

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #8

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

This is a continuation in a series of papers proclaiming that: “**We have an enemy.**” It’s unpleasant enough that we must live under the political, religious and monetary system of the enemy, but it is intolerable, while all this is happening, to have distracting, booing, detractors on the sidelines proclaiming there is no enemy; that somehow they, the “Jews”, (Rev. 2:9 & 3:9) are simply ordinary people who happened to go bad. I don’t know how those gainsaying disputants discount the fact that they and their continued lineage, remain corrupt generation after generation, for thousands of years. It is quite obvious that the “Jews” have retained an inbred, genetic trait which is built into their very being, clearly inherited from their ancestors. Thus, there are **two** genetic peoples at WAR with each other, according to the declaration of Genesis 3:15, and this WAR will not terminate until one side or the other is completely destroyed. At the moment, our side is speedily going down to defeat.

Evidently, the anti-seedliners have never read *Josephus, Wars 2:8:2*. Josephus makes it quite clear that the Pharisees and Sadducees were essentially non-Israelites by birth. Let’s now read this passage:

“For there are three philosophical sects among the Judeans. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes. These last are Judah by birth, and seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have.”

It would appear that of these three sects mentioned, only the Essenes could claim to be pure blooded Israelites; that many, perhaps a majority of the Pharisees and Sadducees, were neither true Israelites, nor, of the true Tribe of Judah. Why didn’t Josephus mention the Pharisees and Sadducees as being Judah by birth? I know that in John 8:33 & 37, it is apparent from that rendition, that the scribes and Pharisees could possibly be true Israelites. Sure, the Arabs can claim Abraham as their father. We know, also, that the “Jews” of Messiah’s day had absorbed Edomite blood, and therefore could claim both Abraham and Isaac as their fathers. The Shelanite-Judahites could even claim an affinity with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Judah, yet that doesn’t make them of the true Tribe of Judah. For evidence that the “Jews” are not who they claim to be, I will now quote from the *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* by John Lightfoot, volume 2, pages 7-9:

“... *Common persons*, as to the priesthood: such whose fathers, indeed were sprung from priests, but their mothers unfit to be admitted to the priest’s marriage-bed ... such as were born in wedlock; but that which was unlawful ... *bastards*: such as came of a certain mother, but of an uncertain father ... Such as were *gathered up* out of the streets, whose fathers and mothers were uncertain. [See *Ezra: chapters 9 & 10.*]

“A defiled generation indeed! and, therefore, brought up out of Babylon in this common sink, according to the opinion of the Hebrews, that the whole Jewish seed still remaining there might not be polluted by it ... Therefore he brought them to Jerusalem, where care might be taken by the Sanhedrim [Sanhedrin] fixed there, that the legitimate might not marry with the illegitimate ...

“How great a care ought there to be in the families of the pure blood, to preserve themselves untouched and clean from this impure sink; and to lay up among themselves genealogical scrolls from generation to generation as faithful witnesses and lasting monuments of their legitimate stock and free blood!

“Hear a complaint and a story in this case: ‘R. Jochanan said, By the Temple, it is in our hand to discover who are not of pure blood in the land of Israel: but what shall I do, when the chief men of this generation lie hid?’ (that is, when they are not of pure blood, and yet we must not declare so much openly concerning them.) ‘He was of the same opinion with R. Isaac, who said ... *A family* (of the polluted blood) *that lies hid, let it lie hid.* Abai also saith, We have learned this also by tradition, That there was a certain family called the family of Beth-zeripha beyond Jordan, and a son of Zion removed it away.’ (The Gloss is, Some eminent man, by a public proclamation, declared it impure.) ‘But he caused another which was such’ [that is, impure] ‘to come near. And there was another which the wise men would not manifest.’

“... When it especially lay upon the Sanhedrim, settled at Jerusalem to preserve pure families, as much as in them lay, pure still; and when they prescribed canons of preserving the legitimation of the people (which you may see in those things that follow at the place alleged), there was some necessity to lay up public records of pedigrees with them: whence it might be known what family was pure, and what defiled. Hence that of Simon Ben Azzai deserves our notice: ‘I saw (saith he) a genealogical scroll in Jerusalem, in which it was thus written; ‘*N.*, a bastard of a strange wife.’ Observe, that even a bastard was written in their public books of genealogy, that he might be known to be a bastard, and that the purer families might take heed of the defilement of the seed ...”

