

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #23

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

Again, the subject of Two Seedline must be brought to the forefront of our attention. Because the agenda of the enemy is to destroy the White Israel Race, we find ourselves in a WAR, and this subject cannot be passed over lightly. We observe this unnatural phenomenon going on wherever we turn. We cannot go shopping or eat out at a restaurant without seeing this shameless manifestation of the race-mixing that is ever on the rise. The reason for bringing this dilemma before you anew is because the positions of those who oppose Two Seedline teaching are wittingly or unwittingly assisting the enemy in their cause. Once again, I will point to Stephen E. Jones, Ted R. Weiland and their whole wrecking crew as the principal offenders.

Their chief crime (and I do mean crime) is to place Cain on an equal footing with Abel. They continue to quote Genesis 4:1 as support for their untenable view, never checking any authority on the Hebrew to verify their suppositions. As a result of their misjudgments they incorrectly direct the blame for all of today's miscegenation problems on the "flesh" rather than on the **AGENDA** of the genetic-satanic-seed of Genesis 3:15. Thus, they are misdirecting blame for our greatest racial problem, and helping to create a racial catastrophe of gigantic proportions. Therefore, we Two Seedliners dare not be silent. To show there is a problem with Genesis 4:1, I will again quote *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary On The Bible* by Charles M. Laymon, page 6: "... **under circumstances which are obscure (vs. 1b can scarcely be translated, still less understood).**" That hardly seems like clear-cut evidence that Adam was Cain's father, does it? I have yet to hear or read an anti-seedliner comment on the Hebrew of Genesis 4:1. By the way, I purchased this book from E. Raymond Capt. I would also remind you, the 12 volume *Interpreter's Bible Commentary* has a similar comment on Genesis 4:1 which I have quoted before.

!! PROOF POSITIVE: ADAM WAS NOT CAIN'S FATHER !!

All one need do to verify this significant Biblical fact is to turn to Jude 14, which states: "**And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these saying, 'Behold Yahshua cometh with ten thousands of his saints'.**" Then, if you will turn to both Genesis 5:1-18 and Luke 3:37-38, and count from Adam to Enoch, you can clearly see there are only six listed. Jude didn't make a mistake when he pointed to Enoch as being the seventh from Adam, for he was including [the prophet] Abel in his

calculations (Hebrews 11:4). It should be noted that Jude didn't say the seventh "generation" from Adam for Enoch was the sixth in that category. Many commentaries agree on this point, but how can this be?

If Abel is included, a proper list would then be thus: (1) Abel, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan (5) Mahalaleel, (6) Jared, and, (7) Enoch. It should be noted that both the Genesis and Luke accounts have a missing man, which can only be filled with Abel. Should one try to force Cain into Adam's genealogy, Enoch would then be the eighth from Adam! At this juncture, one has only one choice of two: Cain or Abel. To exclude both Abel and Cain is also damning, for it makes Enoch the sixth from Adam. Some will argue that one should start counting with Adam as number one, but the Greek doesn't support that idea. Wittingly or unwittingly, the antichrist, anti-seedliners have chosen Cain to fill that spot, for they spuriously claim Cain was Adam's authentic son. A second witness to the fact that Abel should be listed as the missing man is Genesis 4:25 which says: "**And Adam knew his wife [yet] again (not again and again, #5750 Gesenius'); and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For Elohim, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead (in the place) of Abel, whom Cain slew.**" If, as some claim, Cain was kicked out of the family for murdering Abel, Seth would have been a replacement for Cain, not Abel. Evidently the anti-seedliners have a problem counting to seven!

