

CURSE ON CAIN PROVEN

(Part One)

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

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

The subject of this discussion is based upon Gen. 4:11-12, where Cain had murdered Abel, which states:

“¹¹ And now *art* thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand; ¹² When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth. [*underlining mine*]

Many have formed an incorrect premise that Cain and Abel were pure genetic blood brothers, only because Gen. 4:1 is a corrupt passage in the original Hebrew. *The Interpreter's Bible*, a twelve volume collaborative work of 36 'consulting editors', plus 124 other 'contributors', makes the following observation on this verse, vol. 1, p. 517:

“Cain seems originally to have been the ancestor of the Kenites ... The meaning of the name is 'metalworker' or 'smith'; here, however, it is represented as a derivation of a word meaning 'acquire', 'get' – one of the popular etymologies frequent in Genesis – hence the mother's words I have gotten a man. – *From the Lord* (KJV) is a rendering, following the LXX and Vulg., of '*eth Yahweh*, which is literally, 'with Yahweh', and so unintelligible here (the help of [RSV] is not in the Hebrew). It seems probable that '*eth* should be '*oth* – so, 'the mark of Yahweh' – and that the words are a gloss ...” [*underlining mine*]

Secondly, *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary On The Bible*, edited by Charles M. Laymon, makes the following comment on this passage, on page 6: “... under circumstances which are obscure (vs. 1b can scarcely be translated, still less understood). His younger brother was named Abel, which suggests the Hebrew word for breath.”

Therefore, if Genesis 4:1 is “unintelligible” and “can scarcely be translated, still less understood”, how can one prove anything by quoting it? Additionally, if the words are “a gloss”, where is the foundation for any premise assumed from this verse alone?

What is virtually overlooked in the story of Cain and Abel in the fourth chapter of Genesis is the fact that they were both offering a sacrifice, and in the Bible, only priests were authorized to do so. Secondly, unless circumstances prevented it, it was always the firstborn son that was given this dignity of priesthood. Inasmuch as we understand that Eve was the mother of both Cain and Abel, it is obvious that Cain was the firstborn of the serpent (i.e., Satan), and that Abel was the firstborn of Adam. Or are we to believe the preposterous conjecture that Adam had two firstborn sons? (Read my paper, *The Battle For The Priesthood*.)

Therefore, if Cain was really cursed by the Almighty that he could never be a successful farmer, and if there are descendants of the Kenites with us today as there were in later Biblical times (i.e. 1 Chr. 2:55), then we should have historical evidence to substantiate Yahweh's Word, and three historical examples will overwhelmingly prove it, as follows:

UNABLE TO OVERCOME THE CURSE OF CAIN

When the Jews began to migrate to America in significant numbers, they attempted several "back-to-the-land" movements. Imagine Jewish farmers thriving on farms of their own, something they have never been able to do for any prolonged period of time. These movements failed miserably. Here it is in their own words. Now quoting from the book *A Century of Jewish Life*, by Ismar Elbogen, pp. 333-335

"Michael Heilprin was an enthusiastic partisan of the back-to-the-land movement and was happy to find that many immigrants expressed a strong desire to devote themselves to agricultural pursuits. He made it his business to raise funds for this purpose. Settlements were attempted in several states, but unfortunately all of them miscarried. One time it was the water that was at fault, another time it was a crop failure; once drought, again frost and hail spoiled flourishing crops that were almost ready to harvest. Always it was complete lack of experience and consequently ill-chosen ground which was to blame for the failure. The settlers worked with all their might and contented themselves with the barest minimum, but none of the settlements survived its difficulties longer than four years. Individual farmers could set their teeth and outface failure until their soil rendered a return, and indeed many did so. But for closed colonies the requisite experience and capital were never available. Most of the enthusiasts were forced to return to the city disillusioned. A few colonies in southern New Jersey, like Alliance, Carmel, Rosenhayn, maintained themselves because their proximity to large cities provided them a favorable market and because the Baron de Hirsch Fund stood behind them.

