

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #82; February, 2005 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 eighty-second monthly teaching letter and continues my seventh year of publication. We are picking up where we left off in lesson #81. We were in the process of comprehending how archaeology is proving Josephus correct in various parts of his writings. We also saw how Josephus' histories link quite well with certain Scriptures. We will now see how Acts 23:24-24:27 fits with *Josephus' Antiquities* 20:7:1. When you read the next reference, you'll see how ridiculous it is to refute the evidence Josephus has to offer. We get the following information from *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. E-J, page 264:

“ **FELIX, ANTONIUS** ... PROCURATOR of Judea from 52 to 60 and successor to Cumanus. According to Acts 23:24-24:27, Felix was procurator at the time of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem and his arrest there. When Felix was recalled by Nero, Paul was turned over to the new procurator, FESTUS.

“ **1. In Josephus.** Felix, according to Josephus (Antiq. 20:7:1), was the brother of an influential Roman named Pallas. In 52 (or 53) Felix was named procurator. Some two years later, Felix was busy putting down uprisings by ' robbers and impostors ' who ' were a multitude not to be enumerated ' (War 2:13:2-3). By treachery Felix seized one such leader, Eleazar the son of Deneas, after giving him an assurance of no harm. He utilized the services of these robbers (identified as Sicarii) in the murder of the high priest Jonathan (Antiq. 20:8:5). A Jew out of Egypt (see Acts 21:38), who led a large number of Jews, was attacked by Festus; the leader escaped, never to be heard from again, but four hundred of his followers were slain (Antiq. 20:8:6; see War 2:14:6).

“ Felix was recalled to Rome. A deputation of Jews went to Rome to accuse Felix, but the influence and intervention of Pallas saved him from punishment (Antiq. 20:8:9).

“ Felix married DRUSILLA, a sister of Agrippa II, after persuading her to leave her husband, Azizus king of Emesa (Antiq. 20:7:2); she bore him a son, Agrippa. Felix was married two other times.

“ **2. In Roman sources.** Scattered notices about Felix appear in the works of the Roman historians Suetonius and Tacitus. A conflict exists in the data provided by Josephus (Antiq. 20:6:3-7:1; War 2:12:8) and Tacitus (Ann. 12. 54). The latter supposes that Felix was procurator of Samaria and Judea while Cumanus was

procurator of Galilee, whereas Josephus relates that Felix succeeded Cumanus as procurator of Judea. Most scholars prefer Josephus on this point.

“Suetonius (*Claudius* 28) reports that Felix had been married to three royal women (*reginarum*). One was Drusilla; another was the granddaughter of Mark Antony and Cleopatra; the third is unknown (see Tac. Hist. 5. 9).

“Tacitus (Ann. 12. 54) reports that Felix believed that he could commit all kinds of evil with impunity. The influence of his brother was undoubtedly a spur to his arbitrariness. Tacitus comments that his actions only provoked further difficulties. Some six years after Felix’ recall, the Jewish War broke out; Josephus is the source of the credible contention that Felix’ term, with its cruelties and oppressions, provided the cause of the war; neither Festus nor his successors (Albinus, 62-64; Florus, 64-66) would have been able to avert the disaster, had they been minded to, and they were not. Felix is a prime example of colonial mismanagement.

“Apparently he was a freedman, deriving his name Antonius from Antonia, the mother of the Emperor Claudius. (A scribal error in Suidas is the basis of a wrong contention that Felix bore the name Claudius.)

“**3. In Acts.** Acts relates that the Roman tribune Claudius Lysias sent Paul from Jerusalem to Felix in Caesarea; five days later the high priest Ananias and one Tertullus laid before Felix the case against Paul. Tertullus is portrayed as speaking of the peace enjoyed under and the reforms introduced by Felix. Paul’s speech begins: ‘Realizing that for many years you have been judge over this nation, I cheerfully make my defense.’ After Paul’s speech, Felix, to whom is attributed a ‘rather accurate knowledge of the way,’ postponed the decision; he kept Paul in custody, but gave him ‘some liberty.’ A few days later, Felix and his Jewish wife, Drusilla, sent for Paul ‘and heard him speak upon faith in Christ Jesus.’ Felix was alarmed when Paul ‘argued about justice and self-control and future judgment.’ Felix said: ‘Go away for the present; when I have an opportunity I will summon you.’ Felix hoped ‘that money would be given him by Paul. So he sent for him often and conversed with him.’ When Festus became the new procurator, Felix, ‘desiring to do the Jews a favor,’ kept Paul in prison (Acts 23:24-24:27)”

