

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING

LETTER

Monthly Letter #69; January, 2004 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

This is my sixty-ninth monthly teaching letter and continues my sixth year of publication. In the last lesson #68, we surveyed the teachings of Dan Gentry, Stephen E. Jones and Dave Barley. It was observed how, while teaching the Identity Truth, they nullify any beneficial building of the Kingdom they might have accomplished by disowning that Israel has an enemy. By refusing to identify Israel's enemy, they scatter the Israel sheep rather than gather them (Matt. 12:30; Luke 11:23). They further sabotage the Kingdom by teaching universalism. They all seem to be following the subterfuge advanced by Stephen E. Jones. Since Jones wrote his *The Babylonian Connection* in 1978 (an effort to wreck the truth of Genesis 3:15), several others have picked up Jones' toxic leaven. With this lesson we shall continue to expose Jones' prevarications. I will now present an open letter to Stephen E. Jones written by William Finck.

Before making any comment, it will be necessary to review the offending passage at the heart of his postulation (for the entire quotation, refer to lesson # 68):

"The early Church began as the legitimate tribe of Judah, for they were loyal followers of the King of Judah, Jesus Christ, the legal heir of King David's throne.

"When the Church was scattered by persecution into other lands, many other people of different 'trees' were converted to Christ. These 'branches' of other trees were cut off from their former trees and grafted into this Judah fig tree. Soon the number of foreign converts exceeded that of the genealogical Judahites, so that this fig tree began to look like a 'gentile church,' bearing peaches, pears, apples, and plums, with only a few branches bearing figs. Hence, men began to think of this tree as something other than Judah. But they were mistaken ..."

This was an effort on the part of Jones to bring non-Israelites into Yahweh's Kingdom. On the subject of figs, he starts thusly as follows:

"THE FIGS: Rev. 6:13 compares the stars of heaven to figs being cast to the ground before they are ripe. The comparison is very appropriate. In the Bible, the fig tree is the national symbol of Judah. Jeremiah 24 divides Judah into two groups of people: a basket of good figs and a basket of bad figs. The

good figs are those who submit to God, even when God pronounces judgment upon the nation. The bad figs refuse to submit, thinking God wants them to fight God's 'enemies' in order to retain their freedom."

**OPEN LETTER CHALLENGING STEPHEN E. JONES' TIRADE ON REV. 6:13 IN HIS
FOUNDATION FOR INTERCESSION, Issue #171, December, 2002**

(disputed by William Finck):

Jones is making up an entire story extrapolated from a simple metaphor describing a fig tree in Rev. 6:13. Often people pick up a symbol in the Bible and make far too much of it, much more than the Book is actually saying. This is an example, for nowhere in Rev. 6 is Judah alone the topic being discussed.

First Jones makes the statement "the fig tree is the national symbol of Judah." Now although it is true that fig tree or fig metaphors are used several times concerning the inhabitants of Jerusalem (a remnant of Judah and various Canaanite peoples – Ezek. 16:3) and the later 70-week nation of Judaea, the fig tree certainly is not limited to describing Judah.

At Hosea 9:10 Israel is described first as "grapes in the wilderness" but then "as the firstripe in the fig tree", but at 14:6 Hosea says of Israel, "his beauty shall be as the olive tree", and at 14:8, "Ephraim shall say ... I am like a green fir tree." If we were looking for national symbols in these trees, we surely would be confused. David is an olive tree at Psalm 52:8, yet his family a cedar in Ezek. 17. Jerusalem is a useless vine at Ezek. 15. Isa. 6 compares the 70-week nation to a teil (or terebinth) tree and as an oak. Jeremiah was told he was "to build and to plant" and sees an almond tree (1:11). At 11:16 Jeremiah describes Yahweh's calling Judah "a green olive tree." Should we really make a big deal of any of these poetic metaphors? If we make more out of them than we should, we certainly would cause confusion!

Now at Rev. 6:13 John writes, "And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." Does this have anything to do with Judah? Nahum at 3:12 writes: "All thy strongholds shall be like fig trees with the firstripe figs: if they be shaken, they shall even fall into the mouth of the eater." Now Nahum wasn't talking about Judah, but Nineveh and the Assyrians!

