

Analytical Review of Philip Jones' *The Negro, Serpent, Beast and Devil*, #2

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

As we make our way through Philip Jones' book with the above title, we (myself and the reader) will find ourselves at variance with some of his faulty premises. Philip is a researcher and scholar par excellence, but he has picked up some excess baggage somewhere along the way. Philip may have read the 1970 book *God's Law* by Mrs. B.J. Gaillot, Jr.

In her book, chapter 2B, p. 40, under "Black Genealogy Difference of the Seeds", in part: "... But after the curse of Cain, God put the mark upon him, which made him the first negro ..." Well, this isn't exactly the position taken by Philip Jones, but it will serve as an example how some faulty premises are formed.

We will now pick up Philip Jones on page 7, under the heading "The Relationship between the Negro and the White Man" thusly:

"The origin of the negro race is clothed in uncertainty, because the negro has not had the intelligence or the foresight to keep records and history of himself. Whites have the Bible to refer to when they want to explain where they originated from, but the negro has nothing to show for all the years of his existence. Now the negro has been told by well-meaning missionaries that he can adopt the Bible as his history book also, since Adam was supposedly the first person to inhabit Planet Earth. But this is where people go wrong. Adam was not the first person, he was the first White person, so the Bible cannot be so easily transferred over to become a book for all 'races'.

"Some authors write that the negro came from outer space with Lucifer, or Satan, that he was a fallen angel, but we do not hold to this theory because we do not believe the negro was once in heaven as a good angel. What we do believe, however, is that the negro existed before Adam on the earth. H. Imbert, a French anthropologist who lived in the Far East, tells in his book that 'The Negroid races peopled at some time all the South of India, Indo-China, and China' (*Sex and Race*, 9th ed. vol. 1, p. 67 N.Y.). Africa was not the only homeland of the negro. Rogers says: 'Edouard Schure thinks that at one time 'the black race dominated ... the globe' with 'cyclopean cities' in Upper Egypt, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. This black race, he says, was finally driven out from Europe by the whites, its impress having disappeared due to the immense period of time that has elapsed. Two relics of black domination have remained, he says: the fear of the dragon, and the depicting of the devil as black' (*Sex and Race*, 9th ed. vol. 1, p. 277 N.Y.).

From the Internet at: <http://forum.dancehallreggae.com/> we find the following on H. Imbert in part:

"H. Imbert, a French anthropologist who lived in the Far East, says in 'Les Negritos de la Chine'.

“The Negroid races peopled at some time all the South of India, Indo-China and China. The South of Indo-China actually has now pure Negritos as the Semangs and mixed as the Malays and the Sakais ...”

“Similarly, this scholar declares: ‘In the earliest Chinese history, several texts in classic books spoke of these diminutive blacks; thus the Tcheu-Li composed under the dynasty of Tcheu (1122-249 B.C.) gives a description of the inhabitants with black and oily skin ... The Prince Liu-Nan, who died in 122 B.C., speaks of a kingdom of diminutive blacks in the southwest of China.’

“Moreover, he states: ‘In the first epochs of Chinese history, the Negrito type peopled all the south of the country and even in the island of Hai-Nan, as we have attempted to prove in our study on the Negritos, or Black men of this island ... Chinese folklore speaks often of these Negroes, and mentions an Empress of China named Li (373-397 A.D.), consort of the Emperor Hsiao Wu Wen, who is spoken of as being a Negro.’

“Professor Chang Hsing-Lang revealed in an article entitled, ‘The importation of Negro Slaves to China under the Tang Dynasty A.D. 618-907,’ that: ‘Even the sacred Manchu dynasty shows this Negro strain. The lower part of the face of the Emperor Puyi of Manchukuo, direct descendant of the Manchu rulers of China, is most distinctly Negroid. ‘Chinese chroniclers report that a Negro Empire existed in the South of China at the dawn of that country's history’.

“Citing the works of Kwang-Chih Chang, *The Archaeology of Ancient China*, (Yale University Press) and Irwin Graham, *Africans Abroad* (Columbia University Press), R. Rashidi makes the point: ‘There is evidence of substantial populations of Blacks in early China. Archaeological studies have located a black substratum in the earliest periods of Chinese history, ‘and reports of a major kingdom ruled by Blacks are frequently in Chinese documents’.”

Whether or not this excerpt is correct or not, the reader will have to use his own judgment. At least this excerpt from the Internet shows that Philip Jones was not simply pulling something out of thin air! As for myself, I will place this interesting piece of data on the back burner, until I can learn more about it! Until new evidence comes along, I would give an educated guess that at a very remote period of time, before the Roman Empire, that the Chinese were conducting a trade in negro slaves from Africa.

