

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #51; July, 2002 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 fifty-first monthly teaching letter and continues my fifth year of publication. At this point, I am going to repeat a warning. It seems like there is always someone out there teaching a different gospel of the Kingdom. One such person is Garrison R. Russell in his book *Son Placing*, where he says on page 290: "The Sons of God are not descendants of Abraham, or Israel, or Adam." If you have this man's book, I would highly recommend you scrutinize very carefully every word he says. From what I have observed from his book thus far, it is filled with half-truths and downright lies.

You will remember that in the last two *Teaching Letters*, #49 and #50, I promised to document that Queen Elizabeth II's husband, Philip, was of questionable blood and how all the children from that union are unfit to take the Throne of David, which the British throne represents. I said the following in lesson #49: "... from the news I notice the queen-mother of England is dead. I'm fully persuaded Elizabeth II is the last pureblooded descendant of David left to sit on the throne, while Philip Mountbatten and his heirs are of questionable blood presenting prophecy problems." Then again in lesson #50 I reiterated: "In the last lesson, I briefly mentioned that the queen-mother of Britain had died. I believe that this is a major mile-marker in time as to where we are today on Yahweh's time-clock. I would remind you that Scripture says in no uncertain terms that there would always be a descendant of David on a throne somewhere until Messiah's Second Advent. Conceivably, this could mean: if the present Queen Elizabeth II were to have a heart attack and die, and our Redeemer has not returned, the promise to David is a lie and our Bible is untrustworthy. I also pointed out that Queen Elizabeth II's husband was of questionable blood, and because Elizabeth had taken an unsuitable mate, thus violating Yahweh's Law of kind after kind, her children by that marriage are unfit to take the throne" (i.e., Shuah vs. Tamar, Gen. 38).

Some are of the opinion that if the Queen were to suddenly die, the throne could be transferred to another branch of the family. That would be the usual process, but those who make that statement don't take into account there were only to be three "overturns", Ezekiel 21:27, and all three have already happened (i.e., Jerusalem to Ireland, to Scotland, to England). Queen Elizabeth II undoubtedly represents the last surviving pureblooded heir to the throne on behalf of the third "overturn." Let's now

document why the tainted-blood offspring of Elizabeth by Philip, are unqualified to take that throne.

Philip was of the line of Battenberg until the name was changed to Mountbatten. I will now quote from two encyclopedias on the background of the Battenberg side of Philip's lineage: The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1963), volume 3, page 281:

“ **Battenberg**, the name of a family of German counts, which died out about 1314, whose seat was the castle of Kellerburg, near Battenberg, in Hesse. The title was revived in 1851, when Alexander (1823-88), a younger son of Louis II, grand duke of Hesse, contracted a morganatic marriage with the Polish lady, Countess Julia Theresa von Hauke (1825-95), who was then created countess of Battenberg. In 1858 the countess and her children were raised to the rank of princes and princesses of Battenberg, with the title of *Durchlaucht*, or serene highness.

“ In 1917 the eldest son of this union, Louis Alexander (1854-1921), who had become an admiral in the British navy, was created marquess of Milford Haven ..., and, at the request of King George V, the members of the family who lived in England renounced, in 1917, the German title of prince of Battenberg and adopted the surname of Mountbatten. The second son, Alexander Joseph (1857-93), was elected Prince Alexander I of Bulgaria in 1879 ... Henry Maurice, the third son, married on July 23, 1885, Beatrice, youngest daughter of Victoria, queen of England, became a naturalized Englishman and was appointed captain general and governor of the Isle of Wight and governor of Carisbrooke. He died at sea on Jan. 20, 1896, of a fever contracted on active service with the British troops during the Ashanti War. The fourth son, Francis Joseph (1861-1924), married in 1897 Anna, daughter of Nicholas I, prince of Montenegro, and was the author of *Die volkswirtschaftliche Entwicklung Bulgariens von 1879 bis zur Gegenwart* (1891).

“ The only daughter of the princess of Battenberg, Marie Caroline (1852-1923), married in 1871 Gustavus Ernest, prince of Erbach-Schönberg. Princess Alice of Battenberg (b. 1885), daughter of Prince Louis Alexander, and Victoria Eugénie (Princess Ena of Battenberg; b. 1887), only daughter of Prince Henry Maurice, were both married before 1917, the former to Prince Andrew of Greece and the latter to Alphonso XIII, king of Spain. Prince Henry's youngest son, Maurice of Battenberg, was killed in action near Ypres on Oct. 27, 1914 ...”

