

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #10

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

I have now completed nine *Special Notices* to all anti-seedliners that we are in a WAR. This is #10. At the present time, the enemy in this WAR has an agenda of convincing every White to jump in bed with a member of another race (mostly women). While all this is going on, the anti-seedliners proclaim: there isn't any enemy. They may deny they are making such a claim, but, by contradicting the Two Seedline truth, they are, in essence, making such an assertion. Therefore, all the blood of these White victims of "Jewish" propaganda is on their hands. They are actually aiding and abetting the enemy in their vicious ploy to destroy the White, Israel Race. When you next observe the product of a mixed marriage, thank the anti-seedliners for their part in assisting the enemy in their diabolical plot. Also, those who are in support of the anti-seedliners become accessories after the fact. If you are not sure how your pastor stands on this issue, maybe you should ask him. Write and tell him that you would like to support him, but you can't as long as he doesn't teach Two Seedline! After all, it's your children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren who might race-mix as a direct or indirect result of the anti-seedliner's message. **WAKE UP, WE ARE AT WAR!!!**

I really can't see a lot of difference between Ted R. Weiland and John Hagee, for they both teach the "Jews" are "God's chosen people." John Hagee said this: "Let me tell you this: Genesis 12:1 and 3 says: 'I will bless those that bless you, and I will curse those who curse you.' If something within you resents the Jewish people, that something is a demon spirit. The Jewish people, according to the Word of God, are the apple of God's eye. The nation of Israel is the object of God's affection. For David said: 'He that keepeth Israel (and the phrase 'keep' was a military term), he that defends Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps.' Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and Jesus Christ were all Jews." Ted R. Weiland in his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, pages 68 & 94 make parallel statements to Hagee: "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 Israelite* ... The seedliners teach that the Pharisees were *Cainites of the seed line 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 the seed line of Jacob/ Israel*."

Essentially, what both Hagee and Weiland are doing is putting their stamp of approval on our children marrying a cursed descendant of Cain, a “Jew.” I really fail to see much difference between those two. Again, Weiland will try to imply that Cain was a son of Adam with the same genetics as Abel. If this were true, it would I again be approving of a marriage of our children with a “Jew.” To see if that is correct, let’s put it to the acid test. Inasmuch as both Weiland and Hagee are implying that the “Jews”, at the time of Messiah were “God’s chosen”, then, according to Scripture, if we bless the “Jews” we can only be blessed, or the Almighty is a liar.

In 1948, the state of Israeli was supposedly born. For 53 years now the United States has been pumping money into the Israeli (the Israel-lie) in enormous amounts (billions upon billions). Sums of money that the ordinary person cannot even envision. No other nation in all history has pampered a people as the United States has molycoddled the Israeli. If the Israeli are God’s chosen, and if the Almighty’s words are true, the United States should be receiving blessings never before conceived. Let’s take a look at what these blessings consist of:

We are being blessed with an ever increasing abortion rate — well, praise God for that blessing! We are being blessed with an ever increasing divorce rate — isn’t that simply a wonderful blessing? Let’s praise God for that one too. We are told that homosexuality and lesbianism are on the increase — what marvelous blessings these are! Let’s again praise God for those glorious blessings also! Every day rape is on the upswing — isn’t it just wonderful what God is doing for us? The murder rate is ever on the rise in every part of the country — what an amazing blessing that one is. Let’s praise the Almighty for that one too. Drug addiction is going out of control — isn’t that a fabulous and wonderful blessing? Personal debt is going through the ceiling — Oh, please, “God”, bless us some more! Isn’t it wonderful that robbery and breaking and enterings are on the increase? Children and adolescents are committing major crimes at a younger and younger age — what a wonderful new trend for the future. If all of these are blessings, I would really hate to see what a curse might be like. It would appear we were doing better when we weren’t blessing the “Jews” as much! What does it all boil down to? Just this: if the “Jews” are “God’s chosen people”, as Weiland and Hagee claim, Yahweh is a liar, for under that prerequisite, we should be the most blessed nation on the earth in all of history, for no nation has ever done more for the “Jews” than we. Now, Ted R. Weiland might deny he implied or said such a thing, but if you will check his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, it’s exactly as I quoted him.

THE MENTAL SEDUCTION THEORY

The prime argument used by the anti-seedliners is that Eve was “mentally” seduced rather than physically seduced. That is ludicrous. James 1:14-15 describes seven definite steps in the process of sin as follows:

“ 14 But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. 15 Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.” [KJV]

The seven steps are: (1) Temptation: evil thought, (2) Drawn away: strong imagination or fantasy, (3) Lust: delight in viewing, (4) Enticed: weakening of the will, (5) Lust conceived: yielding, (6) Sin: sinful act committed, (7) Death: result of the actual sin.