Isaiah 34:4 is much like Rev. 6:13. It states, "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree." Does this have anything to do with Judah? Isaiah is writing about the indignation of Yahweh upon all the nations!

So Jones takes a poetic metaphor used in several places in the Bible, which have nothing to do with Judah, and makes up an entire story about it, and a very un-Biblical story at that! Yet some elements of Jones' tale must be addressed.

Much more damaging a lie than Jones' mistaking the fig tree of Rev. 6:13 for Judah, is what Jones is trying to do with this fig tree of Judah.

First though, Jones tries to say that the "stars of heaven" are the "overcomers", although this is alluded to nowhere in the Bible. The hosts of the nations in Isa. 34:4 certainly are not "overcomers." Abraham's descendants were to be as numerous as stars, and the woman [the nation of Israel] of Rev. 12 wears a crown of 12 stars [tribes], yet there is no mention of "overcoming" anything. So why does Jones

read “stars” and assume “overcomers”? What Scripture does he base this upon? Note Gen. 26:4 and 37:9, Exod. 32:13, Deut. 1:10, 10:22 and 28:62, Judges 5:20, 1 Chr. 27:23, Neh. 9:23, Job 38:7, Psalm 147:1-4 and 148:3, Isaiah 14:13, Daniel 8:10 and 12:1-3, Joel 2:10 and 3:15, Obadiah 4, Nahum 3:16, Matt. 24:29 (Mark 13:25), 1 Cor. 15:41, Heb. 11:12, Jude 13, Rev. 8:12, and 12:4, and the idea of “stars” being “overcomers” is absurd!

He that “overcomes” is given many promises, Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 2:26, 3:5, 12, 21 and 21:7, and certainly will not be “fell unto the earth” from heaven, as Jones so ludicrously suggests. Why does Jones make these things up?

Yahshua Christ is not the root of a fig tree, as Jones so spuriously claims. He is the True Vine (John 15), and “ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you and ordained you” and He has only chosen the 12 tribes of Israel (Matt. 15:24, 19:28, Luke 22:30, Acts 26:6-7, Rev. 21:12). He is the Tree of Life which bears twelve fruits (Rev. 22), one for each of those 12 tribes. Nothing else may be grafted into this tree, for “every plant, which my heavenly father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.” The New Covenant is only for those 12 tribes (Jer. 31:31-34, Ezek. 37:26-28, Amos 3:2, Romans 8:29-30, 9:4, Gal. 3:15, 4:5, Heb. 8:8-12 et al.).

So what is all this business about grafting peaches, pears, apples and plums into a fig tree? Where did Jones get such an idea from? He may say “Paul”, but certainly not!

“Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with diverse seeds” (Deut. 22:9). “Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed” (Lev. 19:19). Would Paul of Tarsus break the Law of Yahweh? The idea of grafting branches onto a tree is found only in Paul’s metaphoric example to the Romans in Romans chapter 11, verses 13-24. Paul is not attempting to break Yahweh’s Law. “God forbid. Yea, we establish the Law.” (Rom. 3:31).

Paul knew that the Romans were descendants of the Israelites. The Romans had come to Italy from Troy after its destruction by the Greeks (of the tribe of Dan) and were descendants of Judah by his son Zerah. Paul, apostle to the Nations of Israel (Gen. 17:4-6 and 15-16, 35:11 et al.), knew well that the Romans he was writing to (and Romans 11 is an example only for those whom Paul addressed it to) were actually descendants of Israel. Paul tells them that at Romans 1:23-25, and again at 1:31 (calling them “covenant breakers” he can only mean the Old Covenant, the word ἀσύνθετος appears as a verb, ἀσυνθετέω, often in the LXX translated by Brenton “to break covenant”, see Ezra 10:2 and 10:10, Neh. 1:8 and 13:27, and Psalms 72(73):15 and 77(78):57). Romans 2:14-15 is a reference to Isa. 51:7, Jer. 31:33 and Ezek. 36:27 (see also Psalms 33:15, 40:8 and 125:4). Compare Romans 2:26-29 to Ezek. 11:19-20 and Jer. 4:4. Paul counted the Romans as descendants of Abraham throughout Romans chapters 4, 8 & 9, and writing the verse at 16:20 knew full well that the Romans were “the people of [Messiah] the Prince” destined to destroy Jerusalem, foretold at Daniel 9:26.