For another witness I will quote from the *Encyclopedia Americana* (1991), volume 3, page 356: “ **Battenberg** ... is a title of nobility taken from the name of a village near Marburg, West Germany. A family of counts held the title until it died out about 1314. In 1851, upon the morganatic marriage of Prince Alexander of Hesse-Darmstadt to Julia Teresa, countess von Hauke, the latter received the title of countess of Battenberg. The countess and her children were raised to the rank of princes and princesses in 1858. Their descendants retained the title until World War I, when those living in England anglicized it to Mountbatten.”

LET'S EXAMINE THE EVIDENCE

It seems that we have a castle by the name of Kellerburg, near a town called Battenberg in an area known as Hesse in Germany. It also appears that there was a

family of German counts that lived there until they all died out in 1314. That area seems to have been settled mostly by Kelts in early times. Did the family physically die out, or did the succession of royal authority die out? It makes a lot of difference. Be that as it may, it also appears that this heir apparent, Alexander, married a Polish lady. Again, one must ask the question, what kind of ladies might one find in Poland at that time (actually Warsaw)? Then, we are told there was a “morganatic marriage” arranged between this Polish lady named Julia Theresa von Hauke and Alexander. Interestingly, we have another morganatic marriage to compare with that of Alexander to Julia Theresa von Hauke. The party was Constantine Pavlovich (1779-1831) grand-duke and cesarevitch of Russia, born to Paul Petrovich and Mary Feodorovna. His grandmother, empress Catherine II, arranged for his marriage to Juliana of Coburg, which failed miserably. Later, he fell in love with a Polish lady, Johanna Grudzinska, and signed a paper resigning all claim of succession to the throne. Question: Why wasn't Alexander required to sign a similar paper?, or did he?

Well, let's investigate what is meant by a “morganatic marriage.” From *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1969), we read this:

“**morganatic** ... *adj.* Of or pertaining to a type of legal marriage between a man or woman of royal or noble birth and a partner of lower rank, in which agreement is made that any titles or estates of the royal or noble partner will not be shared by the commoner or by any of the offspring. [New Latin *morganaticus*, from Medieval Latin *matrimonium ad morganaticam*, ‘marriage for (no dowry but) the morning-gift’ (i.e., the husband's token gift to the wife on the morning after the wedding night), from Old High German *morgan*, morning ...”

ELIZABETH II AND PHILIP MOUNTBATTEN HAVE SAME GREAT-GREAT-GRANDMOTHER

The marriage of Philip Mountbatten to Elizabeth II was a tragedy of the utmost magnitude, and is only part of the story. While they both had a great-great-grandmother in common the bad blood came through Louis Battenberg, and in turn through Julia Theresa von Hauke, not Victoria. Julia Theresa von Hauke (the Polish lady's) father's name was Maurice von Hauke who had married Sophia of Lafontaine. Alexander Louis George Frederick Emil contracted a “morganatic” marriage to Julia Theresa von Hauke and had the following children: (1) Mary Battenberg, (2) Louis Alexander Mountbatten, (3) Alexander Joseph Battenberg, (4) Henry Maurice Battenberg, and, (5) Francis Joseph Battenberg. The bad blood followed down from Julia Theresa von Hauke to her son Louis Alexander Mountbatten, to his daughter Victoria Alice **of Battenberg**, to her son Philip Mountbatten (Queen Elizabeth II's husband), to his son Charles, Prince of Wales (whose very telltale appearance defies all reasonable doubt of a “Jewish” bloodline connection). Here is what the book *Kings & Queens Of England* by David Williamson says on page 121:

“Not long after the royal family's return to England, the princess's engagement to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten, RN. was announced. He was born at Corfu on 10 June 1921, and like her was the great-great-grandchild of Queen Victoria, being the

only son of Prince Andrew of Greece and Denmark and his wife, Princess Alice of Battenberg.”

Because this may be somewhat confusing, I will show you that alleged bad bloodline from a different perspective:

- Julia Theresa von Hauke.
- Louis Alexander Mountbatten.
- Victoria Alice **of Battenberg**.
- Philip Mountbatten.
- Charles, Prince of Wales.