It should be obvious from this that the Judeans which returned from the Babylonian captivity up until the time of the Messiah were not keeping their family genetics pure. Can you now see how far off the mark Ted R. Weiland was in his book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* when he erroneously tried to prove that the scribes and Pharisees were true Israelites by making the following statements?:

Page 68: “Seedliners claim that because the Pharisees and their progenitors were charged with the murders of all the righteous from Abel to Zacharias, *they cannot be Israelites but instead must be Cainites of the seed of Satan.* The truth is that because the Pharisees and their forefathers were indicted for the murder of the righteous martyrs, *they cannot be Cainites but instead must be Israelites.*”

Page 94: “ The seedliners teach that the Pharisees were *Cainites of the seedline of Satan*, whereas Matthew 3:7-8, 27:6-10, John 7:19, 8:28-37, Acts 4:5-10, 24-35 and 7:2-52 declare that the Pharisees were *Judahites of seed line of Jacob/Israel*. ”

While Ted R. Weiland is off the mark, he is not entirely wrong. However, his error is serious to the point of disaster. To clear up the matter, I will refer again to the *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* by John Lightfoot, volume 2, page 78:

“ There was indeed, a certain *remnant* among them to be gathered by Christ: and when that was gathered, the rest of the nation was delivered over to everlasting perdition. This is ... that *remnant* of the apostle, Rom. 11:5, which then was, when he writ those things; which then was to be gathered, before the destruction of that nation.”

I am sure that Messiah was **NOT** gathering an accumulation of bastards, which the Pharisees and Sadducees for the most part were. The anti-seedliners really have a problem with Genesis 3:15 & 4:1, for if Cain was the son of Adam, there wouldn't have been any difference between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman. If such a thing were true, which it isn't, we might as well invite the descendants of Cain into our churches and Identity meetings. Recently, John Hagee had about ten “ Jews ” on the platform of his church. Many seminaries now have “ Jewish ” professors and advisors. *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, pages 887 & 889, says this about the serpent's seed:

“... Jesus identified the Jewish religious leaders of his day as a part of the Serpent's seed, saying to them: ‘ Serpents, offspring [Gr., *gen-ne'ma-ta*, generated ones] of vipers, how are you to flee from the judgment of Gehenna? Matt. 23:33, *Int. ... Enmity between the two seeds*. The great serpent Satan the Devil has produced ‘ seed ’ that has manifested the bitterest enmity toward those who have served God with faith like Abraham, as the Bible record abundantly testifies. Satan has tried to block or hinder the development of the woman's seed. (Compare Matt. 13:24-30.) ”

This is what John Lightfoot has to say about Matthew 3:7 where John the Baptist called the Pharisees and Sadducees “ vipers ”, in his *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, volume 2, pages 77-78:

“ Not so much ‘ the seed of Abraham ’, which ye boast of, as ‘ the seed of the serpent ’ ... A nation and offspring diametrically opposite, and an enemy to that seed of the woman, and which was to bruise his heel ... Hence, not without ground, it is concluded that that nation was rejected and given over to a reprobate sense, even before the coming of Christ. They were not only ... *a generation*, but ... *an offspring* of vipers, serpents sprung from serpents. Nor is it a wonder that they were rejected by God, when they had long since rejected God, and God's word, by their traditions ... There was, indeed a certain remnant among them to be gathered by Christ: and when that was gathered, the rest of the nation was delivered over to everlasting perdition ... ”

Again on page 83 of the same book, John Lightfoot says the following:

“ The war proclaimed of old in Eden between the serpent, and the seed of the serpent, and the seed of the woman, Gen. 3:15, now takes place; when that promised seed of the woman comes forth into the field (being initiated by baptism, and anointed by the Holy Ghost, unto the public office of his ministry) to fight with the old serpent,

and at last to bruise his head. And, since the devil was always a most impudent spirit, now he takes upon him a more hardened boldness than ever, even of waging war with him whom he knew to be the Son of God, because from that ancient proclamation of this war he knew well enough that he should bruise his heel.”

In Matthew 3:7; 12:34, and 23:33 both John the Baptist and Yahshua called the Pharisees and Sadducees “a generation of vipers”, and in Matthew 12:39 Yahshua spoke of them as “an evil and adulterous generation” (adulterous meaning mixed ... impure). The following are remarks from some various commentaries:

Adam Clarke’s abridged by Earle, page 794: “*An evil and adulterous generation.* Or ‘race of people.’ Our Lord terms the Jews an adulterous race.”

Adam Clarke’s abridged by Earle, page 770: “O generation of vipers. A terribly expressive speech. A serpentine brood, from a serpentine stock. As their fathers were, so were they, children of the wicked one.”

