

WOLVES DECLARE THEIR SHEEP-KILLING PLANS "FORGERIES", #4

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

With this fourth essay we will examine the proven fact of how the wolves not only deny their obvious designs to completely liquidate the White race out-of-existence, but have simultaneously sabotaged the intent of our founding fathers in our United States Constitution by including nonwhite people. We need only analyze the Preamble to become aware of this appalling, fraudulent misapplication of justice, which reads:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." [*emphasis mine*]

Here are verifying excerpts from the website:

<http://liberty-virtue-independence.blogspot.com/2008/12/secure-liberty-to-ourselves-and-our.html>

"Secure Liberty to Ourselves and our Posterity

"Noah Webster proposed a Constitutional Convention as he traveled from New Hampshire to North Carolina in 1785 to 1787. He produced Sketches of American Policy; a 48 page document presented to George Washington at Mount Vernon in 1785.

"Webster was in Philadelphia during the Constitutional Convention and was visited by: Washington, Franklin, Rufus King, Abraham Baldwin, Edmund Randolph, William Johnson, Oliver Ellsworth, James Madison, Roger Sherman, William Livingston, and John Marshall.

"Two days before the Convention adjourned, Thomas Fitzsimmons, delegate from Pennsylvania, requested that he prepare an essay in support of the Constitution. Although Noah Webster wasn't a delegate to the Constitutional Convention; his counsel, advice, and guidance were momentous. Noah Webster is our authority if we are to understand the terminology of the Constitution ..." The website continues:

"I quote Noah Webster [*again*):

"Posterity" [*1828 ed.*]:

"1 .Posterity, descendants, children, children's children &c. indefinitely the race that proceeds from a progenitor. The whole human race are the posterity of Adam. 2. In a general sense, succeeding generations opposed to ancestors."

It is quite clear that Noah Webster's advice was sought by the framers of the United States Constitution in order that no ambiguity in the meaning of any word or phrase would be misinterpreted in the future. While Webster did quite well in bringing

“race” into the equation, he left some obscurity by using the words “indefinitely” and “whole”! From the *Library Of Universal Knowledge*, vol. xv, p. 323 we read in part:

“... In 1807, he (Noah Webster) published *A Philosophical and Practical Grammar of the English Language*, and commenced his *American Dictionary of the English Language*; but finding difficulties in etymology, he devoted ten years to its study, and prepared a *Synopsis of Words in Twenty Languages*; then began his dictionary anew, and in seven years completed it” From this bit of information, we can see how Webster may not have been entirely sure when using the words “indefinitely” and “whole” in this context! However, Webster showed no signs of being confused about the term “race”, as he used it two times in his definition of “posterity”! The following is the definition of “race”, as a people, from Noah Webster’s original 1828 dictionary:

“Origin of **“RACE”**: Middle French, generation, from Old Italian *razza*. First known use, 1580.

“³**race**, *noun*, definition of *race*: 1. a breeding stock of animals. 2. (a) a family, tribe, people, or nation belonging to the same stock; (b) a class or kind of people unified by shared interests, habits, or characteristics; 3 (a) an actually or potentially interbreeding group within a species; (b) *also*: a taxonomic category (as a subspecies) representing such a group; (c) a category of humankind that shares certain distinctive physical traits; 4 *obsolete*: inherited temperament or disposition. 5. distinctive flavor, taste, or strength.”

In Latin the *noun* “race”, *genus*, means: *birth, descent, origin, noble, birth, offspring, race, kind, family, nation*; a derivative of the Latin “*gens*”, meaning: *clan, tribe, family, race*. Therefore, Noah Webster could only mean by his definition of “posterity” the word “race”. And by the definition of “race”, mean: “... 2. (a) a family, tribe, people, or nation belonging to the same stock & 3 ... (c) a category of humankind that shares certain distinctive physical traits” In Latin, “posterity” is *posteris* and *minores* meaning: “posterity” or “a lesser, or younger”, etc.