Thus, I will repeat what I said before: The present Queen Elizabeth II is the last pureblooded Israelite of the Tribe of Judah, of the House of David, to sit on David’s throne, and she has no legitimate heirs to take her place. I challenge anyone to prove otherwise without an additional “overturn.”

From the book *Mountbatten* by Philip Ziegler, ©1985, pages 21-22: “Prince Alexander of Hesse, Mountbatten’s grandfather, was the third son of Grand Duke Louis II and godson to the Tsar of Russia. When his sister married the Tsarevich, the future Tsar Alexander II, it seemed both sensible and in keeping with the national tradition that Alexander of Hesse should take service in the Russian army. He achieved distinction, had a regiment of the Lancers named after him and was awarded the Cross of St George. The Tsar intended him as a husband for his niece and his future in Russia promised to be secure and prosperous. For Alexander, however, at this stage of his life at least, security and prosperity did not count for much. He fell in love with Julia Hauke, one of his sister’s ladies-in-waiting, a Polish girl who, if hardly a nonentity [nobody], was not from a family sufficiently grandiose to justify so princely a match. The Tsar indignantly forbade the marriage. Alexander went to England to forget, remembered, returned to St Petersburg and in 1851 eloped with Julia to Warsaw and thence to Breslau where he married her.

“This impetuous escapade effectively exiled him from Russia. It did little to improve his standing in his native Hesse. His elder brother, now Grand Duke Louis III, was almost as outraged as the Tsar, but felt that he could hardly let Alexander starve. An uneasy settlement was reached. Alexander was allowed to retain his status as a royal prince of Hesse; the defunct title of Battenburg — a pleasant town in the north of the Grand Duchy — and the quality of countess was conferred on his wife; any children of the marriage, though without claim to the throne of Hesse, would at least be of the same rank as their mother. Even this qualified disgrace did not last long. In 1858 Countess Julia of Battenburg was raised to the level of a Serene Highness and four years later the couple returned to Darmstadt. A new house had been born; royal, after a fashion, but bearing about it a faint aura of wildness and irregularity ... There had always been much to-ing and fro-ing between the courts of Great Britain and of Hesse, and this was intensified after the marriage in 1862 of the future Grand Duke Louis IV to Queen Victoria’s daughter Alice.”

From this, we can clearly see that indeed all heirs of Julia Hauke were disqualified as royal members entitled to the throne. The Almighty's promise to David was a seedline promise. Therefore, take away the element of seedline, and we have nothing. The only way we have access to the Kingdom is through the seedline Promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. If one cannot claim that kinsman seedline Promise, there is no Redemption in Messiah's blood. As Hebrews 12:8 says, we are either "sons" or we are "bastards."

THE KEY OF DAVID

It is absolutely impossible to comprehend Yahweh's promise to David, that he would never lack a man to sit on the throne, unless we understand "the key of David", (1 Kings 8:25; 2 Chronicles 6:16; Psalm 132:11-12). Because Zedekiah was the last Biblically recorded descendant of David to sit on that throne at Jerusalem, it would appear the Almighty reneged on that promise. Mr. H. Graber (who uses the title of Dr.) in his book *How Holy Is Your Bible?*, pages 180-181, says the throne of David is no longer "physical" but is now a "spiritual throne." He summed it up this way: "So since Jehoiakin, the Kingship, the 'everlasting throne of David' has been and is SPIRITUAL! (Until the second advent!)" He then quotes several passages out of context in an attempt to prove his point. Had Graber had any understanding of the "key of David" he could not have made such an irrational conclusion.

Before discussing "the key of David", let's read the passage where it is first found in Isaiah 22:15-25:

"¹⁵ Thus saith Yahweh El of hosts, Go, get thee unto this treasurer, *even* unto Shebna, which *is* over the house, *and say*, ¹⁶ What hast thou here? and whom hast thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out a sepulchre here, *as* he that heweth him out a sepulchre on high, *and* that graveth an habitation for himself in a rock? ¹⁷ Behold, Yahweh will carry thee away with a mighty captivity, and will surely cover thee. ¹⁸ He will surely violently turn and toss thee *like* a ball into a large country; there shall thou die, and there the chariots of thy glory *shall be* the shame of thy lord's house. ¹⁹ And I will drive thee from thy station, and from thy state shall he pull thee down. ²⁰ And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will call my servant Eliakim the son of Hilkiah: ²¹ And I will cloth him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand: and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. ²² And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open. ²³ And I will fasten him *as* a nail in a sure place; and he shall be for a glorious throne to his father's house. ²⁴ And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his father's house, the offspring and the issue, all vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to all the vessels of flagons. ²⁵ In that day, saith Yahweh of hosts, shall the nail that is fastened in the sure place be removed, and be cut down, and fall; and the burden that was upon it shall be cut off: for Yahweh hath spoken *it*."