Matthew 23:35 indicates that Abel was among the "righteous." Abel was righteous for the same reason as Noah: he was perfect in his genealogy (generations). At this point, it might be well to quote again the *Targum of Jonathan* on Genesis 4:1: "**And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the Angel of the Lord.**"

THE BATTLE FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

Many surface-readers of the Bible read Genesis 4 and never comprehend the struggle between Cain and Abel for the birthright and priesthood. The firstborn son is always considered in line for ruler and priest of the family. Genesis 4:7 definitely states that Abel would be subservient to Cain, and verses 1 & 2 clearly indicate that Cain was the firstborn of Eve. Now YHWH told Cain that if he didn't "do well", sin lieth at his entry into life by way of his birth. Let's repeat again the *Strong's* definition for "door": "Door — #6607 **pethach**, *peh'-thakh*; from 6605; an *opening* (literally), i.e. *door (gate) or entrance way*:— door, entering (in), entrance (-ry), gate, opening, place." I have yet to read or hear any of the anti-seedliner's explanation for the Hebrew word "door." I suppose they might try to idiotically claim that it was the "door" of Cain's heart! (Ha!) In fact, in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?*, Jack Mohr dimwittedly made that very statement on page 14.

CONTEST FOR THE BIRTHRIGHT AND PRIESTHOOD

In verses 3 & 4, we are told that both Cain and Abel brought offerings unto Elohim, and that there was respect for Abel's but no respect for Cain's. Now only a priest can offer a sacrifice, so both Cain and Abel were priests. Therefore, Abel was the

firstborn of Adam and Cain was the firstborn of Satan. Abel's sacrifice was accepted of ὩΗΗ, not because he was first born of Eve, but because he was the firstborn of Eve to Adam. When we get that straightened out in our minds, we can comprehend that Enoch was the seventh priest **from** Adam. Abel was priest #1 **from** Adam; Seth was priest #2 (as a replacement for Abel) **from** Adam; Enos was priest #3 **from** Adam; Cainan was priest #4 **from** Adam; Mahalaleel was priest #5 **from** Adam; Jared was priest #6 **from** Adam; and, Enoch was priest #7 **from** Adam. As for Cain: he was the firstborn priest of Satan birthed by Eve. Now there were many more sons born to all these patriarchs between Adam and Enoch, but only the first sons were born to the priesthood, except Seth who was a substitute in place of Abel.

Let's rephrase all this in a different manner: First, to count Enoch "seventh from Adam" (ἔβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ) is an ambiguous statement, since each male in the list "begat sons and daughters", means Enoch is but the sixth generation and not even close to being the seventh male from Adam. Again, Enoch is the sixth generation of his own line, and other unmentioned lines may have even more after that. Jude can only mean that Enoch is the seventh high priest from Adam, since only a firstborn son is a family priest. If Cain were Adam's son, Cain's line would have the family priesthood by Law, regardless of Cain's actions. Had Adam been Cain's genetic father, the priesthood would have followed from Adam to ⇒ Cain ⇒ Enoch ⇒ Irad ⇒ Mehujael ⇒ Methusael ⇒ Lamech ⇒ Jabal! Instead, this is the lineal high-priesthood of Satan! Had Cain been removed from the priesthood for murdering Abel, then Enoch of Cain's line should have been the priest "appointed" instead of Seth, and after that all his lineal firstborn descendants. Had Abel been the second-born of Adam, Abel would never have offered a sacrifice, for Cain would have offered it for him. When we fully grasp the line of the priesthood, then we can understand why Adam's and Cain's lines are given separately, and no mention of Cain is alluded to in the line of Adam.

EVE WAS IN THE TRANSGRESSION, 1 TIMOTHY 2:14

1 Timothy 2:14: **"And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."**

Some commentaries make the argument that the deception was a matter of relativity—that both Adam and Eve were deceived and were in the transgression, but that Eve's deception was more intensified than Adam's. However, the Greek doesn't support that opinion, and one must read into the text something that isn't there. The Greek simply states that Eve was deceived and in the transgression [PERIOD].

