplete civilization exercised over [a] great part of Asia an absolute preponderance (excess power), lasting, according to the historian Justin, 1500 years’.”

If you have followed this expose’ on early history, by this book, and have been on your toes, you have learned more about this subject than reading 15 to 20 huge volumes on ancient history. You can observe very quickly, the author didn’t buy the premise of the universal flood of Noah, as he credited Noah with only white children. He refers to the racial mixtures with white, yellow and black are known today as “Hamites.” This is significant, for it would then appear that the descendants of Ham, especially the

descendants of Canaan, were the ones who mixed with these other races, thus being dubbed “Hamitic.” The Palestinians of today’ are good examples of Hamitic peoples. I would believe that much of the Arab world, as it exists today, is basically Hamitic under this definition of the term. It is interesting, too, what the writer has to contribute concerning the Tartar races, for this appears to be the same origin as the Ashkenazi “Jews” — “Huns, Avars, Magyars etc.” (check Arthur Koestler’s *The Thirteenth Tribe*, page 17). I know that of the “Jews” their Mongolian features are very outstanding. Of very special interest is the remark: “*We know, too, that the earliest inhabitants of India belonged to a Turanian, and therefore to a yellow race; and that Turanians mingled with one of the oldest historical Semitic peoples ...*” From many indicators, this was the people that invaded Palestine and mixed with the white Canaanites, descendants of Ham, and were called Horites or Hurrians. Then we are told that this materialistic people of very low morals were a world power that lasted for a period of 1500 years.

At this point, in this study, I am finding this a very difficult subject to pursue. The reason for this is because I have different sources of information telling me contradicting versions of the Horites of the Bible, or Hurrians as they are called by some historians. I believe, though, there is enough evidence to connect them with the Hittite and Hivite wives of Esau. I believe the problem lies in the prospect they are a people called by two different names. It is very similar to the Mexicans of today’ as they are called both Spanish and Indian. Another problem found with the Horites (or Hurrians) is: their inscriptions have been found to be bilingual, as some of their words are found to be of Semitic origin and other words Hurrian in origin. We have the same bilingual problem with the many Hispanics coming so-called legally and illegally into our country today. We shouldn’t be surprised, then, with two diverse peoples mixing together in history that this same bilingual situation would have existed. We should probably be more surprised if it didn’t exist. I would like to refer back to part of a quotation I used in lesson #24 from *Archaeology And The Bible* by George A. Barton, chapter 3 entitled “The Hittites”, pages 74-75: “*The more our knowledge of the Hittites grows, the less simple seems the problem of their racial affinities. Some features of their speech clearly resemble features of the Indo-European family of languages, but other features would seem to denote Tartar affinities ...*” From this observation, we can be reasonably sure the yellow-skinned Tartars mixed with the Semitic Hittites and these are the kind of women which Esau took for his wives, except for Bashemath, Ishmael’s daughter. (By the way, I did find that Esau had a fourth wife, but had no sons by her, and, therefore, there is no accounting in the genealogies (Jasher 28:22-23; Jasher 30:21-22).

The above partial quotation from *Archaeology And The Bible* by George A. Barton, chapter 3 entitled “The Hittites”, page 74 is very important. I am aware that language does not always prove race, but in this case should have some bearing on the case primarily because it is speaking of the ancient languages and in a contemporary time period. Barton went on to say on page 75: “*It may well be that Indo-Europeans followed by Mongols came about 2100 or 2000 [B.C.] into this region, or that the Mongols were there earlier and that the Indo-Europeans then came. In the resultant civilization it would seem, from the information that we have, there was a mingling of the*

two races.” Since we have some evidence that there was a mixture of the Semitic and Tartar races, let’s next investigate what is meant by the term “Tartar.” For this we will go to *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 18, page 38b:

“**Tartar** was the name given early Mongol races of Central Asia. They lived in northeastern Gobi during the 400’s [A.D.], but were later driven southward by the Khitan tribes. During the 800’s, the Tartars founded the Mongolian Empire. In the 1200’s, the Mongols began a movement through Hungary, Romania, Poland, Turkey, Russia, and Bulgaria. Today, the term *Tartar* describes peoples of Turkish origin and other groups who live in western Asia and the European part of Russia. Their physical features and original stocks depend upon where they live. Most of the present-day Tartars are Moslems, and speak some form of the Turkish language. Some are nomads. Others settled permanently and worked on farms or gardens. A typical Tartar group is the Kirghiz. Tartar comes from the Manchu word *tatar*, which means *archer* or *nomad*. Tartar early took the form of *Tartar* because it was associated with Tartarus, the word for a mythical Hades.”

