

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #4

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

[Note: I have slightly revised this paper from the original as of 6-14-08, C.A.E.]

This is a continuation of a topic of the utmost monumental importance, for we are moving very rapidly toward the climax of a 7,000 plus year-old WAR. The forces from both sides of this war are gathering for a final battle which will culminate in the total extermination of one side or the other. This war will not end with a truce or an armistice, but will be a fight to the death. As a matter of fact, we are already in this last great battle, and, for the moment, we are rapidly going down to defeat. And, unless our people wake up PDQ, we are in for one "H" of a conflict. All one has to do is observe the multiculturalism and miscegenation that is going on, and you can very quickly calculate where we stand in this life and death struggle. While all this is going on, the masses have been lulled into a state of indifference and unconcern, while the Clergy are actually aiding and abetting the enemy. And, if this were not bad enough, the anti-seedliners blow the "trumpet" with an "uncertain sound", 1 Corinthians 14:8: **"For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"** By denying the Two Seedline message of Genesis 3:15, this is exactly what they are doing. Actually, it's a capital crime in a time of danger not to identify the enemy. Today, Israel is in greater peril than at any time in her history! [Mark 13:22]

"AN UNCERTAIN SOUND"

We will shortly see an excellent example of a "trumpet" with an "uncertain sound." Once we understand we are in a WAR where the "Jews" are implementing their plan to interbreed the White Israelite peoples out of existence, any rhetorical proclamation which would aid such a cause would be very traitorous and untimely. Jeffrey A. Weakley, a fervently, caustic, anti-seedliner, in his *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History* says this on pages 30-31:

"Results of the Satanic Seedline Teaching, The results of the Satanic Seedline teaching (if accepted as true) should speak for themselves. Most seedliners hate Jews today (those who claim to be) because of their ethnic origin. For this same reason, they honor the white races because of their ethnic origin. This easily leads to race worship. They stress the physical aspect of God's Word (that is, the physical descent of Israel), which is ignored by most churches today, so much that they forget or neglect the spiritual aspect, which is of more importance (Gal. 3:26-29). They make true the words

in 1 Sam. 16:7: ‘... for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.’ Many seedliners go so far as to say that only whites (Israelites) can have eternal life with Christ. Now it is clear that only Israelites can be ‘redeemed’ (Gal. 4:5), but this is not to say that other races can’t be born again. Our eternal life is the result of our election by God to accept His Son by faith. If the Scriptures are to be accepted, we must conclude that people of all races can be born again. ‘Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of the truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.’ (Acts 10:34-35) ... The seedliners that worship their race are no different than those who purport to be Jews. Jews today take pride in their race and consider themselves better than everyone else. Even the Jewish religion (Judaism) teaches that Jews are superior by race. This ludicrous belief was taught at the Baptist Bible college I attended. There is no doubt that God chose Israel to be His people, but nowhere do I find that it was because Israel was a superior race. So whether it be seedliners or Jews, the idea of a superior race is inconsistent with the teachings of God’s Word.”

As you can plainly see, Jeffrey A. Weakley is in no position to fight back at the enemy in this great racial war to destroy the Israel race. With his attitude on race, it wouldn’t be surprising if his daughter or granddaughter ended up getting pregnant by a Negro or Mongolian. But, that would probably be all right with him as long as they are “born again.” He indicates, according to his knowledge, that the Bible doesn’t teach such a thing. Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley should be reminded that the Almighty killed two of Judah’s sons by his Canaanite wife in order to prevent the Satanic gene-pool from getting into the Royal Messianic Line. You will notice, Weakley used Galatians 3:26-29 to try to make his point. Let’s take a look at that passage and see what it is really talking about. Weakley intimates that in this passage it is speaking of other races getting into the kingdom:

“ 26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. 27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. 29 And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

With this passage, Weakley attempts to bring all the other races under Yahweh’s Covenant to Abraham. This is the same approach that Judeo-churchianity uses. Another Judeo-churchianity person, trying to make the same point as Weakley, also quoted to me, Colossians 3:11 where it says: **“ Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.”**

This other person also quoted me Romans 2:10-11; 10:11-13; and 11:13 in order to bring other races under the Covenant. I wrote and answered this person: “You quoted me Romans 10:11-13; Galatians 3:27-29; Colossians 3:11; Romans 2:10-11 & Romans 11:13. I don’t want to appear as a smart aleck or a know-it-all, but I would like to present some background on these passages which I can authenticate from a combination of Scripture, secular history and archaeology.