"Heilprin's influence in the creation of this Fund was considerable. In Constantinople Maurice de Hirsch was in contact with Oscar S. Straus (1840-1926), the United States ambassador to Turkey. Straus informed de Hirsch of the miserable condition of the immigrants in America. Prepared, as always, to give productive help, de Hirsch asked for a plan, and one was prepared by Michael Heilprin and met with de Hirsch's approval. He made the income, and later the principal sum, of ten million francs (\$2,400,000) available, and left the disposition of these moneys to the judgment of an American committee. Upon this committee sat men most experienced in such affairs, among others Schiff, Straus and Judge Mayer Sulzberger. In addition to temporary help immediately upon landing, such as providing shelter, distributing immigrants in the interior of the country and the purchase of tools for artisans, measures were taken for providing permanent help by making the immigrants self-sustaining. There was much difference of opinion in matters of detail, but eventually unity was achieved. In 1890 the Fund began to operate, and the American administration was given broad powers" And the Jews tried the same so-called "back-to-the-land" movement in Canada, which also failed.

Ibid. p. 323: "Canada, too, had a considerable share of immigration. The proximity of the United States, the extent and fertility of the country, and the sparsity of its population were inducements to immigration but prevented a firm and independent development. The reception of the first refugees was very cordial. All charitable work was on a voluntary basis, and the personal interest and warmth with which they were met encouraged the immigrants and made it easy for them to settle down, so that they could soon help others to settle. When immigration became particularly heavy, in 1888, the Young Men's Hebrew Benevolent Society of Montreal, which had always felt responsible for the immigrants, approached Baron de Hirsch and solicited the same interest on behalf of immigrants to Canada as he showed in those to the United States. The petition was promptly heeded; permanent assistance was promised and given. In 1891 the Baron de Hirsch Institute was opened. This provided shelter for newcomers and also secular education, with evening classes for adults. The Institute became more important as immigration grew after the turn of the century. Not content with this work, Baron de Hirsch and later the Jewish Colonization Association, which established a separate Canadian Committee, promoted the settlement of Jews as farmers. The government favored these efforts by putting land at their disposal gratis. As in almost all other countries these settlements began with a very difficult period of trial. Their success was retarded by unfavorable location and failure of crops. According to a census of 1920 there were 3,500 Jewish persons in Canada living by agriculture, and the annual value of their products was a million dollars." That would be \$285.71 per year per Jewish farmer, hardly a living wage even back then! That would amount to about \$23.80 per month to meet the needs of one Jewish family!

Ibid. p. 324: "These figures signify little in view of the greatly increased immigration which took place, especially in the bad decade between the pogrom of Kishinev and the World War. Whereas there were only something more than 16,000 Jews in Canada in 1901, in 1911 the number was 50,000, or 1.03% of the total population, and in 1921 it had grown to 126,196, or 1.44%. This enormous absolute increase was received into the cities, of which some, like Winnipeg and Vancouver, were founded during this period and grew at an astounding rate. The Jews wandered from east to west along the railroad, and many settled at the stations fixed by the railroad. Their small stores became central points for the agricultural regions round about. There farmers not only found their necessities, but frequently an interpreter for the various languages spoken in the country, someone to read and write their letters, and sympathetic understanding for their human problems. At these railroad stops villages came into existence, and also Jewish congregations. They are to be found strewn over the whole broad dominion. But the main body of the Jews settled in a few large cities. Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg contain about three-fourths of the total Jewish population. The character of the congregations was determined by the character of the immigrants, who brought a conservative attitude into an essentially conservative country. It is significant that, as late as 1921, 87% of the Jewish population recorded their mother tongue as Yiddish. Proximity to the United States determined the character of charitable institutions, hospitals, orphanages and the like; all such establishments

followed the pattern set in the United States. The relief organizations for the victims of pogroms and for work in Palestine found ready support in Canada”

The reader has now been given the first two exhibits of the failed back-to-the-land ventures in the United States and Canada. I will next quote from a book entitled *Judaism In Action*, published in 1936. The author did not leave us his name, but his Bibliography on pages 344-345 is outstanding! In it, the author documents many hidden details of the Bolshevik Revolution. I will quote a portion of the Testimony given before the Overman Committee, pp. 15-20:

“Testimony of Theodor Kryshstofovich

“This witness testified that he left Petrograd on December 15, 1918, and that he had been there continuously for the three years previous to that date; that he belonged to no political party in Russia, but had lived among the peasants and workmen, teaching them agriculture. He at one time had been employed by the Russian Department of Agriculture, as an agent, in the United States.