Several reasons could be cited why Josephus (37-100 A.D.) is of the greatest importance for students of the New Testament wanting to understand its background; for without his testimony, much confusion can and does develop. Primarily, he introduces by far the most systematic and comprehensive history of the people of Judea from their beginnings to his own day. Josephus is especially thorough on the periods just before, during, and immediately after our Messiah’s lifetime. He covers especially Herod, and events such as the census of Quirinius. Moreover, he is the earliest non-Christian historical writer who cites John the Baptist, Yahshua (who most call “Jesus”), James, Judas the Galilean, and Theudas the Egyptian prophet. Additionally, he introduces the earliest methodical and comprehensive paraphrase interpretation of Old Testament Scripture.

While the overwhelming majority of classical historical works have become extinct, the writings of Josephus have come down to us in our day mostly intact. This resulted because the Christians found him extremely useful in filling the gap in the

Judaene era between the close of the fifth century B.C. and the birth of our Redeemer. Especially significant is that his work is useful in confirming the historicity of Yahshua and John the Baptist, and the fulfilling of prophesied sufferings of the “broken bottle” nation of “bad figs” at the hands of the Romans.

From Josephus’ own autobiography, he was excellently equipped to write his histories. He claimed descent on his mother’s side from the Hasmonean kings (Josephus’ *Life* 1), “... by my mother I am of the royal blood ...” His father also belonged to the first of twenty-four courses of priests (Josephus’ *Life* 1): “Now, I am not only sprung from a sacerdotal family in general, but from the first of the twenty-four courses ... I am of the chief family of that first course ...” One must understand, after that remnant nation returned from the Babylonian captivity, the Levites, for the most part, served as the leaders rather than the House of David. Josephus was a personal friend of Agrippa II, who is said to have written no less than sixty-two letters testifying to the accuracy of Josephus’ history of the Judean War (Josephus’ *Life* 65): “... and for King Agrippa, he wrote me sixty-two letters, and attested to the truth of what I had therein delivered, two of which letters I have here subjoined, and thou mayest thereby know their contents:– ‘King Agrippa to Josephus, his dear friend, sendeth greeting. I have read over thy book with great pleasure, and it appears to me that thou hast done it much more accurately, and with greater care than have the other writers ...’”

Josephus did not lack for an excellent education in the traditional Judean system. He must have been a child prodigy, inasmuch as at the early age of fourteen the chief priests and other leaders sought him out to counsel them for his interpretation concerning Scriptural Law (Josephus’ *Life* 2) “... Moreover, when I was a child, and about fourteen years of age, I was commended by all for the love I had to learning; on which account the high priests and principal men of the city came then frequently to me together, in order to know my opinion about the accurate understanding of points of the law ...”

Josephus then planned to spend three years gaining first hand knowledge of the three leading sects among the Judeans; the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. At Josephus’ *Life* 2 we read: “... and when I was about sixteen years old, I had a mind to make trial of the several sects that were among us. These sects are three: – The first is that of the Pharisees, the second that of the Sadducees, and the third that of the Essenes, as we have frequently told you; for I thought that by this means I might choose the best, if I were once acquainted with them all ...” Had not Josephus been a pure Israelite by birth, he could never have been admitted to the Essene sect, so we can be quite sure he was not contaminated with bad blood. (See again Josephus’ *Wars* 2:8:2.)

At twenty-six years of age, Josephus was chosen to go to Rome to secure the release of some Judean priests which proved successful (Josephus’ *Life* 3): “But when I was in the twenty-sixth year of my age, it happened that I took a voyage to Rome; and this on the occasion which I shall now describe. At the time when Felix was procurator of Judea, there were certain priests of my acquaintance, and very excellent persons they were, whom on a small and trifling occasion he had put into bonds, and sent to Rome to plead their cause before Caesar. These I was desirous to procure deliverance

for; and that especially because I was informed that they were not unmindful of piety towards God, even under their afflictions; but supported themselves with figs and nuts [*meatless diet*]. Accordingly I came to Rome, though it were through a great number of hazards, by sea ... I became acquainted with Aliturus, an actor of plays, and much beloved by Nero, but a Jew [*Tribe of Judah*] by birth; and through his interest became known to Poppea, Caesar's wife; and took care, as soon as possible, to entreat her to procure that the priests might be set at liberty ..." Observe here that Josephus worked to get Poppea's sympathy through another "Judean by birth" like himself, Aliturus.