The “Gospel” according to all the anti-seedliners is that an evil thought alone is worthy of death. In other words, one strike and you’re out in the anti-seedliner’s ball game. They have made up their own new rules for the Bible! It should now be obvious that Holy Scripture doesn’t support the anti-seedliner’s hypothesis that Eve was seduced mentally only. The next time you have the opportunity to talk with an anti-seedliner, ask him how this seven step process to sin would apply in the case of Eve, for if Eve didn’t go through this seven stage progression defined in James 1:14-15, she did not sin. It would appear that either the Epistle of James is wrong or anti-seedliners are wrong, and I’ll put my money on James.

Not only do the anti-seedliners err concerning the full mental and physical seduction of Eve, but they accuse the Almighty of unjust punishment for her sin. In order to see this, we will have to read Genesis 3:14-16:

“ 14 And Yahweh said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. 15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. 16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.”

We can see from this, that the serpent, the woman, and Adam were punished in that order for their part in that seduction. Yahweh always punishes in like-kind. The Bible makes it clear that if a man kills another in premeditated murder, his life is required in return. Yahweh always metes out punishment to fit the crime. In all Scripture, one cannot find a single incident where this is not true. Eve’s punishment in verse 16 is: (1) to bear children in sorrow, (2) her desire was to be reserved for her husband, and (3) she is to yield to her husband’s authority.

Let’s now zero in on the punishment of “bearing children ... in sorrow.” The word “sorrow” is #6093 in *Strong’s*. It means “*worrisomeness, i.e. labor or pain ...*” *Gesenius*’ has it for Genesis 3:16: “‘... thy pain and thy conception’; Hendiadys for the pain of thy conception.” (“hendiadys” means: a figure in which a complex idea is expressed by two words connected by a copulative conjunction: ‘to look with the eyes and envy’ instead of ‘with envious eyes.’) In other words, “the pain of thy conception”; not “thy pain and thy conception.”

Thus, there are three separate conclusions which can be Biblically drawn from Yahweh’s pronouncement to Eve: (1) That Eve would bear children in pain; that the pain would affect the very part of the body where the sin occurred. (2) That her [sexual] desire would return to her husband (Why did Yahweh even mention it if she were always true to Adam?). It is implied here that Eve’s desire had been to someone else. (3) That Eve would return and put herself under the authority of her husband rather than the influence of the serpent.

Had Eve been guilty only of a mental crime, as the anti-seedliners so loudly proclaim, it would have been highly unjust for Yahweh to have punished her by causing her to bear children with physical pain. In his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* by Ted R. Weiland, he implies that Yahweh is unjust in his punishment where he says this on page 29:

“The Bible is always its own best commentary, and it clearly attests to the fact that Eve was mentally deceived, *not* sexually seduced.”

Not only that, but Weiland scoffs at Dan Gayman's work *The Two Seeds Of Genesis 3:15* on page 16 where Gayman said this:

“In the divine punishment inflicted upon the woman Eve in Genesis 3:16 why did Almighty God employ the pain of childbirth? What is the purpose of the use of the word conception? How about the use of the word desire? The truth is: **God made the punishment to fit the crime.**”

There is one thing for sure, Weiland's “hypothesis” of the account of Genesis 3:16 surely doesn't fit the crime. If it did, when women bear children they would suffer severe mental anxiety without any physical pain. Stephen E. Jones in his *The Babylonian Connection* (a work to repudiate Two Seedline), page 42 says this:

“We conclude then that when Eve explained to God that the serpent had ‘beguiled’ her, she meant that he had mentally deceived her. He corrupted the truth of God's Word by preaching another Jesus (God), another spirit, and another gospel, just as Satan's ministers have done all through the ages. And when Eve believed Satan's doctrine, she too was corrupted. *Nawshaw*, as used in Genesis 3:13, had nothing to do with physical seduction.”

Stephen E. Jones also teaches “universalism” besides being an anti-seedliner. Those two teachings have done more damage in Israel Identity than any I know. In his book *The Babylonian Connection*, Stephen E. Jones prefabricated some of his documentation. I will present it here, and you can decide for yourself to what extent he may have misrepresented things. Weiland is aware that Jones fabricated some of his documentation because I sent him the information concerning it.

For Jones, that item is inexcusable. If a man is untruthful, he should be exposed for that untruthfulness! I will offer the following, as evidence, of such a charge. If a man is deliberately untruthful once, he will be untruthful again. I will now show you where Stephen E. Jones produced totally false information and he used subliminal suggestion in doing it. We will find it in his book *The Babylonian Connection* on page 154, and it reads as follows:

“Liberty under God's Law is our God-given inheritance. When Protestant reformers of 400 years ago discovered this liberty, they forsook the Papal dictatorship. God opened their eyes to the truth of His Word, and they rejected the serpent's lies taught by the Catholic church. Martin Luther wrote:

“My hope is built on nothing less • Than Jesus' blood and righteousness; • I dare not trust *the serpent's lie*, • Concerning immortality. • On Christ the solid Rock I stand, • All other ground is sinking sand.”