“On page 424 he testified in regard to the Jewish aspect of the movement as follows:

“‘And, besides these refugees, most of the people that are governing Russia now are Jews. I am not against Jews in general. They are a very capable and energetic people, but, as you Americans say, the right man must be in the right place. Their place is in the commission houses, in banks, in the offices, but not in the government of a fine agricultural country. They do not understand anything about agriculture, about production, about keeping materials, and about distribution. They do not know anything about those things at all.’

“Senator Wolcott, ‘You mean those that are in charge of the Bolsheviks, do you not?’

“Mr. Kryshstofovich. ‘I am talking about the Bolsheviks; because if you take out Bolshevik government, Lenin is a Russian and all these constellations that are turning around this sun are Jews. They have changed their names. For instance, Trotsky is not Trotsky, but Bronstein. We have Apfelbaum, and so on, and so on.’”

“(b) Other Evidence

“It is important that the other official documents pertaining to the Bolshevik activities in Russia also refer to the question which we are now discussing, namely, the Jewish character of the Bolshevik regime. In this connection we quote, from the British White Book, Russia No. 1 (1919), entitled ‘A Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia, Presented to Parliament by Command of His Majesty. April, 1919.’

“This document was published in London at the government printing office in 1919. In exhibit No. 33, a cablegram: dispatched by Mr. Alston to Earl Curzon, from Vladivostok to London, February 8, 1919 (‘telegraphic – following from consul at Ekaterinburg, 6th February’), the following is stated:

“‘From examination of several labourer and peasant witnesses, I have evidence to the effect that [the] very smallest percentage of this district were pro-Bolshevik, majority of labourers sympathising with summoning of Constituent Assembly. Witnesses

further stated that Bolshevik leaders did not represent Russian working classes, most of them being Jews' (page 33).

"In a cable dispatch from General Knox to the British War Office on February 5, 1919, from Omsk, Siberia, details are given as to the murder of the Imperial Russian family. This cable reads in part as follows:

"With regard to the murder of the Imperial family at Ekaterinburg, there is further evidence to show that there were two parties in the local Soviet, one which was anxious to save Imperial family, and the latter, headed by five Jews, two of whom were determined to have them murdered. These two Jews, by name Vainen and Safarof, went with Lenine when he made a journey across Germany' (page 41).

"Again, in a report made by Rev. B.S. Lombard to Earl Curzon on March 23, 1919, referring to the results of the Bolshevik regime in Russia, among other things, the following is stated:

"All business became paralyzed, shops were closed, Jews became possessors of most of the business houses, and horrible scenes of starvation became common in the country districts. The peasants put their children to death rather than see them starve. In a village on the Dvina, not far from Schlusselfurg, a mother hanged three of her children' (page 57).

"Mr. Henry C. Emery, formerly Chairman of the United States Tariff Board, recently wrote a treatise on Bolshevism, of which Lord Bryce has said:

"It seems to me the sanest and clearest exposition of Bolshevik theory and practice that I have seen and confirms my view that between them and us there can be no peace.'

"Mr. Emery comes to the conclusion that Bolshevism is the promotion of a ruthless and universal class war, and that 'a Bolshevik is a man who believes in the overthrow of the institution of private property by force of arms.' While this is the definition which he gives of Bolshevism as a movement, and his argument in support of it is certainly a very able one, it is interesting to note what he says in regard to the Jewish support of the movement:

"In the minds of some people, especially in Russia, Bolshevism takes on the color of a revolt of the Jews against the Russians, who have so long kept them in subjection. Lenin is of course a pure Russian, and it is a mistake to say that all the other leaders of importance are Jews. On the other hand, the Jews have been active in the movement out of all proportion to their relative numbers. No one who ever made a visit to Smolny Institute, when that was the headquarters of the Bolshevik government at Petrograd, could understand how easy it was to get the impression that the Jews had at last seized the power.'