Although Noah Webster’s definition of “posterity” reflects a certain amount of indecisiveness from our present-day viewpoint, back when he lived there existed a few veiled colloquial idiomatic expressions known only to the people of their day. For instance, Benjamin Franklin called the American Indian tribes “aboriginal enemies” (*Ency. Britannica*, 9th ed.). Not only this, but M.E. Bradford in his book *A Worthy Company*, calls Benjamin Franklin a “xenophobe”, a term not found in the original 1828 Noah Webster’s *Dictionary*. No doubt, under the same circumstance, M.E. Bradford would consider Noah Webster a “xenophobe”! Therefore, if one considers Franklin or Webster to be xenophobes, one would also have to consider Yahshua Christ a “xenophobe”, inasmuch as He stated at Matt. 15:24:

“But he answered [*His disciples*] and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”

Inasmuch as we Israelites have One Elohim (*i.e.*, Almighty) in three manifestations: He is a “xenophobe” as the Father; He is a “xenophobe” as the Son; and He is a “xenophobe” as the Holy Spirit.

Since M.E. Bradford, in his book *A Worthy Company*, called Benjamin Franklin a “xenophobe”, I will repeat it again from page 70 [*Bradford’s exact typesetting; underling mine*]:

“In these long years as agent, Benjamin Franklin openly valued the status of the North American colonies *within* the British Empire and the flow of English constitutional history more than did many of his fellow Americans. An Anglophile, he was clearly a reluctant revolutionary. But never did he doubt that, in some sense, America was one country and England another. True enough, he wished to preserve the English character of the colonies: since ‘the number of purely white people in the world is proportionately very small,’ and since ‘the English [with the Saxons of Germany] make the principal body of white people on the face of the earth, ... why should the Palatine boors be suffered to swarm into our settlements ... why increase the sons of Africa by planting them in America, where we have a fair opportunity, by excluding all blacks and tawnys ...?’ Franklin was a conventional xenophobe, made all the stronger in his cultural identity by the pleasure he took from life in England and from a large circle of English friends”

From the 1894, 9th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. IX, p. 628, we read further on this subject:

“During this sojourn of five years in England, Franklin made many valuable friends outside court and political circles, among whom the names of Hume, Robertson, and Adam Smith are conspicuous. In the spring of 1759, he received the degree of doctor of laws from the Scottish university of St. Andrews. He also made active use of his marvellous and unsurpassed talent for pamphleteering. He wrote for the *Annual Register*, of which young Edmund Burke was then editor, and with whom, at a later day, he was destined to have closer relations, a paper ‘On the Peopling of Countries,’ traces of which may readily be discerned in the first book of *The Wealth of Nations*. In this paper Franklin combated the popular delusion that the people and wealth of the colonies were necessarily so much population and wealth abstracted from the mother country, and he estimated that the population of the colonies; by doubling once in every twenty-five years, would, at the end of a century, give a larger English population beyond the Atlantic than in England, without at all interfering with the growth of England in either direction. Franklin’s conjecture, that the population of the colonies would double every twenty-five years, commended itself to the judgment of Adam Smith, who adopted it; and it has thus far been vindicated by the census.”

The above is also found at Internet Websites:

<http://www.1902encyclopedia.com/F/FRA/benjamin-franklin.html>
& <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/40704/40704-8.txt>

Benjamin Franklin, in his twenty-four part essay *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries*, etc. (1751), states in section seven from www.ditext.com/franklin/observations.html

“7. Hence Marriages in America are more general, and more generally early, than in Europe. And if it is reckoned there, that there is but one Marriage per Annum among 100 Persons, perhaps we may here reckon two; and if in Europe they have but 4 Births to a Marriage (many of their Marriages being late) we may here reckon 8, of which if one half grow up, and our Marriages are made, reckoning one with another 20