When I read this over, the words seemed familiar —they just kept going through my mind. I kept asking myself, Where Have I heard them before? Well, I kept going

over and over them, and then some familiar music began to come to me. It took me about 10 minutes to begin to recognize the melody that went with the words, but I couldn't think of the name of the song. I proceeded to find some old hymn books and looked to see if I could find the song that matched the words. After finding the song books, I spent the better part of an hour looking through them. I didn't seem to have much luck in the indexes of the hymnals, so I just leafed through the pages one at a time. While searching, the words that seemed to come to me were: "I dare not trust the sweetest (something), but (something something) Jesus' name." Finally I found it; the name of the song was "The Solid Rock", and in some hymn books it is just "Solid Rock." But the words "*the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality*" were not there! Apparently Jones changed these words in order to prove his thesis.

Not only that, but I found that "**Martin Luther**" **never wrote these words!** I have an old hymnal entitled *The Evangelical Hymnal*, published by "Board Of Publication of the Evangelical Church", Cleveland, Oh. & Harrisburg, Pa., Copyrighted 1921. For the song "Solid Rock", page 150, it has "Edward Mote" as the author and, "William B. Bradbury" as the composer. From pages xxxiv to xxxvi is found a list of authors. Rev. Edward Mote is listed on page xxxv as the author and flourished from 1797 till 1874. From pages xxxvii to xxxix are listed composers. William B. Bradbury is listed on page xxxvii as the composer, and he flourished from 1816 till 1868 and composed 21 melodies including "Solid Rock." **Now you can judge from this evidence for yourself whether or not you think Jones is being honest or not when he says that "Martin Luther" wrote these words, (and Jones changed the words to his own use to boot). Now if "Martin Luther" wrote these words, then Edward Mote is a plagiarist.** In this hymnal the words, "*Used by permission of The Bigelow & Main Company, Owners*", are used. This indicates that this company had a copyright against this song and it could be used only by their permission.

Let's now take a look at the true words to this stanza of Mote's poem which was later put to Bradbury's melody:

"I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus' name."
(Not) "I dare not trust the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality."

By suggesting that change of words, Jones was using "subliminal suggestion" in his deceitful tactics to get you to buy his argument. The average person would say in his/her mind, "Oh yes, I know those words, so Jones has a good point here." "Subliminal suggestion" is a science, and is practiced much by the "Jews." The question here is: "Who might be the 'Jew' behind Jones doing this?" Notice again, no words about "*the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality.*" They were added by Jones who misrepresented the true author and thought you would never notice! You can see, then, that Ted R. Weiland is simply copycatting the same argument that Stephen E. Jones used to attempt to prove Eve was only "mentally" seduced.

In his booklet *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History* Jeffrey A. Weakley copycats the same argument that Eve was seduced mentally on pages 7-8. Here are some excerpts:

"The seedliners will insist that it be translated 'seduced' and they define it as a physical sexual seduction because the English word 'seduce' can mean that. But can

the word 'deceive' mean a sexual seduction? ... When all these definitions are taken together as synonyms, the conclusion one comes to (if he is seeking to be honest) is that Eve was deceived in the mind, NOT SEXUALLY SEDUCED! ... So the first point the Satanic Seedline doctrine does not agree with the Scriptures — Eve was not sexually seduced, but rather she was mentally deceived.”

Lt. Col. Jack Mohr in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* says this, implying a mental only seduction of Eve:

“In 2 Cor. 11:3 the same Scripture writer indicates that Eve was beguiled in her mind, not through her sexual parts.”

Charles Weisman at a Pete Peters camp retreat used the same argument as Stephen E. Jones, Ted R. Weiland and Lt. Col. Jack Mohr. The following is an excerpt from an audiocassette tape made at that meeting when Weisman, in an extended presentation, attempted to repudiate the Two Seedline message:

“In 2nd Corinthians 11:3 Paul is concerned that the Corinthians would lose their faith and said: ‘But I fear, lest somehow, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds be corrupted ...’ So he interprets this verse to mean something of a mental thing, a mental delusion, mentally delude, to lead astray, deceive, and that is just what the word means.”

