

# SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #14

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

The fact that we are in a WAR should again be emphasized. This WAR started in Genesis 3:15 and has continued now for over 7000 years. This WAR is between two "hate groups"; a good hate group and a bad hate group. Some may reply that all "hate" is unchristian, and that simply is not true. On the one side are the literal "children of Satan"; on the other side are the true "children of YHWH." Among the fleshly "children of YHWH" is the Messiah Himself. Therefore, our Redeemer is a member of the good "hate group." Once more, He is not ashamed to be counted as a member, Hebrews 2:11. Hate is only bad when it is focused in the wrong direction. However, if our hate would be properly manifested, it will not affect the innocent. Should we direct our hate where it is needed, some of our problems with our common enemy could be solved. The one seedliners (anti-seedliners) vent their hatred toward the flesh; the Two Seedliners vent their hatred toward the literal, walking, talking, breathing genetic children of Satan. If our "flesh" is the problem, we had better get our "flesh" out of today's satanic banking system! Maybe one should cut off his "fleshly" fingers to avoid paying the IRS any illegal income tax, which in turn supports the murderous abortion of White children making one an accessory after the fact. According to the anti-seedliners (who teach that the flesh is the problem), we should look at those fingers and "hate" them rather than identify the real enemy. Mother of all absurdities!

While speaking of absurdities, I must relate another situation that happened while researching the subject of Two Seedline. About five years ago I was writing several small articles on this subject having become aware that there were several distracting critics speaking in opposition to it. Because of the seriousness of the matter, I put these several small papers together entitling them *Research Papers Proving Two Seedline Seduction Of Eve*. At that time I had purchased a laptop computer, which I took to work with me and worked on this project in-between customers. Because I was continually being interrupted by phone calls and my usual duties, I made several typos. Sometimes, after tending to business for a couple of hours, it was difficult to find the place where I had left off and then continue running references, making notes and typing again. No sooner would I get organized than I was interrupted again. It was not unusual for me to be interrupted this way 35 to 45 times in a ten hour day. Nevertheless, I managed to put these small documents together with some semblance of order. Later, Ted R. Weiland obtained a copy of these writings and attempted to

make a fool of me. I will now relate one of those instances, and you can evaluate the situation for yourself and determine who is really imprudently ill-advised on this topic.

On page 4 of my *Research Papers Proving Two Seedline Seduction Of Eve*, I said the following in part: “It is absurd, then, to say the woman doesn’t have any seed. The woman, then, contributes just as much genetic makeup to the offspring as the man! The question at this point is: if the serpent has seed, or ‘children’; who fathered and mothered them? For this, it is critical that we go first to Genesis 3:13 which says: ‘And Yahweh said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.’ You will notice that Eve told Yahweh, ‘The serpent **beguiled** me.’ Let’s see what this word ‘**beguiled**’ means in the *Strong’s Concordance* in Hebrew. It is #5377; ‘nâshâ, *naw-shaw*’ a primitive root; to lead astray, i.e. (mentally) to *delude*, or **(morally) to seduce**: beguile, deceive, X greatly, X utterly.’ Here the word beguile can mean seduce, which in turn means, to induce (a woman) to surrender her chastity ... entice to unlawful sexual intercourse. It can also mean to be mentally seduced, (and I claim one is mentally seduced before the physical act). We have to be wise enough to know the difference. Now that we have covered the word beguiled, let’s now take up the word eat. **Eat** in the *Strong’s Concordance* is #398, and means: ‘akal, *’aw-kal*; a primitive root; to eat (literally or figuratively): -X at all, burn up, consume, devour (er, up), dine, eat (-er, up), *feed* (with), food, X freely, X in... wise (-deed, plenty), **(lay)** meat, X quite’ [*X = Hebrew idiom*]. In this particular verse eat could mean what it says, but it is better rendered lay. Now that we have consulted with the *Strong’s Concordance* as to the meanings of these two words, let’s try to determine what Eve really said: ‘**The serpent seduced me, and I did lay.**’ At this point you might say that we are stretching the Hebrew meaning of the word eat.”