Years of Age, our People must at least be doubled every 20 Years.” [“20” & “25” were general speaking]

We know that Benjamin Franklin and the other framer’s dispositions toward the U.S. Constitution were Christian, as we find the following from the *Library Of Universal Knowledge*, vol. vi, p. 241:

“... Franklin was the first American citizen to win European fame. His leading characteristics were common sense, sagacity, and practical wisdom, with industry, tact, and indomitable firmness in the management of affairs, whether small or great. With these was joined a keen, close observation, and painstaking care. Frugal, and regardful of his own interests, he was eminent in public spirit and patriotic devotion. In imagination and all that connects man with the infinite, he was singularly deficient. He brought all things to the test of practical utility. Yet injustice has been done him by exclusive emphasis of this quality. The influence of Shaftesbury made him a skeptic for a short time during his youth, but his most conspicuous act in the constitutional convention of 1787 was his motion that its sessions be opened with prayer” We have no record that any of the other delegates objected to Franklin’s motion!

Just to demonstrate how the truths we have in our old books have been edited out or destroyed by removing them from the library shelves and burning them, I will now show a portion was purposely omitted from the 1910, 11th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. XI, p. 25 under the topic “Franklin, Benjamin” that had been in the 1894 9th edition:

“... He also made active use of his marvellous and unsurpassed talent for pamphleteering. He wrote for the *Annual Register*, of which young Edmund Burke was then editor, and with whom, at a later day, he was destined to have closer relations, a paper ‘On the Peopling of Countries,’ traces of which may readily be discerned in the first book of *The Wealth of Nations*. In this paper Franklin combated the popular delusion that the people and wealth of the colonies were necessarily so much population and wealth abstracted from the mother country, and he estimated that the population of the colonies; by doubling once in every twenty-five years, would, at the end of a century, give a larger English population beyond the Atlantic than in England, without at all interfering with the growth of England in either direction. Franklin’s conjecture, that the population of the colonies would double every twenty-five years, commended itself to the judgment of Adam Smith, who adopted it; and it has thus far been vindicated by the census.”

Here is what was substituted in the 1910 edition, 16 years after the 1894 edition:

“... During this sojourn of five years in England he had made many valuable friends outside of court and political circles, among whom Hume, Robertson and Adam Smith were conspicuous. In 1759, for his literary and more particularly his scientific attainments, he received the freedom of the city of Edinburgh and the degree of doctor of laws from the university of St Andrews.” [Deletion starts here.] “He had been made a Master of Arts at Harvard and at Yale in 1753, and at the college of William and Mary in 1756; and in 1762 he received the degree of D.C.L. at Oxford. While in England he had made active use of his remarkable talent for pamphleteering. In the clamour for peace following the death of George II: (25th of October 1760), he was for a vigorous prosecution of the war with France; he had written what purported to be a chapter from

an old book written by a Spanish Jesuit, *On the Meanes of Disposing the Enemie to Peace*, which had a great effect; and in the spring of 1760 there had been published a more elaborate paper written by Franklin with the assistance of Richard Jackson, agent of Massachusetts and Connecticut in London, entitled *The Interest of Great Britain Considered with Regard to Her Colonies, and the Acquisitions of Canada and Guadeloupe* (1760). This pamphlet answered the argument that it would be unsafe to keep Canada because of the added strength that would thus be given to any possible movement for independence in the English colonies, by urging that so long as Canada remained French there could be no safety for the English colonies in North America, nor any permanent peace in Europe. Tradition reports that this pamphlet had considerable weight in determining the ministry to retain Canada.” **I am sure you will have to agree with me that this is A PRETTY DAMN IMPORTANT DELETION OF TRUE HISTORY!**

While the 1910, 11th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, retains a few lines of the paragraph from the 1894, 9th edition, essentially the main topic of how Benjamin Franklin preferred the colonies to be populated with White Englishmen is gutted from the 11th edition. What someone did was to rearrange the entire article and deceptively leave out the racial preference of Franklin for the White English people. The way the article is rewritten, it is not necessarily untrue, but it shows a great amount of blatant scholarly dishonesty!