For a more ancient observation of the peoples of Asia, I will turn to *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, Ninth Edition 1894, volume 2, page 608, under the topic “Asia”, under the division “Ethnology”:

“**Mongolian group.** Asia, including its outlying islands, has become the dwelling-place of all the great families into which the races of men have been divided. By far the largest area is occupied by the *Mongolian* group. These have yellow-brown skins, black eyes and hair, flat noses and oblique eyes. They are short in stature, with little hair on the body and face. In general terms they extend, with modifications of character probably due to admixture with other types and to varying conditions of life, over the whole of Northern Asia as far south as the plains bordering the Caspian Sea, including Tibet and China, and also over the Indo-Malayan peninsula and Archipelago, excepting Papua and some of the more eastern islands.”

The following is a comment concerning the Horites or Hurrians of Genesis 36:21 by *Adam Clarke’s Commentary*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 69: “*These are the dukes of the Horites.* It appears pretty evident that the Horites and the descendants of Esau were mixed together in the same land, as before observed.”

*The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, page 38, has this to say about the same passage: “**Edom and Its People.** Genesis 36:1-43. Before recounting the life story of Joseph, the writer of Genesis describes something of the land of Edom and its inhabitants. The original inhabitants of Mount Seir were called Horites or Hurrians. In the course of time, Esau and his descendants took over the territory. Esau became wealthy and possessed much cattle and sheep. The principal cities of the area were Sela, Bozrah, Petra, Teman, and Ezion-geber.”

*The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, page 18, has the following to say about the reference to “Horites” of Genesis 14:6: “**And the Horites in their Mount Seir.** Archaeology has contributed much to establish the basic historicity of these early narratives. These people, called **Horites**, are now well known as Hurrians, a non-Semitic group. Their records, uncovered at Nuzu by archaeologists, have thrown much light on patriarchal customs.

William F. Albright believes that these Hurrians came into prominence as early as 2400 B.C., and became competitors of Hittites and Sumerians for supremacy in culture and learning. They must have found their way to the region south of the Dead Sea quite early. They were displaced [later] from the region of Mount Seir by Esau's descendants (Deut. 2:22)."

You will notice that verses 20 to 23 of Deuteronomy chapter 2 were not in the original text. The question arises, then, did Esau displace the Horites or did he absorb them? It appears from the biblical record that he did, at least, absorb part of them. Rebekah also recognized these people as being the "children of Heth" (Genesis 27:46), the descendants of Canaan, the son of Ham. Therefore, it would appear that the Hittite-Hivite-Canaanite sons of Heth mixed with the Mongol-Horite-Hurrians.

To refresh our memory concerning the lineage of Heth, I will quote from *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 1102: "**Heth.** The second-listed son of Canaan and great-grandson of Noah through Ham. Gen 10:1, 6, 15; 1 Chron. 1:13) Heth was ancestral father of the Hittites (1 Ki. 10:29; 2 Ki. 7:6) , one branch of which settled in the hill country of Judah. (Ex. 3:8) It was in the vicinity of Hebron that Abraham purchased from Ephron the Hittite the field of Machpelah and the cave therein, as a burial place. (Gen. 23:2-20; 25:8-10; 49:32) Of its 14 occurrences, the name Heth appears 10 times in connection with 'the sons of Heth.' Two of Esau's wives were from among 'the daughters of Heth' (also called 'the daughters of Canaan'), these wives being a source of grief to his parents. —Gen. 26:34, 35; 27:46; 28:1, 6-8."