Matthew Henry’s, vol. 5, page 24: “The *title* he gives them is, *O generation of vipers*. Christ gave them the same title; *ch.* 12:34; 23:33. They were as *vipers*; though specious yet venomous and poisonous, and full of malice and enmity to every thing that was good; they were a *viperous brood*, the seed and offspring of such as had been of the same spirit; it was bred in the bone with them. They gloried in it, that they were the seed of Abraham; but John showed them that they were the serpent’s seed (compare Gen. 3:15); of their father the Devil, John 8:44. They were a *viperous gang*, they were all alike; though enemies to one another, yet confederate in mischief. Note. A wicked generation is a *generation of vipers*, and they ought to be told so ...”

Matthew Henry’s, vol. 5, page 175: “He condemns the demand, as the language of *an evil and adulterous generation*, v. 39. He fastens the charge, not only on *the scribes and Pharisees*, but the whole nation of the Jews; they were all like their leaders, a seed and succession of evildoers: they were an evil generation indeed, that not only hardened themselves against the conviction of Christ’s miracles, but set themselves to abuse him, and put contempt on his miracles. They were *an adulterous generation* ... As an adulterous brood; so miserably degenerated ... that Abraham and Israel acknowledged them not.”

Matthew Henry’s, vol. 5, page 174: “They were *a generation of vipers*: John [the] Baptist had called them so (Matt. 3:7), and they were still the same; for *can the Ethiopian change his skin?* The people looked upon the Pharisees as a generation of saints, but Christ calls them *a generation of vipers, the seed of the serpent*, that had an enmity to Christ and his gospel. Now what could be expected from *a generation of vipers*, but that which is poisonous and malignant? Can the viper be otherwise than venomous?”

“JEWISH” PROSELYTIZING

This is another aspect which should be delved into concerning the cursed “Jewish” *nation* at the time of the Messiah. Without this understanding, it is difficult to comprehend the conditions surrounding the “Jewish” *nation* at that period. Once that view is understood and grasped, a very different view will be perceived. This is a topic which has **NOT** been addressed, at any length, by the clergy of nominal churchianity or,

for that matter, among those who understand the Israel Identity message. It is paramount that we understand the complexities of that period, **for if we don't**, we simply cannot fathom the elements which were coming into play during that time. Once we comprehend this, we will not be prone to make ludicrous statements such as those which Ted R. Weiland has spewed (vomited) out. [*Proverbs 26:11; 23:8; 2 Peter 2:22.*]

I will first introduce the general story and then present the documentation. First, let's consider the Scripture where Messiah condemned the "Jews" for their proselytizing, Matthew 23:15:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves."

In Matthew chapter 3, we are told of John the Baptist and his endeavor to prepare the way for the Messiah by conversion and baptizing. It seems here, according to the story, the Pharisees and Sadducees came and inquired of John what he was doing. Forthrightly, John informed the "Jews", he didn't baptize "vipers." Why were the Pharisees and Sadducees so interested in what John the Baptist was doing? Many may be unaware of the fact that the Pharisees and Sadducees were also baptizing their converts. The requirement to become a "Jewish" proselyte was firstly, to be circumcised, and when the wound was healed, then, secondly, the candidate was baptized. The "Jews" considered that when their candidate went down into the water he was a heathen, and when he came back up, he was an Israelite. This is fantastic, for a non-Israelite could be baptized thousands of times and it would not make him an Israelite! And of just whom were these "Jews" baptizing and making proselytes? Many were of the seven Canaanite nations. Now some excerpts from pages 55 to 63 from *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* volume 2, by John Lightfoot:

"Whensoever any heathen will betake himself, and be joined to the covenant of Israel, and place himself under the wings of the divine Majesty, and take the yoke of the law upon him, voluntary circumcision, baptism, and oblation, are required ... That was a common axiom ... *No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized ...* [because none becomes a proselyte without circumcision and baptism] according to the judgment [or right] of the Sanhedrim ... *If with a proselyte his sons and his daughters are made proselytes also, that which is done by their father redounds to their good ...* A heathen woman, if she is made a proselytess, when she is now big with child,— the child needs not baptism ... *for the baptism of his mother serves for him for baptism ... 'If an Israelite take a Gentile child ... or find a Gentile infant, and baptizeth him in the name of a proselyte,— behold, he is a proselyte' ...* First, You see baptism inseparably joined to the circumcision of proselytes. There was, indeed some little distance of time; for 'they were not baptized till the pain of circumcision was healed, because water might be injurious to the wound.' But certainly baptism ever followed ... Secondly, Observing from these things which have been spoken, how very known and frequent the use of baptism was among the Jews, the reason appears very easy why the Sanhedrim, by their messengers, inquired not of John concerning the reason of baptism, but concerning the authority of the baptizer; not what baptism meant, but whence he had a

license so to baptize, John 1:25 ... For the admission of a proselyte was reckoned no light matter ... *Proselytes are dangerous to Israel, like the itch* ... When a proselyte was to be circumcised, they first asked him concerning the sincerity of his conversion to Judaism: whether he offered not himself to proselytism for the obtaining of riches, for fear, or for love to some Israelite woman ... As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to baptism; and being placed in the water, they again instruct him in some weightier and in some lighter commands of the law. Which being heard ... *he plunges himself, and comes up, and behold, he is as an Israelite in all things* ...