Jones should have cited H. Imbert's comment on p. 14: “Herodotus, who visited this region in the fifth century B.C., mentioned the dark skins of the people. He called them Ethiopians, but said their hair was straighter than those of the western Ethiopians, who had woolly hair ... ‘The Elamites’, said Sir Harry Johnston, ‘appear to have been a Negroid people with kinky hair and to have transmitted this racial type to the Jews and Syrians’.” (White vs. black Ethiopians.)

Now getting back to Philip Jones' book, at the bottom of page 7, he starts a new heading:

“THE TEMPTER OF EVE

“The Hebrew word ‘Nachash’ occurs several times in Genesis chapter 3, but it should not have been translated as serpent, for the Hebrew word for serpent is ‘Saraph’. The tempter may have been named ‘Nachash’, but he certainly was not a snake.

“The serpent is well-known to be the emblem of desire and lust, and suggests sensation generally. Serpent worship is phallicism. Thus, we would expect to find that ‘Nachash’ was the head of such worship and perhaps the founder of it. The Hebrew word ‘Naga’, used in Genesis 3:3, means ‘to touch’ or ‘to lie with a woman’, while the fruit, often represented as an apple, pomegranate, or mandrake, symbolizes a desire for an intimate union between the sexes.

“Perhaps it is not a coincidence that Genesis and Revelation are so hard to understand. In the case of Genesis, Ariel says ‘The translation ... is so badly done in many places that often we have been in doubt whether the translators *intended to translate* or *intended to disguise* the sense of the original’ (Ariel Rev. Buckner H. Payne, *The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?*, p. 125). We [Jones] agree with Ariel that certain men crept in under the guise of being authorities in the Hebrew and Chaldee languages and modified or disguised the truth of our beginnings in words which only the ‘wise’ could understand. But we do feel that, even with this obstacle, we have been able to unravel enough of the truth to make the first chapters of Genesis clearer.

“There was a being that became the tempter, but that being did not arrive from the stars. Instead, that person was created on the fifth day by God Himself who declared that everything was ‘good and very good.’ We believe that the tempter was a negro, and that he was a member of the beast creation. Ariel says that the Hebrew word *ebhodh* was left untranslated in Genesis 2:5 (‘There was not a *man* to till the ground’), its meaning being ‘slave or chattel’ (Ariel Rev. Buckner H. Payne) *The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?* p. 69). According to Ariel the verse should read: ‘The Lord God took *ha Adhom*, the Adam, and put him to dwell in the Garden of Eden; and by *le ebhodh*, his slave, to dress it and keep it.’ Evidently the translator(s) believed that there were no slaves prior to the fall of Adam or before the flood, but Adam was clearly told after his fall into sin: ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread ...’ (Gen. 3:19). Adam was given dominion over all created of creation, and God created the negro with ability to speak so that he might better fulfill his station as slave or servant to Adam and Eve.”

Philip Jones Blunders On Three Major Issues:

Here under the heading “The Tempter Of Eve”, Philip’s premises on three major topics must be redressed! (1) There is absolutely **NO** Biblical record to substantiate that Yahweh ever created the negro. Check my 8-part *Identifying the Beast Of The Field*, and 6-part *Angels That Sinned ‘Chained In Darkness’, 2 Peter 2:4 & Jude 6*, and (2) The Septuagint translators and writers of the New Testament consistently referred to that Nachash in the garden as the Serpent, and Jones cannot claim to know better than they, and (3) Philip’s reference to “Ariel Rev. Buckner H. Payne, *The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?* p. 69)”, that allegedly there is somehow an untranslated Hebrew word in Genesis 2:5! I have checked several Hebrew lexicons and there is absolutely no such Hebrew word articulated as “*le ebhod*” in Gen. 2:5. You will notice that neither Philip Jones nor Rev. Buckner H. Payne cited which of the many Hebrew manuscripts contained this untranslated Hebrew word at Genesis 2:5, nor did either one cite the Strong’s number for it! Therefore, it is “hearsay” evidence.

Although there is another Hebrew word, #5647, articulated as “**âbad**, (*aw-bad*’); a primitive root; to *work* (in any sense); by implication to *serve, till*, (causative) *enslave*,

etc.:– ...” But this word is a verb (*i.e.*, an action word) and not a “noun masculine” as is Strong’s #5650 articulated “**ebed** (*eh’bed*), translated in the KJV “... X bondage, bondman, [bond-] servant, (man-) servant.”