The word "transgression" in the Greek requires an act, rather than only a mental seduction as the anti-seedliners claim. The word for "transgression" in 1 Timothy 2:14 is #3847 in *Strong's*, and is the Greek word *parabasis*: to transgress, wrongdoing, lawbreaking. In other words, there must be something to transgress before there can be a transgression. If Eve's "transgression" was a thought crime, as the anti-seedliners allege, then we're all in trouble! The progression of sin is explained in James 1:14-15:

"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."

The anti-seedliners declare that this passage is in error, and that thought enticement alone “bringeth forth sin.” I’ll guarantee that every committed act of “transgression” called “sin” (including Eve’s), follows the above route! Enticement is only mental, but “transgression” is an **act** fulfilled. Scripture declares that Eve’s sin was an act of “transgression”, no matter what the anti-seedliners fallaciously contend. In short, there is no way under heaven to apply the Greek *parabasis* to anything other than an act (not a mental violation). Whatever else the Greek *parabasis* can be applied to, it cannot be utilized for anything mental (only an act of breaking a law).

Yet in spite of all this, Ted R. Weiland in his book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* says the following 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.” No, Mr. Weiland, I don’t think the word “transgress” makes it all that “mentally clear.” Then on page 94, he repeats his spurious conclusion again: “The seedliners teach that the beguiling of Eve was *physical*, whereas 2 Corinthians 11:3 declares that the beguiling of Eve was *mental*.” Again Mr. Weiland, what are you going to do with the Greek word *parabasis* meaning “transgression” (1 Timothy 2:14)? Mr. Ted R. Weiland is manipulating the English context of 2 Corinthians 11:2 & 3, but the Greek doesn’t support his conclusion. A better rendering of verse 3 directly from the Greek would be: **“But I fear lest in any way, as the serpent had thoroughly beguiled Eve in his villainy, in that manner your thoughts would be corrupted from that sincerity which is with the Anointed.”** Weiland, by insisting on a mental only seduction of Eve, effectively removes the idea of “a chaste virgin” from verse 2! Once the significance of “a chaste virgin” is removed, there is no longer any redemption for Israel! I noticed also in his “Scripture Index” on page 132, he entirely skipped over 1 Timothy 2:14. (I wonder why?)

In Stephen E. Jones’ book *The Babylonian Connection*, page 42, he 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.” While Jones does not avoid 1 Timothy 2:14, as did Weiland, on page 48, he takes it entirely out of context and engages in some nonsensical “Jewish” style double-talk. But the main thing Jones avoids on 1 Timothy 2:14 is explaining the Greek term *parabasis*, meaning “transgression.” Had he taken *parabasis* into account, it would have destroyed his entire premise. Therefore, like Mr. Ted R. Weiland, Mr. Stephen E. Jones is not the great Bible student he pretends to be.

In Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley’s book *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, he says the following on page 8: “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 of the Satanic Seedline doctrine does not agree with the Scriptures —Eve was not sexually seduced, but rather she was mentally deceived.” I would ask Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley what he is going to do with the word *parabasis* in the Greek, which means “transgression” in 1

Timothy 2:14? It would seem that Weakley is no better a Bible student than Weiland or Jones, for *parabasis* is an act, not a mental condition! Now who's not being honest?

Mr. Jack Mohr, in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* says this on page 10: "In 2 Cor. 11:3, the same Scripture writer indicates that Eve was beguiled in her mind, not in her sexual parts." We must allow somewhat for Mr. Jack Mohr's difficulty in accurately appraising a subject, and his inability to keep things straight. We must further overlook his tendency of contradicting himself from moment to moment when he is speaking, or page to page when he is writing. But Mohr, like Weiland, Jones and Weakley, completely overlooks *parabasis* "transgression" in 1 Timothy 2:14. I have now given you four examples of how, whether by ineptness or on purpose, the anti-seedliners key in on one passage and completely ignore the rest of Scripture. (Shades of Bozo the clown!) The reason I'm out for blood is because this kind of teaching is helping the "Jews" in their effort to destroy our White Israel Race. The next time you go past a playground, you'll see what I mean! Admittedly the "flesh" is a problem, but to misdirect our people from realizing the major enemy is a criminal offense! And that is what they continue to do! I would be derelict in my duty as a watchman should I not take these foolish arguments to task. **Note:** The sexual beguiling or deception is in the mind. It is the **transgression** which takes place physically. The "sexual parts" are not capable of thought, but merely engage in the action the mind conceives.