“... But a proselyte was baptized not only into the washing-off of that Gentile pollution, nor only thereby to be transplanted into the religion of the Jews; but that, by the most accurate rite of translation that could possibly be, he might so pass into an Israelite, that, being married to an Israelite woman, he might produce a free and legitimate seed, and an undefiled offspring. Hence, servants that were taken into a family were baptized,—and servants also that were to be made free: not so much because they were defiled with heathen uncleanness, as that, by that rite ... *becoming Israelites in all respects*, they might be more fit to match [*mate*] with Israelites, and their children be accounted as Israelites. And hence the sons of proselytes, in following generations, were circumcised indeed, but not baptized. They were circumcised, that they might take upon themselves the obligation of the law; but they needed not baptism, because they were already Israelites. [*Bull manure!*] ... The baptism of proselytes was the bringing over of Gentiles into the Jewish religion ...”

You can see from this, things at that period were not at all like we are led to believe. The people of that “Jewish” nation had so corrupted themselves genetically, there were hardly any pureblooded Israelites left among them. Here you have the facts laid out before you, so that it will save you a lot of homework on your part. All you have to do is verify them. It would appear the time has come for some who follow the teachings of anti-seedliners such as the likes of Ted R. Weiland to wake up and get the wax out of their ears. Here is substantial evidence the anti-seedliners are not as informed as they ought to be. Not only are the clergy of today blind to the conditions of that nation, but we have those in Israel Identity who have been trained in the Judeo-churchianty theological centers who aren’t much better. It takes a lot of time and effort, sweat and blood, to put research like this together. Furthermore, if one cannot see the parallel between what is going on today, with all of the mixed-racial marriages, just as the Judeans of that day were taking strange wives and strange husbands, one has to be blind! They were taking others in marriage who were often descended from of the seven Canaanite nations. There were some pureblooded Benjamites who were still in Galilee, from whom Yahshua took all of His disciples except one, as there were some Essenes in Judea.

The anti-seedliners seem to completely overlook the commission of the Messiah in 1 John 3:8, that of destroying the works of Satan:

“He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.”

By coming when He did, Yahshua was there in the midst of the genetic descendants of Satan, through Cain, who were quite aptly called “vipers.” Messiah Himself called them “vipers”, as did John the Baptist. Thus, Messiah was in the realm of the geographic seat where the devils lived. If the devil’s headquarters had been anywhere else in the world, He would have been there. If He was going to destroy the devil’s works, He had to be where the devils thrived, which He was. If you will check the next verse (v. 9), you will notice that whether one is a genetic son of the devil, or, a genetic son of YHWH, depends on the sperm, or “seed”. It speaks of the children of YHWH, saying “his *sperma* remaineth in him.” However, the anti-seedliners insist that *sperma* is spiritual. Let’s now look at *Matthew Henry’s Commentary* which says this on this passage, vol. 6, pages 1076-1077:

“From the discrimination between the children of God and the children of the devil. They have their distinct characters. *In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil, v. 10.* In the world (according to the old distinction) there are the seed [*sperma*] of God and seed [*sperma*] of the serpent. ... and he belongs to the party, and interest, and kingdom of the devil. It is he that is the author and patron of sin, and has been a practitioner of it, a tempter and instigator of it, even from the beginning of the world. ... The devil has designed and endeavoured to ruin the work of God in this world. The son of God has undertaken the holy war against him. ... It showed that he was the firstborn of the serpent’s seed [*sperma*]; even he, the eldest son [*Cain*] ... was of the *wicked one*. He imitated and resembled the first wicked one, the devil.”

A Commentary On The Holy Bible by Matthew Poole, vol. 3, pages 935-936 comments thusly: “And such a sinner, he says *is of the devil*; as if he were born of him, were his child, really conformed to him, and having his sinning nature ... Upon what was said, he reduces all men each to their own family and father, concluding it manifest whither they belonged; i.e. he shows, upon the grounds before expressed, who do not belong to God and his family, leaving it thence to be collected, since two fathers and families divide the world, to which they must be reckoned; i.e. they belong not to God, and consequently to that worst of fathers, who first, in general, do not righteousness; the devil being the first sinner, they are his descendants ... Which showed him to be of that wicked one, of the serpent’s seed: so early was such seed sown, and so ancient the enmity between seed and seed.”