At Rome, under the patronage of Epaphroditus, Josephus happened on his thirty-thousand volume library. There Josephus found a knowledge of Greek literature, especially Homer, Thucydides, Plato which awakened him to Greek traditions. Many critical scholars are somewhat suspicious of Josephus' accounts of which he took part, such as the siege of Jotapara, but for other notable events such as his account of Masada, the excavations by archaeologists in the years 1963 and 1965 have generally established his writings to be amazingly accurate. [*emphasis mine*]

To be noted is Josephus' highly critical introduction to his *Wars*, where he reprimands predecessor historians (*J. W.* 1 §§1-2), in addition to his essay *Against Apion* (1:2-5 §§6-27). Josephus is considerably critical of Greek historians indicating that he himself made a special effort to be fair and accurate lest he be laughed out of court.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JOSEPHUS

Few are the scholars who doubt the validity of Josephus mentioning John the Baptist (*Josephus' Antiquities* 18:5:2) as the language is considerably typical for that part of his *Antiquities*. Had a Christian scribe inserted it, it would be difficult to explain why he gave almost twice the narrative as given to that of the Redeemer who the translators designate as "Jesus." But it is interesting that Josephus gives a different reason for John's death than that found in the Gospels. Josephus says that John was condemned by Herod Antipas inasmuch as he observed that John was drawing such enormous crowds, and feared that this would incite sedition. Additionally, why did not Josephus associate John with Yahshua? In reference to the passage about the Sanhedrin's condemnation of James (*Josephus' Antiquities* 20:9:1), being referred to as the brother of Jesus (called the Christ), practically all scholars accept it as being authentic: "... when, therefore, Ananus was of this disposition, he thought he had now a proper opportunity [to exercise his authority]. Festus was now dead, and Albinus was but upon the road; so he assembled the sanhedrin of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others, [or, some of his companions]; and when he had formed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned ..."

There is a passage in Josephus usually dubbed the so-called "*Testimonium Flavianum*" about Yahshua [Jesus] at *Antiquities* 18:3:3, and is found in all forty-two of the extant Greek manuscripts with regard to this portion of the *Antiquities*, the earliest dating from the eleventh century, as well as in all 171 extant manuscripts of the Latin translation which date to the sixth century under the sponsorship of Cassiodorus, which many scholars are increasingly proclaiming as authentic. It reads: "Now, there was

about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works – a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews [sic Judeans], and many of the Gentiles [sic ethnos]. He was [the] Christ; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day.”

There has been much controversy over this passage, but Jerome *Vir.* 13 cites Josephus as saying not that Yahshua was the Messiah, but that “he was believed to be the Messiah.” Yet another witness can be found in a tenth-century history of the world, in Arabic, by a Christian named Agapius. His edition omits “if indeed we ought to call him a man”, and references to Messiah’s miracles and to the role of the “Jewish” leaders making accusations against Yahshua, and does not say that He appeared to His disciples on the third day, but rather his disciples reported that event. This version declares not that Yahshua was the Messiah, but rather “he was perhaps the Messiah.” A twelfth-century chronicle in Syriac by a Christian named Michael the Syrian in his *Testimonium* uses language similar to Jerome: “He was thought to be the Messiah.” One writing in Arabic in the 10th century, “Christian” or not, demands we be suspicious of his discrepancies!

The ultimate worth of Josephus’ writings constitute by far the most valuable body of literature, for New Testament background of Christianity, we possess. For Josephus conveys to us almost the entirety of what we know about the non-Christian figures, groups, institutions, customs, geographical areas and related events mentioned in our New Testament. It’s hard to imagine how we would manage without his **witness** on these topics. He is the sole surviving contemporary writer, for example, who portrays John the Baptist, the “Jewish” high priests of the first century, the Pharisees and Sadducees, the various religions of Judea, Samaria and Galilee, Herod the Great, Agrippa II and Bernice, the Jerusalem Temple renovated by Herod and its destruction in the revolt of 66-70, the census under Quirinius, Judas the Galilean and Theudas the Egyptian prophet. Although Philo mentions Pontius Pilate and Agrippa I, even there Josephus’ testimony is overwhelmingly critical for evaluation.