Immediately, we must clear up a misconception many make concerning this passage, as they apply this directly to our Messiah. Yes, it does apply to our Savior, but we need to keep it in its proper context, as the key of David (nail) of verse 25 is to be

“removed” ... “cut down” ... and “fall.” That is hardly a picture of our risen victorious Redeemer! Thus, it is vital we discover the identity of “the nail that is fastened in a sure place.” Essentially, this passage is making a contrast of two men diametrically opposite each other. Their names are Shebna and Eliakim. One is like a rolling ball, the other like a very secure peg (or nail). In other words, one is very unreliable, and the other very dependable. Once grasping the extreme differences in character represented here, we can begin to comprehend what is being said. For a commentary on this Scripture, I will now quote from *The Book Of Isaiah* by Sir George Adam Smith, vol. 1, pages 330-332:

“... If there is any reason, it can only be this, for putting the second section of chap. xxii, which advocates a change of ministry in the city (vv. 15-22), so close to the first, which sees ahead nothing but destruction of the State (vv. 1-14).

“The *mayor of the palace* at this time was one Shebna, also called *minister* or *deputy* (lit. *of use to the king*). That his father is not named implies perhaps that Shebna was a foreigner; ... and he has been plausibly supposed to be the leader of the party then in power, whose policy was the Egyptian alliance, and whom in these latter years Isaiah had so frequently denounced as the root of Judah’s bitterness. To this unfamilied intruder, who had sought to establish himself in Jerusalem, after the manner of those days, by hewing himself a great sepulchre, Isaiah brought sentence of violent banishment: *Behold, Yahweh will be hurling, hurling thee away, thou big man, and crumpling, crumpling thee together. He will roll, roll thee on, thou rolling-stone, like a ball thrown out on broad level ground; there shalt thou die, and there shall be the chariots of thy glory, thou shame of the house of thy lord. And I thrust thee from thy post, and from thy station pull thee down* (18 f.). This vagabond was not to die in his bed, nor to be gathered in his big tomb to the people on whom he had foisted himself. He should continue a rolling-stone. For him, like Cain, there was a land of Nod [land of wandering]; and upon it he was to find a vagabond’s death.” [brackets & emphasis mine] I would say that George Adam Smith is right on the money! From this we can see the characteristics of Shebna. Continuing, we will observe those of Eliakim:

“To fill this upstart’s place, Isaiah solemnly designated a man with a father: Eliakim, the son of Hilkiyah. The formulas he uses are perhaps the official ones customary upon induction to an office. But it may be also, that Isaiah has woven into these expressions of even greater promise than usual. For this change of office-bearers was critical, and the overthrow of the ‘party of action’ meant to Isaiah the beginning of the blessed future. *And it shall come to pass in that day that I will call My servant Eliakim, the son of Hilkiyah; and I will clothe him with thy robe, and with thy girdle will I brace him, and thine authority will I give into his hand, and he shall be for a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And I will set the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shut: and he shall shut, and none open. And I will hammer him in, a peg in a firm place, and he shall be for a throne of glory to his father’s house* (20-23). Thus, to the last, Isaiah will not allow Shebna to forget that he [like Cain] is without root among the people of God, that he has neither father nor family.

“... This very year we find Eliakim in Shebna’s post, and Shebna reduced to be secretary ... Catching at the figure, with which his designation of Eliakim closed, that

Eliakim would be a peg in a solid wall, a throne on which the glory of his father's house might settle, Isaiah reminds the much-encumbered statesman that the firmest peg will give way if you hang too much on it, the strongest man be pulled down by his dependent and indolent family. *They shall hang upon him all the weight of his father's house, the scions and the offspring, ... all the least vessels, from the vessels of cups to all the vessels of flagons. In that day, rede [counsel, advise] of Yahweh of Hosts, shall the peg that was knocked into a firm place give way, and it shall be knocked out and fall, and down shall be cut the burden that was upon it, for Yahweh hath spoken.*

“So we have not one, but a couple of tragedies. Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, follows Shebna, the son of Nobody. The fate of the overburdened peg is as grievous as that of the **rolling stone**. It is easy to pass this prophecy over as a trivial incident; but when we have carefully analyzed each verse, restored to the words their exact shade of signification, and set them in their proper contrasts, we perceive the outlines of two social dramas, which it requires little imagination to invest with engrossing moral interest.”