So the bottom line here is that the only “grafting” going on in Romans chapter 11 is the grafting of the wild **olive** branches (11:17) onto a “good” (cultivated) **olive** tree (No fig trees here), and note that they are **all olives!** Paul would not break the Law! The word translated “wild olive tree” in Romans 11:17 is ἀγριέλαιος, “a wild olive” (Liddell & Scott) and the word translated “olive tree” is ἔλαιος, also a “wild olive”, in secular Greek writing (Liddell & Scott), is “olive” everywhere in the Bible, in the Septuagint and N.T. One other Greek word signifying a “wild olive”, κότινος, appears nowhere in the Bible

and ἀγριέλαιος only appears in Romans 11. Paul's "wild olives" were long-lost Israelites who had long ago discarded the truth of Yahweh and the Law (Rom. 1:23, 25, 31). Paul's "good olive tree" were the Judaeans (those who were genetically pure Judah) who kept the Law. Nowhere else is anything or anyone but **olives** (Israel) being grafted onto any tree but an **olive tree**!

So Jones lies about Judah and the fig tree, he lies about stars and overcomers, he lies about grafting trees of different types, and makes up all sorts of stories from his lies! These few paragraphs address less than one-fourth of the content of Jones' 171st newsletter. How many other lies he has told, I shudder to imagine!

William Finck

Now wasn't that a great open letter! It should then be obvious that Jones fabricates continuously one lie right after another. Not only that, but **red** Ted R. Weiland (like a parrot) picks up on Jones' fabrications and expands on them. Have they no shame? To show you that the early Celtic church understood the physical seduction of Eve, I will repeat a notice I placed in my *Supplement Teaching Aids* for October and November, 2003:

EARLY CELTIC CHURCH TAUGHT PHYSICAL SEDUCTION OF EVE

Most of you are aware of the extensive research I have done on the subject of Two Seedline. I will now present solid evidence that Two Seedline is no new doctrine as some so cocksurely insinuate. I get this testimony from the book *The Celtic Church In Britain* by Leslie Hardinge, in a chapter entitled "The Role of the Scriptures", page 48. Though Hardinge does not trace the Celtic Church back to the Church setup at Glastonbury by Joseph of Arimathea about five years after the Passion, he does, however, quite well after 400 A.D., and proficiently documents his material. In this chapter he demonstrates the various methods of teachings used by the Celtic clergy. One of those methods was a question and answer liturgy of which the following is an authentic specimen (answers in parentheses):

"Who died but was never born? (Adam) • Who gave but did not receive? (Eve, milk) • Who was born but did not die? (Elias and Enoch) • Who was born twice and died once? (Jonas the prophet, who for three days and three nights prayed in the belly of the whale. He neither saw the heavens nor touched the earth) • How many languages are there? (Seventy-two) • Who spoke with a dog? (St Peter) • Who spoke with an ass? (Balaam the prophet) • Who was the first woman to commit adultery? (Eve with the serpent) • How were the Apostles baptized? (The Saviour washed their feet)." (Hardinge cites R. E. McNally, *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages*, 38-9, a translation of Ms. 908, "The loca monachorum", an 8th Century Celtic text.)

Now all of you anti-seedliners (and everyone knows who you are) who have been running all over the country making all kinds of snide remarks and asking, "If Two Seedline doctrine is true, why didn't the early Church Fathers teach it"? My answer is: "they did teach it." The anti-seedliners simply haven't done their homework! And all of you who have been following and supporting these theology **quacks**, don't you think it is about time to put their feet to the fire? False teachings scatter rather than gather the Israel sheep!

Hardinge finished this chapter by saying the following: "... The Celtic Church cherished a deep love of the Bible, and from the Epistles of St Paul developed their theology. The Psalms were used in worship, and were the inspiration of poets and preachers. Without the influence of the views of church fathers Celtic theologians set about discovering what the Scriptures meant. Their tenets and practices, based on this understanding, show the eclecticism and pragmatism of exegete and layman. The legislation of Moses pervaded social, economic, and legal relationships to an extent seldom seen in the history of other branches of the Church. Unlike the theologians of Roman Christianity who appealed more and more to the teachings of Church and councils, Celtic teachers stressed the Bible. The role of the Scriptures in Celtic Christianity was indeed a vital one, so much so that no thorough study of the beliefs and practices of the Christians of Celtic lands is possible without bearing this fact in mind."