MORE EVIDENCE EVE WAS SEDUCED SEXUALLY

The next Scripture we are going to use to show that Eve was seduced physically rather than only mentally is Proverbs 30:20: "**Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness.**" The "mouth" spoken of in this verse is not the mouth on the face that consumes food but the vagina. Also the word "eateth" in this verse is the same *Strong's* Hebrew #398 as used in Genesis 3:6 where it says: "... **she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat ...**" If you've read this passage of Proverbs in the past and assumed it was speaking of the "mouth" on the face, you were desperately confused for your assumption was badly flawed. Not only do we know what this "adulterous woman" did, but also what she ate. It was an apple, of course!

In ancient times, the testes of a man was analogous to an apple hanging from a branch of a tree. Anyone who has taken a knife and cut an apple in half knows there are seeds in the core. So is it with the testes of a man. The ancients had other ways of comparing things of a sexual nature. The mandrake, for instance, was considered the "devil's apple." There were the "apples of Sodom" (also known as "grapes" in Deuteronomy 32:32). To show you this, I will quote from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia, volume 4, page 66:*

"Mandrake. Mentioned 5 times in Genesis 30, and once in Song of Solomon 7:13. Mandrake is generally accepted to be the 'love apple.' The mandrake was obviously rare, and was supposed to have aphrodisiac properties. The old-fashioned name of the tomato (*Solanum esculentum*) was love apple. It is thought that the mandrake is *Atropa mandragora*, which is like the deadly nightshade, and therefore a member of the same family. This plant bears yellow fruits, somewhat smaller than the tomato, and

has an 'acquired' pleasant taste. Because of its 'sex' reputation, it is called by Arabs 'a devil's apple.' The description in Genesis of Rachel's conversation with Leah certainly gives the impression that the mandrake was thought to be a love potion. Its near relation, *Atropa belladonna*, is, of course, the source of Atropine, an important medicinal drug. The Royal Horticultural Society's dictionary names the plant *Mandragora officinarum*, and describes the fruit as a globose berry. It gives the alternative name as 'devil's apple' ..."

This is substantial evidence that ancient cultures understood the temptation of Eve in the Garden of Eden to be of a sexual nature rather than mental only as the anti-seedliners declare! This also shows that the sexual seduction of Eve had nothing to do with a Babylonian religion as Stephen E. Jones claims in his book! After all, the Arabs have been around for a long time. It should be noted that some of the Arabs descended from Joktan, brother of Peleg, and son of Eber, Genesis 10:25. Many others descended from Ishmael. The word "Arab" simply means "mixed", so the Arabs, or any mixed group, are far from being our cousins! The fact that the anti-seedliners do not comprehend the significance of Proverbs 30:20, verifies they do not understand the first principles of Biblical interpretation.

To give you further input on what the "apples of Sodom" are about, I will quote from the 1980 edition of the *Collier's Encyclopedia*, volume 2, page 358: "APPLES OF SODOM, a phrase used figuratively to describe anything disappointing. Various ancient writers told of beautiful fruits which, when plucked, proved to be full of ashes. Apples growing by the Dead Sea, sometimes called Dead Sea fruit, are described by the French traveler Jean Thévenot and also by Josephus, Strabo, and Tacitus. They may have referred to gallnuts produced by the sting of the insect *Cynipis insana*. The small tomatolike yellow fruits of the spiny shrub *Solanum sodomaeum* are often called apples of Sodom." It is interesting to note that sometimes these are referred to as gallnuts, as the testes of a man are also sometimes termed "nuts", and fifty years ago this term was considered in very bad taste, and if used in a disgraceful manner, one might expect to receive a slap across the mouth by one's father or mother. Once we understand this kind of allegory, we can better comprehend Deuteronomy 32:32 mentioning our enemy: "For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah: their grapes [testes] are grapes of gall, their clusters [seed] are bitter." Further, it gives us some insight on Acts 8:23, speaking of a "Jew" with "the gall of bitterness", and John 1:47, "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." Nathanael had none of Cain's satanic blood, as some of the other Judaeans of that time! "Gall" is in the genetics and not in the mind as the anti-seedliners would have us to believe. It's just natural for Satan's children to be scheming and crafty as it's their biological disposition! What did you think "gall" or "guile" in these cases meant?