“As you quoted three passages from Romans, let’s consider who the Romans were. If you will look up in your encyclopedia (and you may have to use more than one) for the founding of Rome, you will find it was established under the insignia of a she-wolf (the story of Romulus and Remus). Who, then, in the Bible is identified as the wolf? The answer is found in Genesis 49:27; Benjamin is the wolf! Some of the Romans to whom Paul preached were Israelites of the tribes of Zerah-Judah and probably some Benjaminites! Do you know anyone by the name of Wolf/Wolfe?; no doubt a Benjamite. Also the name ‘Wilson’ means ‘wolf’s son.’ As Zerah-Judah also settled in that area, many of the Romans were definitely of the House of Zerah-Judah. When it says, Romans 10:12, ‘For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek ...’, it is indicating there is no difference between the Tribe of Dan and the Tribe of Judah for they are both Israelites. The term ‘Jew’ must be qualified as there were true Israelites of the Tribe of Judah and some counterfeit people claiming themselves the Tribe of Judah, but lying about it (Revelation 2:9; 3:9).

“As the word ‘Greek’ is used three times in these passages, let’s investigate who the Greeks were. Some of the Tribe of Dan left Egypt before the Exodus (I have documentation). As Hebrew writing has no vowels, it is written simply as ‘dn’. Variations of the name can be Dan, Den, Din, Don or Dun. Do you know anyone by the names of Dunn, Dunbar, Duncan, Dunham or Dunlap? Genesis 49:17 says: ‘Dan shall be a serpent by the way...’ Judges 5:17 indicates that Dan literally lived in his ships. Dan, in his ships, wove like a serpent up every river valley putting up a sign with his name on it. The river DANube is named after him. The name McDonald means ‘son of Don, or Dan.’ Paul preached at a place called ‘MaceDONia’ in Greece (Acts 16:9-12). I know you know the story. When Paul was preaching there to Danites, he was preaching to Israelites!

“I’m glad you quoted Colossians 3:11. What this verse is saying in essence is: There is no *difference* between a genuine member of the Israelite Tribe of Judah and the Israelite-Greek Tribe of Dan — there is no *difference* between a circumcised Israelite and an uncircumcised Israelite — there is no *difference* between a Barbarian Israelite and a Scythian Israelite — there is no *difference* between a bond Israelite or a free Israelite, for Christ [Yahshua] is genetically a brother, or related to all of them. Galatians 3:28-29 goes on to indicate there is no genetic *difference* between an Israelite male or an Israelite female, for if you are a genetic relative to Christ [Yahshua], you are Abraham’s *sperma* and you are included under Yahweh’s Covenant to Abraham.

“There is one other group we should talk about, and that is Zerah-Judah. There is much evidence, that some of Zerah-Judah, like Dan, left Egypt before the Exodus. If you will check 1 Chronicles 2:6, you will find that Zerah had a son by the name of Dara. In 1 Kings 4:31 his name is spelled Darda. This branch of Zerah-Judah left Egypt, as I say, before the Exodus. Today the area they settled is named the Dardanelles, although they are long gone from there. They were Trojans and established the city of Troy where they lived for four hundred years. The Israelite-Trojans then moved to Italy, and while some stayed in Italy, others returned to the Aegean area; built hundreds of ships and sailed to Britain. This part of Zerah-Judah’s history is completely documented by Bible and secular history; there are no missing links. In other words, it is

an absolute historical fact that Zerah-Judah made it to Britain. The Scottish Highlanders wore kilts like the Trojans. In his 1999 book *The Bible Is History* by Ian Wilson, page 87, it has been found that the Israelites of Canaan wore kilts also; it has been a mode of Israelite dress from the beginning.