That Eve committed **adultery** with the **serpent** was one of the tenets that the Celtic clergy taught! Over the last several years, I have piled substantial evidence on top of substantial evidence on this subject. Yet hecklers on the sidelines continue to criticize my research. It will be interesting to see how they will try to gainsay this evidence, but I'm sure they will attempt some asinine tactic. While some will blow everything but their nose, others will be strangely quiet! The usual ploy of the antichrist anti-seedliners is to quote 2 Corinthians 11:3 which says: **"But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."** By this they assert that Eve's seduction was only mental. Would someone please explain how one might commit "mental" adultery? How absurd! And the term "adultery" is very fitting here as Eve's adultery was a mingling of Adam-kind with serpent-kind through sexual encounter. Most everyone who has studied the history of the Celtic Church has a deep respect for and favors it far over the Roman whore system. Either the anti-seedliners are wrong or the Celtic clergy was wrong, and I would rather believe the Celtic clergy! As you can see, this evidence concerning the belief that Eve committed adultery with the serpent is very profound, and cannot be easily brushed aside. Further, it exposes the anti-seedliners for the abysmal prevaricators they are!

One must take into account that only the priests in those days had the Scriptures, and that generally by copying them for themselves. Therefore, the clerics in those days had to devise methods of teaching by litany, a ceremonial style of memorization. Once understanding this fact, one can then realize that the ritual of saying "Who was the first woman to commit adultery? (Eve with the serpent)" was repeated over a long period of time thousands upon thousands of times. It wasn't something that was said in passing only once.

Another thing that should be taken into account is that Leslie Hardinge is not in any way promoting Israel Identity, so he is a neutral witness with no ax to grind about Two Seedline doctrine. He is only reporting the historical fact that this was one of the question and answer sessions the Irish clerics used. For anyone who might wish to purchase this book, the address I have is Teach Services, Inc., Route 1, Box 182, Brushton, NY, 12916, and there is a price of \$8.95 marked on it.

This Celtic Church evidence agrees with *The Protevangelion* 10:1-7 where it says (Mary's Joseph speaking); found in *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten books of Eden*:

"1 And when her sixth month was come, Joseph returned from his building houses abroad, which was his trade, and entering into the house, found the Virgin grown big: 2 Then smiting upon his face, he said, With what face can I look up to the Lord my God? or, what shall I say concerning this young woman? 3 For I received her a Virgin out of the temple of the Lord my God! and have not preserved her such! 4 Who has thus deceived me? Who has committed this evil in my house, and seducing the Virgin from me, hath defiled her? 5 Is not the history of Adam exactly accomplished in me? 6 For in the very instant of his glory, the serpent came and found Eve alone, and seduced her. 7 Just after the same manner it has happened to me ..." [emphasis mine]

There is no mistaking the language from this quotation! When taken together with the Celtic Church evidence, it overwhelmingly supports a physical seduction of Eve by the serpent, which in turn was spawned by a mental seduction.

In the last lesson (#68) we took up the "no devil" doctrine as taught by Dan Gentry and his backslapping cronies. We will now develop further against that un-Biblical dogma. As we proceed, it will be necessary to have a Bible in hand and follow every Scripture cited.

OPEN LETTER TO ALL WHO TEACH THE "NO DEVIL" HERESY

By: William Finck

THE FLESH IS NOT SATAN AS SOME PUT FORTH

The ultimate fate of Satan (the Adversary) is not discussed in Scripture, but the ultimate fate of "the devil and his angels" is at Matt. 25:41, Rev. 20:10. The devil is Satan: Rev. 12:9 and 20:2, where we see that the Serpent and Dragon are also synonyms for Satan (Gen. 3:14, Luke 10:18-19). The Serpent-Devil-Satan entity has children here in the earth: Genesis 3, Matt. 13:24-30, John 8:44, Acts 13:10, 1 Pet 5:8. The fate of these children, "the anti-christ", "the adversary", "Satan", etc. is foretold at Obad. 17-18, Zech. 14:21, Matt. 13:30 and 13:40, and it is evident that this fate is the same as that of the "devil and his angels." Once one understands that relationship, the fate of "Satan" is clear. See also 2 Thes. 1:6-9.