For further information concerning the Hittites, Horites, Hurrians or whatever other name you wish to reference them by, I will quote from *The Revell Bible Dictionary*, page 487:

"**Hittite.** (1) A great northern empire, which at its height included all of Syria, as in Josh. 1:4; (2) an ethnic group, widespread in Canaan by patriarchal times, as in Gen. 15:20. 'The Hittite Empire developed in northern Anatolia (modern Turkey) around 1800 B.C. By 1650 B.C., Hittite armies sacked Babylon. After a decline, the Hittites became a major power again under Suppilulimas around 1350 B.C. At that time the empire included all of Syria. But by 1200 B.C., the empire had been scattered by the aggressive Sea Peoples, among whom were the biblical Philistines. The Hittite Empire was gone, but Hittite culture was preserved in Syrian city-states. Although the empire never included Canaan proper, later Assyrian and Babylonian records refer to the northern fertile crescent area, extending into Syria and Palestine, as the 'land of the Hatti [that is, Hittites].' By Abraham's time, groups of migrant Hittites were already settled in Canaan. Most biblical mentions of Hittites refer to these ethnic groups rather than the Hittite Empire. Abraham purchased a cave from Ephron the Hittite as a tomb for Sarah (Gen. 23). Exodus identifies Canaan as the land of the Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, etc. ..."

Not only are the "Jews" descended from Cain, who was the product of the union of Satan with Eve, but they are also the offspring of the incestuous union of Ham and his mother, and thus, they also are of Canaan, and received the curse put upon him by Noah. Let's refresh ourselves to the names of Canaan's sons as recorded in Genesis 10:15: Sidon, Heth, Jebusite, Amorite, Girgashite, Hivite, Arkite, Sinite, Arvadite, Zemarite & Hamathite. All of these eleven tribes of Canaan's sons, along with any

daughters, had the curse of Noah on Canaan upon them. This curse has followed Canaan's descendants down to this very day. They were also white people, at least from the start with Ham. We have to remember, though, Ham had other children and descendants who did not come under Canaan's curse.

### **MORE INFORMATION ON THE HURRIANS**

From *The Sacred Name Broadcaster*, June, 1983, we get the following information from an article entitled "How Did the Hittites Infiltrate Israel?", page 9:

"... **Introduction to the Hittites.** The original Hittites were descendants of Heth, the second son of Canaan (therefore of Hamitic origin), according to the Biblical genealogy, Genesis 10:15; Chronicles 1:13. By the third millennium B.C.E., they were established in the area of central Turkey. Shortly after 2000 B.C.E., they were conquered by Indo-Europeans who set up a number of city-states. The most important of these was Hattusas, located about 90 miles east of where Ankara is located today. The name *Hattusa* is now changed to *BoghazKoi*."

"... 'As early as 1600 [B.C.E], they appear to have had a certain monopoly in the manufacture of iron', says the article published in *Collier's Encyclopedia*. ... 'Iron was a precious metal from which ornaments were made and not weapons', *The Secrets of the Hittites*, pages 211-212. In the times of the Hittites, iron was five times more expensive than gold and forty times dearer than silver. For centuries it must have been among the rarest of luxuries. This was not the Iron Age, for the sea people which dominated Asia Minor from 1800-1200 B.C.E., who overthrew the Hittite Empire, introduced the Iron Age."

"**The Hittites were short and stout, yellow in color with black hair and beardless**" (emphasis mine). They migrated from northeast Mesopotamia, and worked south toward Palestine, and west into Asia Minor. According to Numbers 13:39, they lived in the mountainous regions, which include Lebanon and Syria. Joshua 1:4 describes them as inhabiting the land, 'From the wilderness, and this Lebanon, even to the great river, the Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites.' According to Deuteronomy 7:1-2, they became populous and mighty, and became a major nation among those of the Fertile Crescent. Yahweh, in Exodus 3:8 describes the land of the Hittites and other nations of the Fertile Crescent (with the land of Canaan as the southwest point) as flowing with milk and honey. Being descendants of Canaan brought them under the curse pronounced by Noah upon Canaan, and like the other nations descended from Canaan their religion was primarily pagan."