Not only did Weisman, like Weiland, Weakley, Jones and Mohr, use the same argument that Eve was only “mentally” seduced, but on this very same audiocassette tape, he insinuates the Pharisees and Sadducees at the time of the Messiah were true blooded Israelites:

“Now we go to Matthew 23. Now this is one of the questions that a guy who wrote me a letter asked about where in verse 35 it states ‘That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias whom you slew between the temple and the altar.’ Now, the statement about this verse by Satanic Seedline doctrine people is that they say, here, Christ identified his enemies as being the serpent race, and tells the Jews, who you’re [sic. He’s] talking to, that they are responsible for all that have been murdered upon the earth, even righteous Abel. Well, Christ here is speaking of a judgment that is to come upon Adamic man. And this judgment includes the murderers recorded in the Old Testament. Jesus did not say to these Jews that they were responsible for Abel’s death. They [sic. He] said, all of his [sic. their] blood will come upon you. So they are going to be judged. All of --- all of --- shed blood --- innocent blood --- is going to become upon --- this --- this people. And these people were the last of the Israelite order. And they were the last true representatives of the Adamic race under God’s old order. So they were the ones who could be judged. So, He is not really saying they were guilty for Abel’s death, but rather, it would come upon them. But He does say that they were guilty of killing Zacharias, which is recorded in 2nd Chronicles 24:21. They were stoned by this people or this --- this nation. And in verse 31 [Matthew 23:31], Christ says to them, ‘wherefore you be witnesses unto yourself that you are the children of them which killed the prophets.’ So it’s quite identifiable here who He’s talking to. **He’s talking to Israelites!** Just as Stephen said to these same people, ‘which of the fathers have you not persecuted’, Israelites! These are the people that

Jesus came to and spoke with and judged. They were not descendants of Cain, but Israelites, as only Israelites could be judged, not mongrels.”

There is fairly good evidence that the words “son of Barachias” were never in the original script. *A Commentary On The Holy Bible*, edited by Rev. J. R. Dummelow points this out on page 701:

“**Zacharias son of Barachias]** Jesus probably said ‘Zachariah’ as in St. Luke, without mentioning the father’s name, but the evangelist or one of the earliest copyists, who thought it necessary to distinguish among the twenty-nine Zachariahs of the OT., and understood the canonical prophet to be meant, added the words ‘son of Barachias ...’”

The problem is: most of the prophets were after the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:21. Therefore, it is more probable that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist is meant in Matthew 23:35, (see Protevangelion, chapter 16). In such a case, Yahshua did indeed mean all the righteous blood from Abel to Zacharias! Also, as I have pointed out in several of my *Special Notices* to the anti-seedliners, that Josephus makes it quite clear that, outside of a minor few, the majority of Pharisees and Sadducees were not of the Tribe of Judah by birth, *Josephus Wars* 2:8:2. Therefore, Weisman’s argument against Two Seedline doctrine is totally spurious. This also shows that it is highly likely that Weiland was parroting Weisman when he mistakenly, but unequivocally, claimed the Pharisees and Sadducees were true descendants of “Jacob/Israel”, pages 68 and 94 of his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?*

There are many who don’t realize that Pete Peters is not Two Seedline. He clearly showed his position on the subject when he introduced Charles Weisman at his camp retreat when Weisman made his presentation against the Two Seedline doctrine. This is what Peters said:

“Charles Weisman was definitely one of the intellectuals of the people. And he is a man that has been a very diligent scholar from what I can ascertain. He has some very fine writings, and I’ve been blessed immensely from some of the things he has brought. Shall we give Charles Weisman a hand ...”

Being applauded, Charles Weisman concluded his totally erroneous presentation against the Two Seedline doctrine saying the following, and Pete Peters sat right there and never challenged a single word Charles Weisman had to say:

“So why does this [Two Seedline] doctrine exist today? Well, it exists because we have a tendency within ourselves to not want to have evil and problems to come from within; we want them to come from without. And, therefore, if you tell somebody about a falsehood, about problems coming from without, some other people from other groups will accept it, but if it’s from within, it’s less likely to be accepted. Same problem when you try to tell people about the corruption and evil in American Government. They just can’t accept it, but if you tell them lies about some foreign country, or about some Saddam Hussein, they will accept that because now the corruption is from without. It’s hard for us to accept that problems come from within ourselves, our family, our government, our nation, our race. It’s more appealing and acceptable if they are from without. The Cain-Satanic seedline has problems and evil coming from without; an outside source, that being Satan. Who were the enemies of Israel in the Bible? Most of

them were offshoots of the Adamic race [*bull manure*]. The Midianites, the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Edomites, the Amalekites, even a lot of the Canaanites. Remember Esau was your brother, and so was Cain [*bull manure again*], and so was Canaan, and so were those who stoned the prophets, and who killed Christ. The truth is that all the evil associated with the Jew today is from within. That is, it comes from within people of the Adamic race; those who were rejected by God, cursed by God, cast out etc. That is what, in part, constitutes the Jew today. Sort of the refuse of the Adamic race. God throughout history has been pruning His vine, separating out from the original Adamic stock, people like Cain, and Canaan, and Esau, and others. In conclusion, the Satanic Seedline doctrine is not Scriptural, it's not logical; it is a false doctrine that I think we need to set aside and move on to the truth of what God has actually done in the earth ...” [*More bull manure!*]