- That the children of the Adversary had taken over the kingdom and the temple-priesthood (being the children of Cain, Canaan, Esau, Selah): John 8:31-47, Rom. 9:1-13, 2 Thes. 2, Rev. 2:9 and 3:9, Luke 11:51, Matt. 23:35, Matt. 3:7, et al.

- That the "prince of this world" is this same entity, and totally contrary to Christ: John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11 and that they are responsible for His crucifixion: 1 Cor. 2:6-8, Matt. 27:25, John 19:15 (Luke 19:12-27), 1 Thes. 2:14-18.

- Contrary to the fate of Satan, the fate of the "flesh" is that: "all **flesh** shall see the salvation of God" (Luke 3:6), and "...yet in my **flesh** shall I see God." (Job 19:26), and after His resurrection: "...a spirit hath not **flesh** and bones, as ye see me have." (Luke 24:39). **The fate of the FLESH is not the fate of "Satan"!**

Matt 24:22: “And except those days be shortened, there should be no **flesh** saved: but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.” Psalm 65:2: “O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all **flesh** come.” Psalm 136:25: “Who giveth food to all **flesh**: for his mercy *endureth* for ever.” Psalm 145:21: “... and let all **flesh** bless his holy name for ever and ever.” Isa. 40:5: “And the glory of Yahweh shall be revealed, and all **flesh** shall see it together ...” Isa. 66:23: “And it shall come to pass ... shall all **flesh** come to worship before me, saith Yahweh.” Jer. 32:27: “Behold, I am Yahweh, the God of all **flesh**: is there any thing too hard for me?”

And while the Adversary certainly walks about in fleshly bodies, as demonstrated above, “Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up” (Matt. 15:13, speaking of some of the Pharisees: 15:1-12 and 15:14.) Note Matt. 13:38-42. Now it should be evident that the Flesh and Satan are **two entirely different things**, there are some things we should know in order to distinguish between, and to understand, each individual’s struggle with the **flesh** and our (the Anointed as a group) primary struggle with Satan (the Adversary, the serpent seed of Gen. 3:15).

- That the **flesh** is inherently weak: Matt. 26:41 (Mark 14:38), Rom. 6:19, 7:13-25, 8:1-13, 13:14, 1 Cor. 1:26-29 et al. Our sin comes through the acts of fulfilling the desires of the flesh: Gal. 5:16-26, Eph. 2:3, Col. 3:5-10, 1 Tim. 6:4-10, 2 Tim. 3:1-9, James 4:1 & 1 Pet. 2:11 et al.

- Even good seed is destroyed by lust: Mark 4:22, Matt. 13:22, Luke 8:14; but also by Satan (**again demonstrating that the flesh and its lust are not “Satan”**, and vice-versa): Mark 4:15, Matt. 13:19, Luke 8:12, also called “the wicked one” and “the devil.”

- That it is the Adversary who tempts us into pursuing the lusts of the flesh (as did the Serpent with Eve): Matt. 4:1-11, 1 Cor. 7:5, 2 Cor. 2:11, Eph. 4:27, 1 Tim. 3:6-7 and 5:14-15 and 2 Tim 2:22-26 et al. (And in this is the reason why nearly every generation of our political and religious leaders wander from righteousness and cater to those who would destroy us.)

- That idolatry moves us to immorality: Romans 1:25-32, 2:1-16, Eph. 4:18-19, Rev. 9:20-21 et al. Immorality brings the wrath of Yahweh upon us: Rom. 4:15, 1 Cor. 3:16-17, 6:13-20, 9:27, 10:8-13, Gal. 6:8, Eph. 5 :1-8 et al. Faith and obedience alone save us from that wrath: Rom. 5:9, 8:14-39, Gal. 2:16, 6:8, 1 Thes. 4:3-4, 1 Tim. 1:12-14, 4:16 et al.