I know someone is going to point out immediately that the above quotation is from the "Jew", Jacob O. Meyer, and try to disqualify it on that account; guilt by association in other words. I have another non-Jewish source which is saying essentially the same thing. I will now quote from this book which is entitled *The Westminster Dictionary Of The Bible*, page 251, under the topic "Hittites":

"... The racial affinities of the Hittites are not clearly understood. One type frequently seen on the monuments of Egypt **has the large nose**; it seems that the modern Armenians are lineal descendants of one group of this nation. **The Hittites were short and stocky and had thick lips. The large nose and retreating forehead are also represented on the Hittite monuments.** The Hittites were not Semites. According to the monuments they wore heavy



clothing, coats that reached down to the knees, and high woolen headdress. They wore shoes which were turned up at the toes, which suggest that they came from the snowy mountains. It is inferred from their appearance that they were a people from a cold climate. In fact, the plateau of Anatolia varies from 4,000 to 3,000 feet above sea level.

“ Historically a sharp distinction must be made between the Hittite Empire and the Hittite states of north Syria and southeast Asia Minor. Archaeologically the word Hittite applies to [the] remains of the remarkable and unique culture found in Asia Minor, northern Syria, and northern Mesopotamia ... It is now generally agreed that Hittite is somehow related to the Indo-European languages. It seems that Hittite and primitive Indo-European are connected by virtue of a common descent from a parent speech, which may be called Indo-Hittite.

“ The real key to the Hittite problem was discovered by Hugo Winckler of Berlin, who in 1906-1907 and 1911-1912 discovered at Boghazköi (the site of ancient Hattushash) about 10,000 clay tablets inscribed in cuneiform characters. Here were represented a number of languages: Sumerian, Akkadian, Hattic, Hittite (Nasi or Nesi), Luian or Luish (the tongue of Arzawa and closely related to Hittite), Palaic, and **Hurrian**. The inscriptions on the Hittite monuments are written in Hittite hieroglyphs.”

It seems, according to *The Book Of Jubilees*, that at the instructions of Noah, all the lands around them were given out by lot to his grandchildren. The territory, later to become known as the land of Canaan, was given to Shem and his descendants. To pick up this part of the story, I will quote from *The Book Of Jubilees*, chapter 10, verses 22 through 27:

“ 22 And Ham and his sons went into the land which he had taken, which fell to him by lot in the land of the north (south); and Kanaan (Canaan) saw the land of the Libanon to the canal of Egypt that it was very good, and he did not go into the land of his inheritance to the west of the sea, and dwelt in the land of Libanon on the coast of the sea. 23 And Ham, his father, and Cush and Mezrem, his brothers, said to him: ‘ Thou hast settled in a land which is not thine and did not fall to us by lot, thou shouldst not do thus; for if thou doest thus, then thou and thy children will fall by condemnation in the land, and as cursed ones by sedition, for by sedition ye have settled and by sedition thy children will fall and thou wilt be rooted out to eternity. 24 Do not dwell in the dwelling place of Shem, for to Shem and his children was it given by lot. 25 Cursed art thou and cursed shalt thou be above all the sons of Noah by the curse which we covenanted with an oath between us in the presence of the holy judge and before Noah our father.’ 26 But he (Canaan) did not listen to them and dwelt in the land of Libanon from Emath to the entrance of Egypt, he and his sons until this day. 27 And on this account this land is called Canaan.”

I have some serious questions in my mind concerning *The Book Of Jubilees*, but maybe it is a matter of getting the different events in their proper chronological order. I will not go into some of these questionable items here, but I believe that this passage just quoted seems to fit the overall picture. If this passage is true, it appears that Canaan and his descendants may have more than one curse on them. Like the first curse, this curse, too, would follow them throughout their generations forever. Again,

this curse is still resting today upon the heads of the present-day “Jews”, as they, being Canaanite-“Jews”, are once more in Shem’s land trying to claim it.

“The Strong’s number for the term Canaanite is #3669: ‘patrial from 3667; a *Kenaanite* or inhabitant of Kenaan; by implication a *pedlar* (the Canaanites standing for their neighbors the Ishmaelites, who conducted mercantile caravans): — Canaanite, merchant, trafficker.’” According to *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 1, page 701, this name also means “Belonging to (the land of) Purple.”