In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume R-Z, page 786, it says the following under the heading "Vine" (listed under Vine of Sodom at the top of the page): "... And the Jews are symbolized by the wicked tenants of a vineyard who beat those sent by the owner (God) to collect some of the fruit; finally they killed even the owner's son (Christ) in order to gain control of the vineyard. Naturally the tenants were put to death and the vineyard was rented to others (... Matt. 21:33-43; Mark 12:1-11; Luke

20:9-17). Of greater significance, however, is Jesus' description of himself as the 'true vine' and his Father as the vinedresser (John 15:1-11). Jesus is probably comparing himself *[as opposed]* to the vine of the Jews which has become degenerate ..." We can understand this last statement about the "Jews" being "degenerate", for many had racemixed with the Canaanite nations. When we read Jeremiah 2:21, this is the message we get. This is a factor that the anti-seedliners continue to deny. Time after time after time after time, Ted R. Weiland in his book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, identifies the Canaanite variety of "Jews" as being of true Judah. That alone completely disqualifies him as any kind of authority concerning Scripture. Caution should be advised with all his tapes and books, for one listens to and reads them at his own peril.

Jeremiah 2:21: "**Yet I had planted thee [Judah] a noble vine, wholly a right seed: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange [hybrid] vine unto me?**" What is there about this verse the antichrist, anti-seedliners don't understand? —and no amount of soap can wash that hybridization away (v. 22)!

CAIN'S STATUS AND OCCUPATION NEVER CHANGED

In the Old Testament, Cain was a vagabond, and in the New Testament he remained the same. In Acts 19:13-19, we read: "**13 Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Sovereign Yahshua, saying, We adjure you by Yahshua whom Paul preacheth. 14 And there were seven sons of *one* Sceva, a Jew, *and* chief of the priests, which did so. 15 And the evil spirit answered and said, Yahshua I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? 16 And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. 17 And this was known among all the Judaeans and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Sovereign Yahshua was magnified. 18 And many that believed came, and confessed, and shewed their deeds. 19 Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all *men*: and they counted the price of them, and found *it* fifty thousand pieces of silver.**"

On another occasion, Paul rebuked a "Canaanite-Jew" thus, (Acts 13:9-10): "**9 Then Saul, (who also *is called* Paul,) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, 10 And Said, O full of all subtilty [guile] and all mischief, *thou* child of the devil, *thou* enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of YHWH.**"

The interesting thing about Acts 13:10 is the fact that the center cross-reference takes us to both Matthew 13:38 and 1 John 3:8 which reads as follows:

Matthew 13:38-39a: "**38 The field is the world; the good seed [of the woman] are the children of the kingdom; but the tares [seed of the serpent] are the children of the wicked *one*. 39 The enemy that sowed them is the devil [the serpent of Genesis 3:15] ...**"

1 John 3:8: “**He that committeth sin is of the devil [serpent of Genesis 3:15]; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God [Yahshua] was manifest, that he might destroy the works of the devil [Satan and his son Cain along with all their progeny].**”

Scripture instructs us at Romans 16:17 as follows: “**Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.**” Further, we are admonished to scrutinize those who use “good words and fair speeches” to “deceive the hearts of the simple.”