- **That the real war, or struggle**, is not with our incontinence **but with our enemies**, those enemies of Yahweh, the Adversary who are the offspring of the serpents: Eph. 6:11-12, 2 Cor. 11:14-15, 1 Thes. 2:14-18, 1 Cor. 2:8, 2 Cor. 10:1-6, Col. 2:15, et al.

- That faith and obedience cleanse us of immorality and sin: Rom. 2:12 (where the verb ἀπολοῦνται is actually a form of ἀπολούω “to wash off” and not ἀπόλλυμι “to destroy”, this same verb correctly translated at Acts 22:16, 1 Cor. 6:11; the verb form belonging to either of the two verbs.) “For as many as have done wrong without law, without law then are they cleansed ...”, 2 Cor. 7:1, Eph. 5:26, Titus 3:3-5, Heb. 10:21-24, 2 Pet. 2:17-20, 1 John 1:9, 1 Cor. 6:9-11, Rev. 1:5 et al.

- That those who are NOT faithful and obedient are delivered to the Adversary (Satan, children of the Serpent, etc.) for either their correction, or their destruction: 1 Cor. 5:1-5 (5:13, 2 Cor. 5:1), 1 Tim. 1:20, 5:14-15, 2 Tim. 2:26, 2 Thes. 3:1-3, Rom. 1:32 and 2:1-9, Phil. 1:27-28, Luke 1:70-75 and 10:18-20 et al.

It should be evident that physical might means nothing, but that when the Anointed (who are the children of Israel) are faithful, moral and obedient, they prevail over the Adversary (who are the children of Cain, Canaan, Esau etc. – today’s “Jews”, Arabs, Turks, most Italians, Spaniards, Iranis, Iraqis etc.) and when the Anointed are faithless and disobedient, they are destroyed by the Adversary – from within and from without, on both a national and personal level – the same story told by the books of the Old Testament, **for nothing changes!**

- That the Adversary (Satan etc.) is the author, the originator of wrongdoing (sin) we see at: Mat. 18:7 (Luke 17:1), 1 Cor. 1:20, 5:10, 2 Cor. 4:4, Jude 6-16, 1 John 3:8-10, 2 Thes 2:1-12, John 8:44 et al.

- That the discourse of Yahshua Christ concerning the men which are defiled by that which proceeds from their heart (Matt. 12:35, Mark 7:15, Luke 6:45) and their mouth (Matt. 15:11) and are all amidst His discourses concerning **race** (Matt. 12:33-34, Luke 6:43-44 and Matt. 15:13) and should not be removed from that context. See also 1 Cor. 12:3 and 1 Cor. 16:22 (where the mixed Greek/Hebrew verse may be better rendered: “If anyone does not love the Prince, Yahshua Christ, he must be accursed, a rebel to be destroyed”), 1 John 2:22-23, Matt. 12:31-32, Mark 3:29 and Luke 12:10.

- That although the word ἄγγελος (“angel”) may often refer to an earthly messenger, there are spiritual beings, in “heaven”, unlike those of us in the flesh, who are eternal and which we are once we leave the flesh: Matt. 22:30, 24:31, Mark 12:25, Luke 20:36, Hebrews 1:7 and 1:14, Rev. 12:4 and 7, 1 Cor. 15:42-44. 2 Cor. 5:1-8, 2 Cor. 12:1-4, Rev. 4:1-2, Acts 12:14 et al. **And that those who deny the existence of such are modern day Sadducees:** Matt. 22:23-33 (Mark 12:18-27, Luke 20:27-38), Acts 23:6-8 and *Josephus, Antiquities* 18.1.4 (18.16) and *Wars* 2.8.14 (2.164-165). Of these are Dan Gentry, Gerda Koch, Nicholas Weins, Sheldon Emry **and their ilk.**