The part that Weiland quoted from my work was that part I had taken from the *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* on the Hebrew word #398, *akal*, plus the sentence before it and the last two sentences after it. Then Weiland commented as follows on pages 24-25:

“The seedliners *indeed* stretch the Hebrew meaning of the word ‘eat.’ Any linguist would maintain that the Hebrew word ‘akal’ translated ‘eat’ has been distorted to say something it does not mean. The word ‘lay’ is not part of *Strong’s* definition for the Hebrew word ‘akal.’ The definition is only that word, or group of words, that *precede* the colon. In the preface to his Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary, Mr. Strong explained that what *follows* the colon are renderings by the translators of the King James Bible: ‘6. Finally (*after* the punctuation-mark:-) are given all the different renderings of the word in the Authorized English Version, arranged in the alphabetical order of the leading terms ...’ Mr. Strong also explains his use of parentheses around the word ‘Lay’: ‘( ) (parentheses) ... denotes a word or syllable sometimes given in connection with the principal word to which it is annexed.’ This is demonstrated in the following passage from Hosea: ‘I [Yahweh] drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love: and I was to them [the house of Israel] as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat unto them. (Hosea 11:4)’ In other words, the word ‘lay’ as used by James Strong is not in any sense a definition or replacement for the word ‘eat’ and

cannot be used in the fashion dictated by the previous seedliner [myself].’ Concerning the word ‘beguiled’ in Genesis 3:13, one seedliner [Nord Davis] speculated: ‘When Eve was cross-examined [by Yahweh], she is quoted as admitting: ‘Nachash beguiled (Strong’s word #5377, nasha, sexually seduced) me and I did eat, Genesis 3:13.’ For this seedline author [Nord Davis] to insert the word ‘sexually’ into Strong’s definition borders on dishonesty. *Strong’s Concordance* does not say ‘sexually’ seduced.”

Since Nord Davis is dead and cannot defend himself, I am compelled to give an answer for him: Nord might instruct Mr. Weiland to check out the *Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, for it does say “sexual pleasures” for the Hebrew word #398, *akal*! There are four meanings for the word *akal*, and number three says this, page 43: “(3) to enjoy anything, as good fortune, Job 21:25; the fruit of good or evil actions, **sexual pleasures**, Pro. 30:20 (comp. 9:17 ... 5:20).” This meaning can also be verified from *Wilson’s Old Testament Word Studies* under the topic “eat”, page 141. Also, George M. Lamsa, in his *Idioms In The Bible Explained*, points this out concerning Proverbs 9:17 as “stolen love” and “making love to another woman in secret appears pleasant.” This is the same word that Eve used when she said, Genesis 3:13: “... The serpent beguiled me, and I did *akal*.” Now, who really is the one “bordering on dishonesty”? Such spurious nit-picking arguments about “punctuation marks”, “colons” and “parentheses” have little or no bearing in this case. Remember, the statement made about “any linguists” above?: “Any linguist would maintain that the Hebrew word ‘akal’ translated ‘eat’ has been distorted to say something it does not mean.” Well, is *Gesenius* a qualified “linguist” or no? From this we can conclude one of two things: **either Weiland doesn’t have a *Gesenius’ Lexicon* or he has refused to use it!**

Actually, Weiland’s explanation of the components of *Strong’s* definition is correct. His real fault lies in his disdain for idioms. Just like he dismisses the entire *Talmud*, which contain many of the tenets of Israel Identity, he wants to dismiss all valid idioms in Hebrew. Weiland should also check *Strong’s* at the front of the “Hebrew And Chaldee Dictionary” under “Signs Employed” concerning idioms, especially under “X”. Inasmuch as Weiland frowns on idioms (like in Genesis 49:9, 17, 21, 22, 27), by his own standards, we should start searching for the “lost tribes” at the Bronx Zoo!