Yes, we should definitely take much interest in what is being said here. Curiously, the author was supporting Two Seedline doctrine without being aware of it. Inasmuch as the Bible teaches Two Seedline from beginning to end, it would be difficult for anyone to avoid, yet some try. It is noteworthy that Shebna was unable to show his family line. We shouldn't be surprised at this as nowhere in the chronicles is it recorded who Cain's father was. Of one thing we can be quite sure, nowhere in all Scripture is Adam recorded as Cain's father. We are also told that Shebna was like “a ball” or “rolling stone.” Isn't it amazing that we had a so-called musical group during the hippie revolution by that very same name. That George Adam Smith makes a comparison between Shebna and Cain is simply outstanding. Surely, a better comparison couldn't be made of a “vagabond” to a “ball” or “rolling stone.” It should be noted also that Shebna was a man of pride which is a common trait among the descendants of Cain.

On the contrary, we see that Eliakim was the very anti-type of Shebna. He knew who his father was. Eliakim, rather than being a rolling-stone was a man of stability; one who could be counted on in time of trouble. Additionally, Eliakim was a humble man without self-glorifying pride. In short, these two men were 180° opposite in nature in every respect. These men were not kings in themselves, but were given the power of the king's office. One of their responsibilities was to keep track of David's genealogy to make certain it was kept pure. Because Isa. 22:24 speaks of David's “offspring” in close relation to “vessels”; no doubt the term “vessels” is referring to David's descendants. Often people are likened to “vessels”, 2 Cor. 4:7.

PROPHECY CONCERNING DAVID'S KEY

Now that we understand that the words “peg” and “nail” are other words for “key”, let's consider the prophecy found in Isa. 22:25: “In that day, saith Yahweh of hosts, shall the nail that is fastened in the sure place be removed, and be cut down, and fall; and the burden that was upon it shall be cut off: for Yahweh hath spoken *it*.”

It should be immediately evident that this verse is not speaking of Messiah, although we are told (in Rev. 3:7) that He possesses that “key.” Rather, verse 25 is

speaking of Eliakim, the chief steward of the king. The next question we must ask is: Where is the “sure place” the “nail” was to be fastened? There are two periods in history which simply don’t fit the criteria. They are the periods from David as king to Zedekiah, and from the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple until the time of our Redeemer. The only other “sure place” would be the British throne from Jeremiah until the present time. Is there, then, any place in history that threatens to weaken the stability of that “nail” that it might be “cut off?”

Yes there is, and it’s as plain as the nose on a “Jew’s” face. To fit that criteria, the situation must return to a king’s advisor similar to Shebna, a “rolling-stone” descendant of Cain. By this yardstick, it can only be Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, sometimes called “Dizzy.” Benjamin was born 1804 and died 1881. He lived during the reign of Queen Victoria, born 1819, death 1901. She took the throne June 28, 1838. She married her first cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, 10 February, 1840. Upon the death of Prince Albert 14 December, 1861, at the age of 42, the serpent in the form of Benjamin Disraeli moved in.

We cannot fully grasp the maneuvering that was developing at that time unless we understand Disraeli’s background. For that, I will give an abridged paraphrase from the book *DISRAELI* by André Maurois: In the year 1290, on All Saints’ Day, King Edward I expelled the “Jews” from England. It was the time of the Crusades, and the monks were crying, ‘get rid of the Infidels.’ Those “Jews” who survived that onslaught took asylum in France. There in 1306, King Philip the Fair, being pressed for money, confiscated their belongings and thrust them towards Spain. Upon the persecutions in Spain, they moved to Venice and Amsterdam, and back to France once more. After much confusion under Cromwell and the Puritans, at the close of the 17th century, a small community of Portuguese and Spanish Jews was reestablished in London. Among these returnees was the Disraeli family. Benjamin’s father, Isaac, spent most of his time at libraries and the British Museum. Upon the advice of Sharon Turner, the great Anglo-Saxon historian, Isaac and his family were “converted to Christianity”, and “baptized.” After problems with his schoolmates, Benjamin, at the age of 15, returned home to utilize his father’s library, reading a wide variety of subjects. Vigorously, he read details on the secret societies; the Vehmgerichte, the Council of Ten, and the Jesuits, reading and rereading the life of St. Ignatius Loyola. Following a boring attempt at law practice, he reverted to writing and traveling, after which he entered politics, which his “baptism” helped to facilitate.