Therefore, Strong’s #5647 as a verb can only mean that it would have to be eth-ha-Adam who would be tilling the ground, and not some negro! The same Hebrew word is used at Gen. 2:15 stating:

“And Yahweh Elohim took the man¹²⁰, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress⁵⁶⁴⁷ it and to keep it.” Here it is also speaking of eth-ha-Adam who would be dressing the garden, and not some negro! I would highly recommend that the serious Bible student examine the 288 times that Strong’s #5647 is used in the Old Testament. [back to Philip Jones]:

“Before we proceed, let us recall that Adam and Eve were produced as a single *unit*, while all the animals and beasts were created in *pairs*. Only Adam had his female within himself. Paul the Apostle writes that God gave every seed its own body and that there are different kinds of flesh: ‘there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds’ (I Cor. 15:38-39). We will see a little later that the negro does indeed have a different kind of flesh than Whites. We must also remember that Adam, the White Man, was given dominion or power over everything that was created before him. Nachash and all negroes are therefore subject to White men (see Mk. 16:18 and Lk. 10:19).”

[**Critical note** by Clifton A. Emahiser: Surely it would seem that Philip would understand that Mark 16:9-20 was never in the original Greek manuscripts! I am quite surprised that he cited it. As for Luke 10:18-19, it would indirectly apply to the negro as satyrs (half fallen angel and half ape). From this point on through the next five paragraphs, Jones rambles in an attempt to justify his faulty conclusions. Philip will, though, bring up a very important point, and I will comment on it when we arrive at where it is. – back to Philip]:

“As long as the negro remained subject to the Man, everything was all right and very good. The negro was created to be Adam’s attendant in the same relative position as night attends the day, darkness first and then light. However, there was a great gulf between the Man and the negro; one was the ‘king of the beasts’, the other was ‘lord over all creation,’ and the son of God.” [**Critical note** by Clifton A. Emahiser: This excerpt from Philip is based on conclusions derived from faulty premises! – back to Philip]:

“Adam was created immortal, the negro wasn’t. All the animals were created subject to death, but Adam stood above death for awhile. It is therefore understandable that the negro was made subject to Man, the Woman (Eve) to Man, and Man to God. [*ho-hum*] As long as this order prevailed, everything was very good. Yet God made it possible for Man to become mortal through sin and to experience death in order to teach him obedience. [*ho-hum*] The negro, on the other hand, was never perfect, never will be, and so it was to his advantage to make himself equal to Man. He was a ‘child of the flesh’ and had a carnal (animal) mind which was at enmity with God and God’s children from the very start. [*ho-hum*] God did not make the negro like Adam, for if He had, there would have been no temptation. So God left it up to Adam and Eve to keep the ‘old serpent’ in his place as a servant. As long as the negro knew his place, he was submissive and even docile. [*ho-hum, oh how monotonous*] Yet the White Man must

never forget that the negro 'is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be' (Rom. 8:5-7). Only Adam and Adam's progeny are directly subject to God and answerable to Him. [Critical note by Clifton A. Emahiser: Well, at least Philip got that one thing right, but in this next paragraph Philip brings us an excellent **ZINGER!**]:

"The Targum, an Aramaic translation or paraphrase of a portion of the Old Testament, clearly uses the term 'ape' for the phrase 'beast of the field' (*The Tempter of Eve*, Savannah. pp. 154-162), therefore we have other evidence that the ancients understood the beasts to resemble monkeys or apes. But we are talking about the negro as a 'serpent'. How can the two be reconciled? [Critical note by Clifton A. Emahiser: Well, Philip might be under the delusion that he is talking about the negro as a 'serpent', but in reality he is proving Pliny the Elder to be correct in proclaiming, "'satyr' to indicate a kind of ape." And also proving Adam Clarke correct in his 6-volume *Commentary*, vol. 1, pp. 47-49, "Is it not strange that the *devil* and the *ape* should have the same name, derived from the same root, and that root so very similar to the word in the text?" – back to Philip Jones.]