Yet these portions of information, as important as they are, do not turn out to be the most momentous contributions of Josephus in relation to New Testament background study. Knowledgeable scholars are coming to realize that Josephus wrote about these matters because he felt a compelling urgency to do so. And his invaluable stories represent the most fully articulated statements of first-century Judaism in Judea that we possess, save none. These enlightening accounts are conveyed by a contemporary of the first and second Christian generations who came from circles very dissimilar to that of Yahshua’s followers: that being a member of the governing aristocratic priesthood. Therefore, Josephus’ narratives are significant both because they portray a different view of the same circumstances that the New Testament mentions, and because they provide indispensable context for the understanding of

what Josephus says about various personages and developments. Now to take a few cases in point:

Pontius Pilate seems to have been recalled to Rome about A.D. 36 and replaced by a new prefect, Marcellus. Then, A.D. March 16, 37 the Emperor Tiberius died. The legate Vitellius was still in Jerusalem trying to soothe the feelings of the Judeans who had been outraged at Pilate, when the news arrived there of the new emperor, Gaius Caligula (37-41). The Judeans were the first of the nationalities of Syria to pledge their allegiance to the new emperor and hailed his regime, which was peaceful for the first 18 months. But whereas Tiberius had shunned emperor worship, Caligula then began to demand it. He wanted images of himself as *divus* erected in all shrines and temples (including synagogues) throughout the empire.

Caligula had not served long on the imperial throne before he bestowed on his friend Herod Agrippa I, the brother of Herodias and the grandson of Herod the Great, the territory of Philip's tetrarchy in north Transjordan. Along with this grant went the title of king. Returning to Palestine, King Herod stopped off at Alexandria, and his brief stay there became an occasion of a serious defamatory outburst against him, along with the local colony of Judeans. This went unrestrained by the Roman prefect Avillius Flaccus (Philo, *Flaccus* 5. 25-35), and there followed a turbulent anti-Judean persecution (A.D. 38). Protesting, the Judeans of Alexandria finally sent a delegation to the emperor in A.D. 40 to plead their cause. Among this legation was the philosopher Philo, but these emissaries had little success (Josephus' *Antiquities* 18:8:1).

Upon the exile of Herod Antipas in A.D. 39, his territory (Galilee and Perea) were annexed to the dominion of Herod Agrippa I. The latter, who had been insulted by the Roman prefect in Egypt, found greater success in swaying the legate of Syria, Petronius, who had been sent out by Caligula in A.D. 39. King Herod advised him not to press the issue of emperor worship; whereupon Petronius delayed matters as far as Jerusalem was concerned. But upon the erection of a crude altar to the emperor by the pagan inhabitants of the coastal town of Jamnia, it was torn down by the Judeans of the locale. The incident being reported to the emperor, he retaliated by commanding the immediate erection of a colossal statue of himself in the Temple (Philo, *Embassy to Gaius* 30. 203). But in spite of this development, Petronius still procrastinated, while at the same time trying to get the Judean leaders to acquiesce to the order with good grace. Highly appalled, the Judean leaders gathered in Ptolemais where Petronius was quartered and entreated him not to erect the statue. Herod Agrippa then visited Caligula, hoping he would rescind the order. Enraged toward Petronius, the emperor commanded that he should commit suicide. However, the entire problem was put to rest by the murder of Caligula on January 24, 41 A.D.

That brought Claudius to the throne (41-54 A.D.), by the acclamation of the Roman troops, whereupon his first directive was an edict of toleration in favor of the Judeans (*Antiquities* 19:5:2-3):

“So Claudius sent an order to the president of Egypt, to quiet that tumult; he also sent an edict, at the request of king Agrippa and king Herod, both to Alexandria and to Syria, whose contents were as follows: ‘Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, high priest, and tribune of the people, ordains thus:— Since I am assured

that the Jews of Alexandria, called Alexandrians, have been joint inhabitants in the earliest times with the Alexandrians, and have obtained from their kings equal privileges with them, as is evident by the public records that are in their possession, and the edicts themselves ... I will, therefore, that the nation of the Jews be not deprived of their rights and privileges, on account of the madness of Caius; but that those rights and privileges, which they formerly enjoyed, be preserved to them, and that they may continue in their own customs ... Upon the petition of king Agrippa and king Herod, who are persons very dear to me, that I would grant the same rights and privileges should be preserved to the Jews which are in all the Roman empire, which I have granted to those of Alexandria, I very willingly comply therewith; and this grant I make not only for the sake of the petitioners, but as judging those Jews for whom I have been petitioned worthy of such a favor, on account of their fidelity and friendship to the Romans ...”