“As for the ‘Barbarians’ and ‘Scythians’: In Jeremiah 51:20, Yahweh told Israel: ‘Thou *art* my battle axe and weapons of war: for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms.’ Judah was the fighting tribe. The Barbarians of Paul’s time were the German tribes, and are rightly described as such in Jeremiah. My ancestors were these same Barbarians, for I am German and of the Tribe of Judah. The name Scythian is one of the names which the Israelites were called after breaking away from the Assyrians. Therefore, the Scythians spoken of in Colossians 3:11 are definitely Israelites. As a matter of fact, all the Scripture references you quoted me were speaking only of Israelites.”

What I wrote to this other person, I now announce to Jeffrey A. Weakley! Now, Weakley accuses us Two Seedliners of taking Scripture out of context, but who really is, for he proved absolutely nothing to backup his thesis by referring to Galatians 3:26-29? Jeffrey A. Weakley then proceeds on pages 14 to 20 to try to prove that Two Seedline doctrine (according to his assumption) must be false. In doing this, he presents some history of the Identity movement which I believe you will find interesting; although his conclusions, as in his foregoing postulation, are flawed:

“*The Origin of the False Teaching*. If, as I contend, the Satanic Seedline doctrine (as taught by the Seedliners) is not found in the Scriptures, and since it was not taught by any of the early church fathers as being correct, how did it find its way into the Christian belief system known as ‘Identity?’ To find the answer we need to properly define Identity. There are at least three specific systems of belief which are very similar, and yet each is distinctly different. There are the Anglo-Israel, British-Israel, and Christian-Israel beliefs. Identity can include all three of these beliefs, depending on how they are taught. For a definition of Identity we will go to the man who first made the term popular in America over 50 years ago (see *The National Christians*, 1991 Ed., p. 25). That man is Howard B. Rand. ‘The preaching of that Identity has been going on for years now. It has resulted in millions in Anglo-Saxondom becoming acquainted with the fact that they are lineal descendants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel ... Thus, the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic people stand out as Israel in these latter days.’ (*Study in Revelation* by Howard B. Rand, p. 115)

“Thus Identity is the belief or teaching that the Anglo-Saxon and kindred peoples are the physical descendants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament. I will note here that many believe that Wesley Swift founded Identity (see *Bitter Harvest* by James Corcoran, p. 38) in 1946 and others that the ‘Identity movement was conceived and first spread by three men with ties to the Radical Right: Wesley Swift, Bertrand Comparet, and William Gale’ (see *God, Guts, and Guns* by Phillip Finch, p. 68). Although this view is set forth, it is simply the product of those who do too little research and do not yet have all the facts. The simple fact is that the term ‘Identity’ as used to describe the Anglo-Saxon history was used as far back as 1884, when Elieser Bassin used it. He tells how he picked it up from others before him.

However, it was Howard B. Rand that called the Anglo-Israel history 'Identity'. Rand did not hold or teach the Satanic Seedline doctrine. 'Two sons were born to Adam and Eve and they were named in their order: Cain and Abel,' (*Primo-Genesis* by Howard B. Rand, p.41) The Satanic Seedline was brought into the Identity teaching with San Jacinto Capt and Wesley A. Swift. Actually, San Jacinto Capt claimed to have gotten Wesley Swift started (in Identity) (see *Committee of the States* by Cheri Seymour, p. 83). In any case, Wesley Swift presented the seedline doctrine to Gerald L. K. Smith (see *Besieged Patriot* by Gerald L. K. Smith, pp. 238-239). From there Swift got Bertrand Comparet started (who was an attorney that represented Gerald L. K. Smith) and shortly later Jacinto Capt (father of E. Raymond Capt, who has written many outstanding books on archaeology) introduced William P. Gale to Swift. In later years Richard Butler would take over Swift's Church (now known as Aryan Nations).

"As this is not meant to be a history of the Identity movement, I will stop here, but suffice it to say that the seedline doctrine saturated Identity through the influence of San Jacinto Capt, Wesley Swift, and William P. Gale. Where did they get this belief? Capt and Swift both got it from the Ku Klux Klan (they both were members — see *Committee of the States* by Cheri Seymour, p. 84)."