"The Bible says that the 'Nachash' was very subtle, the wisest of the beasts of the field. Undoubtedly he was the most intelligent negro to be found and was therefore the chief foreman. [*ho-hum*] At any rate, he was not a 'fallen angel', for if he was, it would have been no tribute to him to have been more subtle than the animals in God's creation (see Mt. 10:16), [*ho-hum, the negros not wise as serpents CAE*] and certainly would not explain how he could have outwitted Eve. The tempter could also walk erect, otherwise he would not have been cursed to walk on his belly or abdomen (some say 'all fours'). If he had been 'the devil of Christendom', he would still be going on his belly, for God cursed him 'all the days of thy life' (Gen. 3:14), [*ho-hum, this simply means that the serpent would operate pawn shops, junk yards, landfills, and deal in rusty metal and dirty rags, and engage in all kinds of recycling. CAE* – back to Philip] "but of course that would mean that 'the devil' was created immortal like Adam, and yet his sin would not have made him mortal as Adam's sin did (another contradiction) [*more ho-hum*]. *Nachash* could also speak without the help of any supernatural agency, for if the serpent had been a talking snake, it would have startled Eve, to say the least, and would have been so conspicuous in the midst of the animal creation that it would have deprived the serpent of its anonymity and obstructed the act of deception. [*more ho-hum*] Had the *serpent* been a snake, God surely would have appeared ridiculous addressing it as if nothing out of the ordinary was amiss. Why did God give the snake a hearing and a judgment, as if the snake was morally responsible? If he was a snake, where did he get his ability to reason and dispute with Eve?

"We note that death was not one of the punishments pronounced upon 'Nachash', as was awarded to Adam and his seed, for 'Nachash' was mortal already. The 'serpent' was thus no more a snake or a 'devil' than was Sitting Bull a bull. Had a snake been influenced or controlled by a supernatural agency, why didn't God take 'the devil' more seriously, rather than rendering a judgment upon him which in no way could hinder him (eating dust and sliding on his belly could not have hindered a *spiritual* being very much)? [*ho-hum, see above CAE*] If a 'devil' had come in and occupied a snake's body, why not Eve's body? God would have condemned the 'devil' to remain in the snake's body as punishment for invading the helpless body of a reptile, deprived it of

speech, and placed it in a cage where it would not have been able to deceive anyone again. [Philip continues]:

“THE SERPENT SEED

“In Genesis 3:15 we grasp the impact of the sin of insubordination: ‘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.’ God predicts that from that time on the negro would present a problem to the White Man, not just to the white woman. Note that we are talking about two seed-lines, meaning that the Nachash was an offspring-bearing animal. As long as this enmity exists, the two seed-lines must still be present on earth. And since Eve had physical seed, the Nachash must have had physical seed also. We also note that God did not deprive the ‘serpent seed’ of speech, by which that enmity might be transmitted by word of mouth to Nachash’s descendants.

“There are very few snakes today which we know of that hate the White Race or wish to destroy us. And we do not think that a ‘fallen angel’ sits in ‘hell’ today, waiting on its belly, eating dust and ashes, for unconfessed (White) sinners to die. Had God cursed the ‘snake which the devil occupied,’ but not ‘the devil-occupier’, then the devil could have forcibly choked Eve and made her eat the forbidden fruit and still gotten away with it, while Eve, like the innocent snake, would have been the victim”

To Philip Jones’ credit, he does believe and promote Two Seedline doctrine, but his version of it is so entirely twisted and distorted that he is causing confusion concerning the issue, rather than giving a just and honest analysis of what really happened. By following and accepting the thesis of Rev. Buckner H. Payne in his *The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?*, Philip has wittingly or unwittingly corrupted the very core of Two Seedline teaching.

Philip’s error is brought about by not properly identifying the two entities, (1) the “serpent”, and (2) the “satyr”. Now both of these entities are satanic, but each in its own way!

From the *Aramaic Targum* pseudo-Jonathan on Genesis 4:1 we read: “**And Adam knew that his wife Eve had conceived from Sammael the Angel (of death) and she became pregnant and bore Cain. And he was like those on high and not like those below. And she said: ‘I have got a man from the angel of the LORD’.**” “Sammael” would be the ringleader of the third of the angels who were cast out of heaven at Rev. 12:7. In tempting Eve, “Sammael” would **NOT** have taken on the form of a negro, but “Sammael” would have assumed the appearance of the handsomest White man that Eve could have envisioned. For anyone who has fully studied Gen. 6:2-4 understands that the DNA of angel-kind doesn’t mix very well with the DNA of Adam-kind. Had Cain have been half White and half negro (a mulatto), Adam would never have allowed Cain to offer a sacrifice, and there wouldn’t have been a battle for the priesthood!

We have to remember at Gen. 3:15, that the woman’s seed would bruise the head of the serpent’s seed, whereas the seed of the serpent would bruise the heel of the woman’s seed. While all Adamites are the woman’s seed, specifically this was fulfilled with the Crucifixion of Christ. There is absolutely **NO** record that the negro Crucified Christ! **HOW ABSURD!**