Thus, Claudius rewarded Herod Agrippa I for his patronage of Roman dominion by extending his territory to include that of the ethnarchy of Archelaus (Judea, Samaria, Idumea) so that from henceforward until his death he ruled over a territory almost as vast as that of Herod the Great. One of Herod Agrippa’s tentative projects was to build Jerusalem’s “third north wall”, which upon completion would have made the city practically impregnable. But prior to its finishing, Claudius was warned by Maurus, legate of Syria, and he halted any further progress (*Antiq.* 19:7:2): “As for the walls of Jerusalem, that were adjoining to the new city [Bezetha], he repaired them at the expense of the public, and built them wider in breadth and higher in altitude; and he had made them too strong for all human power to demolish, unless Marcus, the then president of Syria, had by letter informed Claudius Caesar of what he was doing. And when Claudius had some suspicion of attempts for innovation, he sent to Agrippa to leave off the building of those walls presently. So he obeyed, as not thinking it proper to contradict Claudius.”

Today the location of that wall is much disputed by archaeologists. An excavation in 1965 by Kathleen Kenyon proposes a date no sooner than the sixties A.D. for “Sukenik’s wall.” Either the wall was not built by Agrippa, or he only laid out the line for a third wall, and the real building was accomplished at the time of the First Jewish Revolt (W. E. Albright), or later, during the time of Bar Cochba.

WITHOUT JOSEPHUS LITTLE WOULD BE KNOWN OF ROME’S APPOINTED PROCURATORS TO JUDAEA

They are Coponius, A.D. 6-9; M. Ambivius, A.D. 9-12(?); Annius Rufus, 12-15(?); Valerius Gratus, 15-26; Pontius Pilatus (Pilate), A.D. 26-36; Marcellus, A.D. 36-37; Marullus, A.D. 37-41(?); C. Cuspius Fadus, A.D. 44-46; Tiberius Julius Alexander, A.D. 46-48; Ventidius Cumanus, A.D. 48-52; M. Antonius Felix, A.D. 52-60(?); Porcius Festus, A.D. 60-62(?); Luceius Albinus, A.D. 62-64; Gessius Florus, 64-66.

Josephus speaks of Coponius at *Antiq.* 18:1:1; 18:2:2 & 14:8:5. Marcus Ambivius at *Antiq.* 18:2:2; Annius Rufus at *Antiq.* 18:2:2; Valerius Gratus at *Antiq.* 18:2:2 & 18:6:5; Pontius Pilate at *Antiq.* 18:3:1-3; 18:4:1-2; 18:6:5; *Wars* 2:9:2-4; Marcellus at *Antiq.* 18:4:2; Marullus at *Antiq.* 18:6:10; Cuspius Fadus at *Antiq.* 15:11:4; 19:9:1-2; 20:1:1-2; 20:5:1-2; *Wars* 2:11:6; Tiberius Julius Alexander at *Antiq.* 20:5:2;

Wars 4:10:6; 2:11:6; 2:18:7; 5:1:6; 6:4:3; Ventidius Cumanus at *Antiq.* 20:5:2-4; 20:6:1-3; *Wars* 2:12:1-7; M. Antonius Felix at *Life* 3, 9; *Antiq.* 14:11:7; 20:7:1-2; 20:8:4-9; *Wars* 1:12:1; 2:12:1, 8; 2:13:2, 4, 5, 7; 2:14:1; Porcius Festus at *Antiq.* 20:8:9-11; 20:91; *Wars* 2:14:1 Luccius Albinus at *Antiq.* 20:9:3; 20:11:1; *Wars* 2:14:1-2; 6:5:3; Gessius Florus at *Life* 5; *Antiq.* 18:1:6; 19:9:2; 20:11:1; 20:9:5; *Wars* 2:14:2-9; 2:15:1-6; 2:16:1-3; 2:17:1, 4; 2:19:4; 2:20:1.