"Mr. Robert Wilton, a well-known Englishman, who was the Petrograd correspondent of the *London Times*, and a Knight of St. George, in his book entitled *Russia's Agony*¹, refers to the part which the Jews played in undermining the Kerensky government and establishing the Bolshevik rule:

"Subversion had been carried out by a handful of pseudo-Jew Extremists in the Soviet, but the Soviet was a party to the traitorous business. Most of the leaders – especially the pseudo-Jews – were a truculent pack, cowering behind the soldiery,

intent upon realizing their revolutionary 'ideals,' but terrified by a possibility of failure and eventual reprisals.'

"The author also states: 'Afterwards their numbers (referring to the Jew Extremists in the Soviet) increased largely, and although they studiously concealed their identity under assumed Russian or Polish names, it became known that the principal ones were: Nahamkez – Steklov, Apfelbaum – Zinoviev, Rosenfeldt – Kamenev, Goldmann – Gorev, Goldberg – Mekowski, Zederbaum – Martov, Himmer – Sukhanov, Krachman – Zagorski, Hollander – Tlieshkovnski, Louier – Larim, Seffer – Bogdanov, Among the leaders of this gang – under Lenin – were Trotzky, whose real name was Bronstein, and Feldmann, alias Chernov.

"[¹*Russia's Agony*, pp. 137,138, published by Edward Arnold, London, 1918.]"

We should take note that all those testifying before the Overman Committee did not use the same terms we might use today, for they too, being White Caucasians, were also blinded to their Israel Identity, and the ethnic origin of our common enemy! Had we have lived during their era, no doubt we couldn't have described these terrible experiences any better than they did!

After the Bolsheviks had slaughtered approximately twenty million White Ukrainian farmers, and other industrious kinsmen, and the food supply was nearly depleted, the jewish Bolsheviks decided to establish collective farms. The leaders of the Bolsheviks then forced nearly everyone to move into jewish Bolshevik owned tenant housing in nearby cities or towns, and be transported daily to work in the fields, which turned out to be just another jewish failure, as collective farming gave no incentive to the workers. It would appear, then, the curse upon Cain included the management of farming. The Bolsheviks did allow the Russians to have a small garden plot, and from that time until now, the greater part of the food supply for the Russian people came from those garden plots!

While in the United States, we were enjoying large, clean supermarkets with a wide selection of various foods, the markets in the Soviet Union appeared more like an oversize barn or warehouse with birds flying around the ceiling, and droppings from the birds everywhere present, and a danger of being the recipient of the discharge from one or more of the birds. These highly unclean Soviet food markets were lined with hundreds of empty shelves, and what shelves did contain something, only a small selection was available.

Dangerous for us today in the United States is the fact that, little by little our farming system is changing to the collective farm system that failed in the Soviet Union. During the 1970s and 80s, our unlawful so-called Federal Reserve system jacked up their interest to farmers to 20 plus 1 percent, and as a result, many of our independent farmers went bankrupt and had to take a job in a factory, or have his farm become a corporate farm, while he became a tenant-farmer on the land that he and his forefathers had owned for untold generations.

But this is only part of the story! Little by little, these corporate style collective farmers in the United States have been encouraged to hire illegal aliens to work our land. This is a problem, as only Adam-man was commissioned to till the ground, and was created by Yahweh specifically for that purpose at:

Gen. 2:5: “**And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for Yahweh Elohim had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and *there was not a man*¹²⁰ to till the ground.**”

Once the reader establishes the definition and/or definitions of a word or phrase, then one must determine the part and/or parts of speech to understand how the word or phrase is generally applied. It is not unusual sometimes to spend four to eight hours of study on a single word. For Instance, the Hebrew word “**âdâm**” is used four ways: (1) #119 as a verb, (2) #120 as a noun masculine, (3) #121 as a noun or pronoun masculine, and (4) #122 as an adjective. The English articulation for #120 at Gen. 2:5 is “ADM”, while at Gen. 1:27 & 2:7 the articulation is “ETH–HA-ADM” or (Strong’s #853 + Article + *Maqqeph* (i.e., hyphen) + #120. What this amounts to is: If one cannot blush (i.e., show blood in the face), one is not of Adam! **No!** All of the races we observe today did not originate with **Adam!**