Not only is Mr. Ted R. Weiland taking these things totally out-of-context, but he makes some of the most blasphemous statements against the Almighty I have ever witnessed in his book *Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?*, on pages 4 and 5. Here are some excerpts of his remarks attempting to put his own outlandish contrived words into the Two Seedliner’s mouths: “Yahweh, Himself, is a sexual deviant” ... “Yahweh had sexual relations with women and fathered children” ... “Yahweh is a liar” ... “The Bible is untrustworthy” ... “Adam was a sodomite ...” ... “Both Adam and Eve were abominations in the eyes of Yahweh” ... “Adam and Eve were permitted by Yahweh to have sexual relations with several partners ... or people of other races” ... “Yahweh was the originator of and even promoted spouse swapping for both heterosexual and homosexual purposes” ... “Yahshua carried the genes of someone of another race” ... “All Israelites are the seed of Satan” ... “Satan could have and possibly did have sex

with some of the Corinthian Christians, both men and women alike” ... “Yahshua the Christ had and has sexual relations with His followers.”

Now Weiland makes the claim that we Two Seedliners imply these things just quoted. For the life-of-me, I have never read or heard any of the Two Seedliners make any such suggestions. Therefore, those statements belong to Weiland and Weiland alone, and he must bear the responsibility for them. They are his invention and he owns them by copyright, Library of Congress, #00-090494. Weiland, by making these remarks, implies that I personally am making such assertions, for he quotes me several times in that book (and mostly out-of-context).

Weiland not only quoted me, but also many other prominent Two Seedliners. He tries to make it appear he is not pointing his finger and naming names. He does that by placing a number at the end of each quotation and then lists them at the back of his book. Let's take a look at some of the people, other than myself, who he accuses of such blasphemy on pages 105-115: Dan Gayman, Gladys M. Demaree, Bertrand L. Comparet, Jarah B. Crawford, Nord W. Davis, B. J. Dryburgh, Dewy Tucker, James E. Wise, Scott Stinson, Norman Moody Rogers and Arnold Murray. How dare Weiland try to put blasphemous words like those into our mouths! Not only that, but some of these people are dead and cannot defend themselves, and if they said such blasphemous things, why doesn't Weiland quote book, chapter and verse? He doesn't because he can't!

### **IN HIS BLINDNESS, WEILAND STUMBLES ACROSS SOME VALUABLE INFORMATION FAVORING TWO SEEDLINE**

Despite Weiland's dogged, determined pursuit to destroy the Two Seedline Truth, he accidentally happens on some valuable evidence which helps substantiate Eve's sexual encounter with Satan, though he ridicules it as being "Babylonian-influenced." But, before I use this secondhand quote from Weiland's *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* concerning that informative data, you will need some background regarding it. According to Weiland's *source notes*, it was written by a Scott Stinson in an article entitled "The Serpent and Eve." In that article, Stinson speaks of the contents of various *Targumim*. For a very brief explanation of what a Targum is, I will quote from the *New Concise Bible Dictionary*, Editor Derek Williams, pages 541-542:

**"TARGUM.** An Aramaic translation or paraphrase of some part of the OT. Targums exist for all OT books except Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel. They came into being as the synagogue evolved after the Exile, when Aramaic began to replace Hebrew as the Jews' language. It therefore became customary for a reading of the Hebrew Scriptures in the synagogue service to be followed by an oral rendering into Aramaic. As time passed, these renderings became more fixed and traditional, and were committed to writing probably from the 2nd cent. BC.

"Even the most literal targums brought place-names up to date, smoothed over textual difficulties and clarified obscure passages. Some of the paraphrase targums expand the text considerably, substantially altering the text and inserting additional material ('midrash'). Their value today is that they offer major evidence for the

vernacular speech of ancient Palestine, and hence for the study of NT language and background. They also offer an important witness to the OT text.”