Upon the death of Queen Victoria’s husband, Prince Albert, Disraeli immediately bombarded her with a barrage of flattering letters to which she responded enthusiastically, and that relationship continued to Disraeli’s death. Therefore, in essence, Disraeli (counterpart of Shebna) became the Queen’s chief steward. From the book *DISRAELI* by André Maurois, pages 288 and 290, we read this:

“... Downstairs he would come, and she would receive him with such delight that for an instant he thought she was going to embrace him. So full of smiles was she that she looked younger, and almost pretty. She twittered and glided about the room like a bird. She was happy. She had recovered her Minister, the only Minister who gave her confidence in herself. For the Queen had had a difficult life. She had been unpopular,

very unpopular. She had seen people in London turn their backs on her carriage in the streets. First it was because of Lord Melbourne; and then it had been poor Albert, whom the public would not pardon for being a German; and then the Queen had been reproached for her mourning, and not one of her Ministers had defended her ...

“... Sometimes when they were alone, the Minister’s compliments became flowery and almost direct. But the Queen excused him when she recalled that he had Eastern blood. The Queen loved the East. She delighted to have [him] ... standing behind her chair, and at the head of her Realms this ingenious and sentimental Grand Vizier.

“ She invited him everywhere. She asked him to come and see her at Balmoral, where life was simpler and more free. Unfortunately, the guest was often ill. The long journeys fatigued him. The Queen sent her physician, the famous Sir William Jenner, to Mr. Disraeli’s sick-room. Sir William insisted on the Premier keeping his bed. In the morning the Queen came to see him. ‘ What do you think ’, he wrote Lady Chesterfield, ‘ of receiving your Sovereign in slippers and a dressing-gown?’ Seeing him so weak, she became maternal. Their relations became entirely human. She talked to him of Albert; he told her of Mary Anne. Minister and Sovereign had both found happiness in marriage, in the past, and here was one more bond between them.”

A few years ago, the *Christian Vanguard* of Metairie, Louisiana, published an article showing that Disraeli had gotten to Queen Victoria and convinced her that the Anglo-Saxons and the “ Jews ” were the same people, and that they were permitted to intermarry. I sure wish I still had that issue. Inasmuch as Sharon Turner was a personal friend to the Disraeli family, it makes sense. The Israel Identity message, through the efforts of John Wilson and Edward Hine, became very popular during that period. Therefore, the *Christian Vanguard* article is very plausible. Interestingly, Wilson and Hine were also unaware that today’s “ Jews ” are not Israelites.

THE DEMISE OF THE THRONE AS WE KNOW IT

In 1948 there was something significant that happened in England which was a catastrophic tragedy of the greatest magnitude. And, once that appalling disaster manifested itself, it could never be corrected, for there simply is no remedy once such a thing takes place. On November 14, 1948, Charles Philip Arthur George (a “ Jew ”; a descendant of Cain) was born to Queen Elizabeth II by her non-Royal husband, Philip Mountbatten. By that birth, the “ nail ” of Isaiah 22:25 was “ removed ”, “ cut down ” and there was a great “ fall.” It marked the end of David’s Monarchy on that Throne until the rightful “ Shiloh ” comes. Absolutely none of Philip Mountbatten’s issue are **Biblically, lawfully** qualified to be coronated to that dignity. The day Charles was born brought death to that Great Royal line of kings. With the advent of Julia Theresa von Hauke, the “ seed of the serpent ” of Genesis 3:15 entered that Royal line. Additionally, it should be noted that Julia Theresa von Hauke’s shield has no Israelite symbols as do other royal members. Hers’ is what appears to be a cartwheel on a red background; indeed, a befitting emblem for a “ rolling-stone ” upon Satan’s color, **RED!**