We need to interrupt Weakley at this point, for he is making a dangerous and uncalled for false assumption. From this point on, for the rest of chapter 4, he builds a case based on circumstantial supposition. (1) He first makes the claim, just quoted, that San Jacinto Capt and Wesley A. Swift got the Satanic Seedline doctrine from the Ku Klux Klan (2) He next presents evidence the Ku Klux Klan was instituted by the Masons. (3) Then, he makes a connection of the Masons with the Gnostics. (4) And lastly, he connects the Gnostics with the Jews and the Talmud, and makes the claim the Satanic Seedline doctrine originated with the "Jews."

Jeffrey A. Weakley has a weak link in his hypothesis. He did not prove with any tangible evidence that there was a connection of the Satanic Seedline doctrine with the Ku Klux Klan!!! If he had had any evidence, you can be quite sure he would have quoted it. There isn't any, and he didn't. It is like saying he saw a person check in at a motel one night at Salem, Massachusetts, and then, swearing to God on a stack of Bibles 20 feet high, proclaiming he knew for a fact that person practiced witchcraft. I would sure hate to be on trial for my life and have Weakley as a juror. Let's now continue with Weakley's remarks on the KKK on pages 15-16:

"The Klan takes some explaining. The first Ku Klux Klan was organized in Tennessee in 1867 under the leadership of Gen. N. B. Forrest. This Klan was disbanded sometime in 1869 (see *Vigilantes of Christendom* by Richard K. Hoskins, pp. 245, 247). The next official Ku Klux Klan was founded in 1915 as The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. The founder was William Joseph Simmons, who was a Royal Arch Mason (see *Occult Theocracy* by Lady Queensborough, aka Edith Starr Miller, p. 607). Thus the Ku Klux Klan got its seedline doctrine from the Masonic teaching. Many people do not know that a Mason started the Ku Klux Klan, and fewer people know the Masons teach the seedline doctrine. William P. Gale became an honorary member of the Ku Klux Klan after he had already been teaching the seedline doctrine for some time. He denied that he developed his belief from the Ku Klux Klan, and this may be true.

William P. Gale was a long-time Mason and developed his seedline belief from the same place the Ku Klux Klan got theirs: the Masons. Now I will prove that the Masons teach seedline.”

Mr. Weakley, we may have another problem. I don't know whether it is true or not, but I have heard that Howard B. Rand was also a Mason. If this is true, why did he teach against the Two Seedline doctrine? If this is correct, would this discredit all of Mr. Rand's teachings also; or any other former Mason for that part? This is the old dishonest con-artist's trick of guilt by association, plain and simple.

WEAKLEY PLAYS HIS ACE CARD

On page 20, Jeffrey A. Weakley finally plays his ace card, and thinks he has won his argument. After going step by step from the KKK to the Talmud, he lays all his cards on the table. This is what he says: “Next we find that the Kabalists got their teaching from the Jewish Babylonian Talmud. ‘... what evil, however, could be involved here? 13—That of infusing her with sensual lust. For R. Johanan stated: When the serpent copulated with Eve, 14 he infused her 15 with lust ...’ ... ‘(14) In the Garden of Eden, according to a tradition. (15) I.e., the human species ...’” [*The Babylonian Talmud* (Soncino Press Ed.), Seder N,ashim (Yebamoth 103b)]

“The Babylonian Talmud is the written form of the ‘tradition of the elders’ (Matt. 15:2-3) which had been orally taught since the Babylonian captivity. This teaching was a perversion of God's Law. These traditions were actually a combination of Baal worship (as practiced in Babylon) and the Law of God as given to Israel by Moses ... Thus we have arrived at the human origin of the Satanic Seedline doctrine: Babylon. What I find especially fascinating is that most seedliners express unfathomable hostility toward those who call themselves Jews today and at the same time they adopt the ‘Jewish fables’ (Titus 1:14) that came out of Babylon.”

To catch you off your guard, Weakley wants you to presume that every last statement in the *Babylonian Talmud* is a 100% total lie. If this were true, even the “Jews” would repudiate their own Talmudic books. Weakley believes he has pulled some type of magic string by quoting directly from the *Babylonian Talmud*, and you will automatically, like a programmed robot, buy his argument. It's similar to the way the “Jews” use the magic “anti-Semite” word. Again, it's the old dishonest “Jewish” con-artist's trick of guilt by association, plain and simple, and Weakley is playing it to the hilt of his sword. My advice is: don't ever stay at a motel overnight in Salem, Massachusetts, or you might be accused of being a witch.