Without Josephus, we might know little about Pontius Pilate so needed to prove our Scripture correct; that there really was a Crucifixion. Without Josephus, we would have little data on the martyrdom of James. In fact, without the witness of Josephus, on so many urgent issues, men today would scoff at us, claiming our Scriptures are fraudulent. To remove the witness of Josephus is to destroy the faith of many, and in turn destroy our own families, and leave us in a state of complete anarchy. But thankfully, Josephus gives us a tool whereby to prove that the prophecy of Matthew 24 really happened, and help resolve our faith.

JOSEPHUS RECORDS THE FULFILLMENT OF GENESIS 3:15

You may say “That’s impossible”! But if we will check with Scripture we will find it’s true. To put it very concisely, the story goes like this: While Mel Gibson’s intentions were admirable with his *THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST*, he failed to identify those responsible for Christ’s murder. Who killed Christ can be determined rather quickly from anyone’s Bible. The first prophecy concerning the Crucifixion is found at Genesis 3:15, “**And I will put enmity (hatred) between thee (Satan) and the woman, and between thy seed (genetic physical offspring) and her seed (genetic physical offspring); it (the woman’s seed) shall bruise thy head, and thou (Satan’s seed) shalt bruise his heel.**” The “chosen vessel” Paul, in addressing the Romans at 16:20 “**And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your (Roman) feet shortly.**” Hence, in Paul’s day the Romans were of the “woman’s seed”, or true Israelites, and the bruising of Satan was the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D., for which Josephus’ *Wars* gives a graphic blow by blow account. Therefore, it was rather some Kenite(Cain)-Canaanite-Edomites pretending to be of the Tribe of Judah, and not the Romans, who committed the premeditated murder of Christ!

Thus, Paul identified the Romans by-and-large as the “seed of the woman” and the “serpent people” at Jerusalem as the “seed (physical descendants) of the serpent.” Not only did Paul identify the Romans as the “seed of the woman” of Genesis 3:15, but also identified the false-Judahites who by-and-large occupied Jerusalem and vicinity in-and-around Judaea in 70 A.D. I don’t know about your Bible, but the center reference in mine takes me to Genesis 3:15 from Romans 16:20. So all you two-seedliners who are criticizing Paul, had better take another look at this passage, or join the anti-seedliners! And all you turkeys (like Ted. R. Weiland and his fellow travelers) who are teaching that we Israelites are responsible for the crucifixion of Christ better take a new look at Romans 16:20. Anyone who claims there are not TWO SEEDLINES are calling Paul a liar! Since Paul identifies the Romans as the “seed of the woman”, the Romans are those who were to bruise the head, not the heel! Inasmuch as it was prophesied that the Romans, being the seed of the woman, were to

bruise Satan's head, they can hardly play the parts as both the bruiser of the head and also the bruiser of the heel! But just ask **Red Ted**, he knows everything there is to know; at least that's the impression he attempts to give! Shame on all the Paul-bashers! Shame on all the antichrist anti-seedliners! Yahweh, thank YOU for the "chosen vessel", Paul!

While we are on the subject of Two Seedline, we can see clearly from Jude 7 & 11 that Cain was indeed a half-breed: "**Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire ... Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.**"

The "they" of Jude 11 is not only referring to the Baal-Peor incident, where Balaam advised Balak to have his non-Israel women sexually seduce and fornicate (race-mix) with the Israel men, but also refers to Sodom and Gomorrhah, who were "going after strange flesh", which is also race-mixing. Jude compares or parallels this as being identical to "the way of Cain." Thus, (1) Sodom and Gomorrhah, (2) the advice of Balaam, and (3) the way of Cain all have race-mixing connotations. Thus, Jude makes it clear that Cain was a product of miscegenation, and not the son of Adam. Josephus describes the incident at Baal-Peor more graphically than anyone else, and that is why we desperately need his greatly detailed version of that race-mixing episode. Every parent who is concerned about today's racial dilemma should read this passage in Josephus to his children in order to avoid today's greatest disaster being foisted on us by our common enemy.

It all boils down that if we condemn Josephus' witness on many critical subjects, we may do so to the destruction of our own family. This is quite serious, as the news media continues to forecast that in the not-so-far future, the White race is condemned to extinction. Today, before our very eyes, we are seeing the genocide of the entire White Adamic Race!