What it amounts to is: When the 1910, 11th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* was circulated worldwide, millions of history students in grade, junior and high schools, along with colleges, were deceived into believing a false corrupted history. No doubt, hundreds of thousands of school and college teachers went to their graves believing that they had taught their students the truth in history, which in fact were damnable lies! Here we are today, one hundred and three years later, still eating out of the garbage cans which the wolves call “history”! It constitutes MOLESTATION of our children’s minds, (comparable to sexual molestation)! Who else would do such a thing, other than the wolves? We are cautioned about such people at Psalm 58:3-10 which states:

“³ The wicked^{H7563} are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies. ⁴ Their poison *is* like the poison of a serpent: *they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear;* ⁵ Which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely. ⁶ Break their teeth, O Elohim, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O Yahweh. ⁷ Let them melt away as waters *which* run continually: *when he bendeth his bow to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces.* ⁸ As a snail *which* melteth, let every one of them pass away: *like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun.* ⁹ Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in *his* wrath. ¹⁰ The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked^{H7563}.”

The word “wicked” is the Strong’s Hebrew #7563, and means in Gesenius’ *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*: “... (1) wicked, unrighteous ... (2) having an unrighteous cause ... (3) guilty” Hebrew #7563 is used quite effectively at Psalm 1:1-6, where it reads:

“¹ Blessed is the man^{H376} that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly^{H7563}, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. ² But his delight is in the law of Yahweh; and in his law doth he meditate day and night. ³ And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. ⁴ The ungodly^{H7563} are not so: but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. ⁵ Therefore the ungodly^{H7563} shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. ⁶ For Yahweh knoweth the way of the righteous: but the way of the ungodly^{H7563} shall perish.”

The bottom line is: There are a people who are untruthful from their birth (known as congenital liars), and are identified as such by Yahshua Christ at John 8:44 thusly:

“Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

It is this sort of people who wish to corrupt our true history by editing it to proclaim something entirely different, or deleting it all together. People like this are also found at 1 Thessalonians 2:14-15:

“¹⁴ For ye, brethren, became followers of the assemblies of Yahweh which in Judaea are in Christ Yahshua: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: ¹⁵ Who both killed the Messiah Yahshua, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not Yahweh, and are contrary to all men ...” [KJV, ed. CAE]

William Finck, in his *Christogenea New Testament* translates this passage as follows:

“¹⁴ You have become imitators, brethren, of the assemblies of Yahweh in Judaea which are among the number of Christ Yahshua, because these same things even you have suffered by your own tribesmen, likewise they also by the Judaeans: ¹⁵ those who killed both Prince Yahshua and the prophets, and banished us, and are not pleasing to Yahweh, and contrary to all men.”

These same people who are identified by Christ Himself, at John 8:44, were found to be troublemakers for the early Christians at Acts 17:5-8:

“⁵ But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people. ⁶ And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; ⁷ Whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, *one* Yahshua. ⁸ And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things.” Multiply all of the things presented in this series of papers by a million, and one will begin to comprehend the seriousness of our present situation.

This brings up the old bugaboo of believing that today's so-called “jews” are the Israelites of the Bible! To come to a proper understanding on the matter, one must distinguish three different distinct entities, (1) the house of Israel, (2) the house of

Judah, and, (3) the Edomites who were converted to Israelite-ism about 124 B.C. by John Hyrcanus (see Josephus' *Antiq.* 13: 9:1). The truth of the matter is: the so-called "jews" are neither of the house of Israel nor of the house of Judah. Therefore, Yahshua Christ, who was of the house of David, within the house of Judah; was absolutely no relation whatsoever to the converso-Edomite-jews who were half-Esau and half-Canaanite.