Among these targumim are the *Targum of Onkelos* and the *Pseudo-Jonathan Targum*, among others. Weiland is definitely of the opinion that those targumim were and are “Babylonian-influenced.” I would rather believe they were not, for it wasn’t until after they came back from the Babylonian exile that the targumim came into being. They were borne out of necessity; not some Babylonian religious system! As the books of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah were not entirely written in Hebrew, there wasn’t a need for Aramaic targums for them. When the exiles returned speaking Aramaic, it then became necessary to have a translation from the Hebrew into Aramaic. With the Scriptures being read publicly, both in their former Hebrew and in the Aramaic, any variation in the text would have been censured and reprimanded, for they had very stringent rules on how this was done. Scott Stinson points out that the targums and the Hebrew, as we know it today, do not agree on the Temptation story. Now, quoting Scott Stinson indirectly from Weiland’s book, page 96:

“This [seedline] interpretation is confirmed in the ancient literature of Israel, especially the commentaries on the Hebrew Bible written in Aramaic and commonly known as Targums. These commentaries were written after the [house of Judah’s] return from Babylon ... One text gives this interpretation of 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’ (Targum of Jonathan to Genesis 4:1). Another ancient commentary gives a similar interpretation of the same passage: ‘And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord ...’ (Palestinian Targum to Genesis 4:1). In another Rabbinic work we find a similar interpretation ...: ‘And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord.’ (Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, 21). One Rabbinic source states: ‘Eve bore Cain from the filth of the serpent, and therefore from him were descended all the wicked generations, and from his side is the abode of spirits and demons’ (Ahare Moth 76b). A similar explanation for the evil deeds of Cain’s lineage is found elsewhere. We read: ‘For two beings had intercourse with Eve, and she conceived from both and bore two children. Each followed one of the male parents, to this side and one to the other, and similarly their characters. On the side of Cain are all the haunts of the evil species, from which come evil spirits and demons.’ (Bereshith 36b).”

The real “Babylonian-influenced works” to which Ted R. Weiland refers is rather the Cabalistic numerology system by which the priesthood of that day till this attach an occult secret meaning to every letter, word, phrase and sentence of the Old Testament. Reading targums in public is hardly “secret.” Evidently, Weiland is unaware that the Aramaic targums affected greatly the *Greek Septuagint* version of the Old Testament, which is also considered a targum. Obviously, Weiland is also oblivious to the fact that most of the Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament are taken mostly from the *Septuagint*. By Weiland’s own premise, we are going to have to throw out all

these Old Testament quotations in our New Testament because they are from Aramaic targums which are supposedly “Babylonian-influenced”! Not only that, but when our Savior Himself quoted from the Old Testament, as recorded in Luke 4:17-21, He may have read from a targum. If He had read directly from the Hebrew, the people would have demanded an interpreter. What Ted R. Weiland, along with several other one seedliners, attempt to do is condemn everything written in the *Talmud*, the *Cabala*, the *Zohar*, the targums and other “Jewish” literature as being 100% false, and that we must take a 180° stand in opposition to any such information! If we were to take such a position, we would have to condemn as well most of the tenets of the Christian Israel Message, for hundreds of references in the *Talmud* are parallel to Identity beliefs. Therefore, I believe that Scott Stinson presented some credible, relevant evidence concerning Genesis 4:1. If his research evidence is correct, then, someone has altered the meaning of Genesis 4:1. I will develop, expand, and elaborate more about the subject of these targums in a separate *Special Notice*.

While the one seedliners (anti-seedliners) rant and rave about Two Seedline doctrine being “Babylonian-influenced”, there is a reference on page 8 of *The Wycliff Bible Commentary* concerning Genesis 3:14-15, for which they cannot make that claim:

“14. Cursed (*’arûr*) art thou. The Lord singled out the originator and instigator of the temptation for special condemnation and degradation. From that moment he must crawl in the dust and even feed on it. He would slither his way along in disgrace, and hatred would be directed against him from all directions. Man would always regard him as a symbol of the degradation of the one who had slandered God (cf. Isa 65:25). He was to represent not merely the serpent race, but the power of the evil kingdom. As long as life continued, men would hate him and seek to destroy him. 15. I will put enmity. The word *’êbâ* denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man (cf. Num 35:19,20; Ezk 25:15-17; 35:5,6). Thou shalt bruise (*shûp*). A prophecy of continuing struggle between the descendants of woman and of the serpent to destroy each other. The verb *shûp* is rare (cf. Job 9:17; Ps 139:11). It is the same in both clauses. When translated *crush*, it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in describing the attack of the serpent on man’s heel. It is also rendered *lie in wait for*, *aim at* or (LXX) *watch for*. The Vulgate renders it *conteret*, “bruise” in the first instance and *insidiaberis*, “lie in wait,” in the other clause. Thus, we have in this famous passage, called the *protevangelium*, ‘first gospel,’ the announcement of a prolonged struggle, perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of woman. God’s promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. This assurance fell upon the ears of God’s earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption.” [Ed. underlining]

This passage spells it all out except naming the counterfeit Judahites (“Jews”) as the “serpent race” and Eve’s seed as the Anglo-Saxon descendants of the Israelites. Truly, the one seedline position is built on error, and therefore to maintain it, it becomes an endless necessity to build on top of it, with one error after another.

## THE AGENDA OF THE SERPENT'S SEED

According to some one seedliners (anti-seedliners), the only seed of Genesis 3:15 is exclusively, and only, "Jesus Christ." For the rest of them who assign the seeds of that verse to the so-called "seeds of the spirit and the seeds of the flesh", they deny the Messiah Himself! Not only are there children (seed) of the serpent of this "First Gospel", but his seed has an agenda. I have a prisoner on my mailing list who is taking a college course in Business Administration, and he sent me a copy of a page from one of his textbooks on that subject called *Your Future in Business Begins Now*, chapter 1, page 11. As you read it you will begin to see just how serious this WAR of TWO SEEDLINES is, which the one seedliners (anti-seedliners) challenge:

"The United States is undergoing a new demographic transition: it is becoming a society composed of people from multiple cultures. Over the next decades, the United States will shift further away from a society dominated by whites and rooted in Western culture toward a society characterized by three large racial and ethnic minorities: African Americans, U.S. Hispanics, and Asian Americans. All three minorities will grow in size and in share of the population, while the white majority declines as a percentage of the total. Native Americans and people with roots in Australia, the Middle East, the former Soviet Union, and other parts of the world will further enrich the fabric of the U. S. society.

"The labor force of the past was dominated by white men who are now retiring. They will be replaced by a multicultural labor force who are beginning their careers in entry-level jobs in 2000. The proportion of workers who are non-Hispanic whites will decrease from 77 percent in 1997 to 74 percent in 2005. A diverse is a healthy workforce. Diversity leads to new ideas, new ways of doing things, and greater income equality among ethnic groups.

"Multiculturalism exists when all major ethnic groups in an area — such as a city, county, or census tract — are roughly equally represented. Because of the current demographic transition, the trend in the United States is toward greater multiculturalism, although the degree varies in different parts of the country.

"Four of New York City's five boroughs are among the 10 most ethnically diverse counties in the country. People of various ancestries have long been attracted to San Francisco county, and not surprisingly, it is the most diverse in the nation. The proportions of major ethnic groups are closer to being equal there than anywhere else. The least multicultural region is a broad swath stretching from northern New England through the Midwest and into Montana. These counties have few people other than whites. The counties with the very lowest level of diversity are found in the agricultural heartland — in Nebraska and Iowa."

Does this agenda sound like a mere "flesh" problem as the anti-seedliners claim? How foolish an assumption! By denying Two Seedline doctrine, as the one seedliners (anti-seedliners) do, they actually help promote that agenda of the seed (children) of the serpent. Although the enemy is crying now for "equality", in the end, he will demand total annihilation of the Whites. Once he has brought about admixture to the Whites, in essence, he has, in effect, annihilated them. Therefore, there is only one solution to the problem, and that is the total separation of the Whites from the other

races. And unless that is brought about in the near future, we do not have a destiny. Possibly, with an understanding of Two Seedline doctrine, we might forestall, completely halt and reverse that forthcoming disaster to our race. If we ever come out of this dilemma, it will be no thanks to those who are fighting the Two Seedline message!