William Finck

Again, a very great open letter by William Finck, and I will now give you some commentary on it: As stated in Matt. 25:41, there is an “everlasting “ place of “fire prepared for the devil and his angels.” How do the “no-devil” people get flesh out of that? And secondly, how is our flesh associated with angels? Absurdity personified, (meaning the embodiment of absurdity)! At Rev 20:10, it speaks of “the devil that deceived them.” If the devil is “the flesh” how could it deceive us or anyone? At Rev. 12:9, “... the great dragon ... that old serpent ... Devil ... Satan ...” are all the same related entity! At Rev. 12:3, that entity is called “a great red dragon”, and we know this is Esau who married dragon seed. At Rev. 20:2, the four synonyms for “the devil” are used again. At Luke 10:18-19, (the Genesis 3:14-15) “serpent” is used in conjunction with “Satan.” At 1 Cor. 5:5, the flesh and Satan can only be two separate entities, or it would mean that Satan must destroy himself. At 2 Cor. 12:7: “the messenger of Satan” is described as “a thorn in the flesh.” Surely this would make Satan the enemy of the flesh! At Matt. 13:24, it speaks of the “prince of devils.” Are we to believe, according to the twisted mentality of the no-devil people, that there is such a thing as the “prince of the flesh?” How do the no-devil people not see at v. 28 of this passage that the devil is the “strong man” representing the “Jew Pharisees”, and that Yahshua is going to cast them out (which happened

in 70 A.D. at the siege of Jerusalem by Titus)? This was the binding of Satan at Rev. 20:2 which was to last a thousand years.

Are we to believe that the “devil” at Matt. 13:39 is the “flesh”? Are we to believe that it was the “flesh” that planted the tares?, and that the tares which the “flesh” planted will be harvested? You can see that when we start twisting Scripture around, we arrive at all kinds of strange absurdities. Are we to believe that “the synagogue of Satan” at Rev. 2:9 & 3:9 is the “synagogue of the flesh”? Are we to read “flesh” rather than “devil” at Matthew 4:11, where after the devil tempted Yahshua that His flesh “leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him.” Well, I guess if He were skinned alive, He would have needed many angels! But this is what these turkey no-devil people claim, that Yahshua was tempted by His flesh! Are we to replace the word “flesh” for “devil” at Luke 8:12? In that case it would read: *“Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the flesh, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.”* How preposterous!

Are we to read “flesh” for “devil” at John 6:70? In that case it would read: *“Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a flesh?”* Are we to read John 8:44 thusly: “Ye are of *your* father the **flesh**, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” And John 10:21 would read: “Others said, These are not the words of him that hath a **flesh**. Can a **flesh** open the eyes of the blind?” In that case, John 13:2 would have to read: “And supper being ended, the **flesh** having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon’s *son*, to betray him.” And Acts 13:10 would have to read: “And said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, *thou* child of the **flesh**, *thou* enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?” You should now see why I call people like this, theology **quacks**!

I am aware that I have given you much to think over and contemplate in this lesson. You should also begin to see just how serious a problem we have. There is probably more false doctrine floating around the world today than since the dawn of history. No wonder Matthew 7:13 says: “Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat.” For those who really want to know the truth, it’s something that must be worked at. And the only way one is ever going to find it is “study to show yourself approved.” You cannot take anyone’s word for anything. Each individual must check every facet of evidence for himself and have the ability to discern the truth when he finds it. All truth starts with a correct premise.

FURTHER EVIDENCE THE OTHER RACES WERE NOT CREATED

The KJV translates Acts 17:26 in part: “And hath made of one blood all nations...” Ferrar Fenton renders it: “He made by One every race of men ...” There is some question whether or not the word “blood” should be in the text. W. E. Vine under the word “blood” indicates only the words “of one.” The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders it: “and made from One, Every Nation ...” which

may be more nearly correct. Smith & Goodspeed has it: "From one forefather he has created every nation ..." Everything depends on the definition of who the "One" is and who the "Nations" are. Ferrar Fenton really goofed on this one as the Greek word is ethnos, meaning nation. Once we realize the word "One" means Adam and the word ethnos means the "nations" of the tribes of Genesis 10, all the confusion disappears. Now whether or not the word "blood" is used is superfluous, for all the Genesis 10 nations have Adam's blood! This verse is simply saying that from Adam came all the White Genesis 10 nations. I will repeat again, Scripture does not record the so-called creation of the other races! Paul spoke these words to explain to the Athenians, who were of Javan the Japhethite, that although they were not Israel, they too were children of Adam, being one of the White Genesis 10 nations.

When are we ever going to get it through our thick heads that the Bible is about Adam's race and Adam's race only? Acts 17:26 is a good example of a verse, which when taken out of context, leads to fornication with the other nonwhite races!