ANOTHER WITNESS

One of the very first things the anti-seedliners who are opposed to a literal Satan-spawned genetic physical seedline do, is point out the fact the information can be found in the *Babylonian Talmud*. Jeffrey A. Weakley is no exception as quoted above. This is a sneaky, deceptive and dishonest method used by many to declare guilt by association. The question must be asked: is every single word in the Talmud false? This idea is built on the assumption, that if it is found in the *Babylonian Talmud*, it is automatically evil. For anyone who uses this approach, I would challenge them to prove

every single word in the *Babylonian Talmud* to be false. It can't be done, even though it is a collection of the most evil writings ever put together. Only a weak mind would accept such a totally flimsy premise. Not only is there evidence found in the Talmud substantiating the seduction of Eve, but evidence can be found in *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten books of Eden*, The "Protevangelion" 10:1-10:

"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. Then Joseph arising from the ground, called her, and said, 8 O thou who hast been so much favoured by God, why hast thou done this? 9 Why hast thou thus debased thy soul, who wast educated in the Holy of Holies, and received thy food from the hand of angels? 10 But she, with a flood of tears, replied, I am innocent, and have known no man."

If you will remember, Jeffrey A. Weakley made this statement on page 14: "*The Origin of the False Teaching*. If, as I contend, the Satanic Seedline doctrine (as taught by the Seedliners) is not found in the Scriptures, and since it was not taught by any of the early church fathers as being correct, how did it find its way into the Christian belief system known as 'Identity?'" As he seemed to have such a high regard of his own ability to research, and was so critical of the Two Seedliners to do so, let's see whether or not the "early church fathers" understood anything concerning this doctrine. For this we will use part of an article from *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, pages 799-800:

"James, Protevangelium Of, ... The earliest of the infancy gospels, recounting the birth, childhood, adolescence, token marriage, supernatural pregnancy, and delivery of Mary. Together with the Gospel of Thomas, ... it was the chief source of several other infancy gospels. Its original title appears to have been History of James Concerning the Birth of Mary; Origen refers to it as the Book of James It was first styled Protevangelium (i.e., Protogospel) of James by its sixteenth-century discoverer, Guillaume Postel. The earliest certain reference to this writing is by Origen, who cites it as the source of the tradition that Jesus' brothers were 'sons' of Joseph by a former wife whom he had married before Mary' ... 'Now I, James, who wrote this history in Jerusalem, when there arose a tumult when Herod died, withdrew myself into the wilderness until the tumult ceased in Jerusalem. Glorifying the Lord God who gave me the gift and wisdom to write this history'."

As you can plainly see, the early church fathers were very much acquainted with the Protevangelium, and thus they understood the physical seduction of Eve by Satan as described in the quotation from said book above. I believe, Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley, that Origen was indeed an "early church father." Weakley uses some very

underhanded tactics in his unwarranted and groundless argument trying to prove the Two Seedliners in error. We will look at one of them now. On page 21 of his *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, he tries his best (or maybe his worst) to mislead his readers. He tries in vain to convince them that the Seedliners are mistaken by quoting from *Matthew Henry's Commentary*. In doing this, he does not name the volume or page as he so faithfully did with his other quotations. It is glaringly apparent he didn't want anyone to go to *Matthew Henry* and check on him on this one. All he said was: "*The best explanation for this is found in Matthew Henry's Commentary.*" After searching for some time, it was found he was quoting from page 29 in volume 1 concerning Henry's comments on Genesis 3:14-15 and this is what he quoted:

"Observe here, The serpent and the woman had just now been very familiar and friendly in discourse about the forbidden fruit, and a wonderful agreement there was between them; but here they are irreconcilably set at variance. Note, Sinful friendships justly end in mortal feuds: those that unite in wickedness will not unite long."

Weakley deliberately omitted *Matthew Henry's* remark just three paragraphs later on the next page (page 30), hoping you would never find where *Matthew Henry* says the following: "A perpetual quarrel is here commenced between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the devil among men; war is proclaimed between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent."