

ALL KINDS *of* FLESH NOT *the* SAME, 1 Cor. 15:39, (#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

Like the last paper in this series, what Paul proclaims at this passage conflicts with the erroneous position that some hold, claiming that Gen. 1:24-27 & 3:1 is proof that Yahweh created the nonwhite races where the word "beast" is used.

At 1 Cor. 15:39 in the KJV, Paul states: "**All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men^{G444}, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.**" (G#444 = Adam)

Inasmuch as the Bible never conflicts in context, the Greek word Paul is using here means the same thing as "man" or "Adam" of Genesis chapters 1 through 5. The language may change, along with the articulation, affecting the pronunciation of the names or words, but the meaning never changes. So the "men" (G#444) in the above cited verse means the same as "man" or "Adam" (H#120) in Gen. chs. 1-5. The context in these passages absolutely cannot apply to any nonwhite, non-Adamic peoples! There may be various kinds of species among the beast (wild and domesticated), fishes and birds, but there is only one species among White Adam-man throughout the Bible! So in what category do we place the nonwhite peoples, as "**... there is one kind of flesh of men ...**"? The answer is: in the majority of cases in the Old Testament, the nonwhites are idiomatically placed under (H#929), behemah, which I covered in my *Identifying The "Beast Of The Field"* series.

While I was in the process of putting together *All Kinds of Flesh Not the Same, #1*, I was asked to prove that Wellhausen, of the German school of Higher Criticism, was either a Jesuit or a Canaanite-jew. I know that this may seem off the subject, but for the sake of others who might have the same trepidation, I supply the following documentation from a booklet entitled *Our Heritage: The Bible*, by Rev. Wm. Pascoe Goard, pp. 25-30:

"THE BIBLE UNDER ATTACK

"The question is being asked to-day, Can we trust our Bible? It is right that we should first consider *who it is that raises this question*.

"Primarily the question was raised in German Universities. The people who raised the question in German Universities were not the followers of Luther. Let this be taken into consideration most carefully. The supporters of the Reformation never raised the question as to the trustworthiness of the Bible.

“Let it be remembered that the Reformation was bitterly opposed by political action; by administrative power, exercised without mercy, and by all the power of the ecclesiastical machine, backed by the power of the Papal States of Europe. Witness the Inquisition. It was made a matter of life and death to possess a copy of the Scriptures and to confess the faith of the Reformation. Even in England, usually so free, men and women went to the stake and were burned by English men and women for the profession of their faith.

“They went to their death as martyrs to the truth, innocently condemned. *By their condemnation and execution kings and parliaments, priests and laymen, became guilty of murder in the highest degree, for which they will yet stand at the bar of justice of the King of Israel, and will yet give an accounting for these things, although they have passed away with their own age.*

“The physical weapon is not used now in Europe and Britain. *But the struggle against the principles of the Reformation is not yet over. The source of the strength of the Reformation was the Bible, the inspired Word of God.* This has been true all through the ages. The strength of the resistance to the Reformation was thrown against the Scriptures. It was thrown against the translation of the Scriptures into English. It was thrown against the printing of the Scriptures. It was thrown against the circulation and possession of the Scriptures. But all along the line the fight against the dissemination of the Scriptures was lost.

“The weight of the opposition is now thrown against **The Inspiration, The Historicity, And The Reliability Generally Of The Scriptures.**

“It is a continuation of the fight against the free doctrines of the Reformation.

“The attack this time is in the mental world.

“It has so far succeeded that many of those who would fain support the Scriptures have been captured in the mental world and have been made the bondservant of the enemy. They are like Samson Agonistes, captive, with eyes put out, grinding the mills of the Philistines, and making sport for them at the same time. Thus we could name men who believe themselves to be Protestant, and who are active against the claims of those who attack the Reformation in the matter of forms of worship, taking the field with courage and vigour against the Romanizing section of the Church: who are nevertheless actively pushing the propaganda against the historicity and reliability of the Scriptures. These may be sure that the Romanizing element will forgive them all their opposition to Roman ritual as long as they do the work of the Roman Hierarchy in attacking the inspiration and historicity of the Scriptures.

“The Modernist attack upon the reliability and the inspiration of the Scriptures *is being engineered by those who have never ceased to attack the Reformation, and the open Bible.*

“But these are not working alone.

“The Jew is in the closest sympathy with everything which will tend to overthrow not the Reformation only, but also the whole of the Christian faith. Thus they have joined with all their mental power in the attack upon the Bible.

“Take the list of the outstanding fathers of the Modernist attack upon the Bible, whose names have been the leading names with which to conjure in the German

Universities, from Wellhausen upwards, and it will be found that they are German Jews. [*emphasis mine*]

“These two forces, Jesuit and Jew, have combined to attack the foundations of our faith, namely, the Bible. They have secured the co-operation of Protestant British men, of England, Scotland and America, and together the attack has been made.

“The *supporters of the Reformation* have been caught asleep. Their attacking power never existed during these last generations. They slept on the laurels their fathers had won with the expense of life and fortune. They shepherded in a perfunctory manner the descendants of the sheep their fathers had gathered, scattering to them with none too liberal hand the supplies of biblical food their fathers had prepared. So peaceful was the time that they neither prepared to defend their charge, nor to attack the enemies of the faith.

“Thus the last generation of the supporters of the Reformation were routed, horse, foot and artillery. Those who maintained their ground did so more because their particular charges had not been acutely subjected to the attacks of the modernist enemy.

“But now the enemy is within their walls at every point and is attacking the validity of the Bible. Thus we say that the question as to the validity of the Scriptures was raised by the Jesuit and the Jew. They have made it appear by partial statements of fact and wrong statements that there is not reliability such as our fathers believed in, in the sacred Scriptures. The time has come for the forces which defend the Reformation to rally. And the first step we have indicated is to reconnoitre the enemy. The next step is to consider, *who, within the ranks of the church and nation of the Reformation, are working in harmony with the enemy*.

“The Jesuit is still pressing his campaign to overthrow the Protestant faith. His own writings up to date will give absolute proof of that.

“The Jew is still pressing his campaign, and is doing so hand in hand with the Jesuit. His own writings will also make this clear.

“The modernist within our ranks, and especially within the Universities, is acting with both of these, although unconsciously.

“All of these are calling into question the reliability of the Scriptures. Such then are the forces which are attacking the Scriptures. The next thing necessary to do is to *reconnoitre their methods*.

“METHODS OF ATTACK

“The chief attention has been focused on the Scriptures. Regarding these they have assumed certain definite positions.

“They have represented that there is confusion arising from the various names of God in the Bible. Each name is supposed to have represented, in the beginning, a different religion. From the sources of such religions it has been assumed the original Bible materials were drawn. These materials were then supposed to have been worked in together to form the text of the holy Scriptures, the various names of God being retained in the documents so incorporated. Thus Wellhausen and all his followers.

“From this citadel these must now withdraw. It is an untenable position.

“They have represented that there is more than one story of the creation, and that these do not agree with each other. It was a fatal move for the wing of the enemy of the Bible when he entered into this citadel. *There are not two or more accounts of the creation.* There is one sequent account dealing with progressive stages of creation history. From this position modern scholarship will have to withdraw.

“They have caused it to be believed that science has demonstrated the theory of evolution against the Biblical account of the creation. As a matter of fact this is not true. Science has demonstrated no such thing.

“That there was a progressive creation the Scriptures assert and the defenders of the faith of the Reformation believe. But that there has been a continuous evolution, and that species ascended from lower forms of life by inherent powers science does not demonstrate, and theologians do not believe. It remains for the philosopher who has an animus against the Bible alone to maintain this statement, which is nowhere shown to be the fact. Those who assert and maintain this to be the case are the left wing of the forces attacking the Scriptures. Many will say, Why should we trouble about that? God either worked by successive creative acts, or once for all He placed within the orders of life the inherent power to ascend in the scale of being.

“If we were simply seeking for an explanation of God and of His methods of working in His universe, it might not be a matter of great importance. If we were Mohammedans or Buddhists making the same enquiry, even if we were Roman Catholics who build their faith on, and accept as the final authority, the voice of the church, it might not be for us a matter of prime importance. But being *Christians who build upon the written Word of God*, it is of the first importance to us.

“It is because it is so important to the Protestant Christian that the integrity of the Word should be maintained, that the creation narrative is thus being so persistently attacked. If faith in the Word can be shaken in the mind of the Christian *then he will easily turn to the voice of the Church*, or at all events *he will turn away from his living Christian faith.* The first would satisfy the Jesuit, the second, the Jew.

“Therefore the creation narrative has been attacked and the evolutionary theory has been substituted. For if the latter be true, the Bible is held to be mistaken and therefore not inspired.

“Therefore it is said that science has established the theory of evolution. Science has done no such thing.

“So patently is this the case, that evolutionists have in part ceased to state that it is so, but are saying, ‘It is generally accepted by the best scholars.’ But the best scholars to speak for science are scientists. The leading men in that realm are declaring that evolution has not been demonstrated, but remains only a working hypothesis. For instance, Sir Oliver Lodge says, the term evolution means only a process of creation. But a process of creation is that which the Bible sets forth. The whole evolution movement will have failed of its aim if this be the accepted definition. Then, instead of disturbing faith in the Scriptures it will confirm it.

“From the statement that science has demonstrated evolution the attacking forces must now withdraw” [Note: I was about 8 years old when Goard wrote all if this! C.A.E.]

My Analysis Of Julius Wellhausen & William Pascoe Goard: As for Julius Wellhausen *Who's Who In Christian History*, by J.D. Douglas states in part: "Wellhausen achieved fame by purporting the view that the Pentateuch was written by different authors at different times – as late as the postexilic period. Many archaeological discoveries in the past century have discredited this view. Most of his writings focused on Old Testament criticism and Jewish history; his most acclaimed book is *History of Israel* (1878, translated into English in 1883)." [emphasis mine]

Although Wellhausen made a few outstanding positive offerings, but because of some of his grave errors, nearly everything he advocated should be highly scrutinized! Under the circumstances, if Julius was not himself a Canaanite-jew, he contributed to their motives, probably believing they were "God's chosen people", and bought their satanic jargon!

As for Rev. William Pascoe Goard, he died shortly after 1937, according to Howard Rand's *Destiny Yearbook 1947*, p. 245. Many of Goard's writings were featured in Rand's monthly *Destiny Magazine* from time to time. Also, E. Raymond Capt reprinted many of Goard's works, and that is the source I quoted from above. Goard, like many of the early Israel Identity teachers, had his share of unintended errors (the 6th and 8th day creation of Adam-man being one of them). I fully agree with Goard about Julius Wellhausen, the Jesuits and the Canaanite-jews (although he was not aware that those calling themselves "jews" were the seed of the serpent). Nevertheless, he correctly ascribed their motives.

I would state one thing further, and that is the fact that Rand and his associated Identity writers are only correct about 50% of the time. So check out Rand and company before accepting any of their conclusions derived from faulty premises. I could cite several examples, but space does not permit. However, the 50% of the time when they are correct, it is overwhelmingly beneficial! So, solicit Yahweh for His "gift of discernment"!

I will now show how both Julius Wellhausen and William Pascoe Goard may have, and probably were, influenced by Canaanite-jewish thinking, and give you an example of what I wrote in another brochure for documentation:

A friend of mine sent me a small 4"x6", 32 page booklet entitled *The Two Messiahs*, written by staff writer Kevin Williams of the "RBC Ministries." While the author uses the usual nominal churchianity rhetoric like "Jew" and "Gentile", nevertheless, he wrote a scholarly treatise with documentation to back up his subject. He demonstrates on page 16 how some Jews differentiate between a "suffering" Messiah and a "conquering" Messiah, which is typically a "Jewish" line-of-thought. Unable to reconcile both a "suffering" and a "conquering" Messiah in one being, some of them decided that there must be two. To show you this, I will now quote from pages 16-17 of this booklet:

"One highly regarded rabbi during Europe's Medieval Period was a Babylonian rabbi, Sa'adiah Gaon (882-942), who attempted to narrow the scope of the debate with a two-Messiah position.

"According to Michael Brown: '[Rabbi Sa'adiah Gaon] explained that there would actually be *two* Messiahs, the Messiah son of Joseph (mentioned explicitly in the

Talmud in b. Sukkah 52a), who was associated with a time of victory mixed with hardship and calamity, and the Messiah son of David, who would establish God's kingdom on the earth.'

"Apart from the singular Talmudic reference, Rabbi Gaon is the earliest known Jewish scholar to articulate this two-Messiah position, and one of the only people to develop it into the 'Messiah son of Joseph' theology. However, for Rabbi Gaon, the coming of the Messiah son of David was contingent entirely on the work of the suffering servant, Messiah son of Joseph."

I will now copy and paste the passage mentioned above (Mas. Sukkah 52a), from the Sancino Talmud into this document:

"Our Rabbis taught, The Holy One, blessed be He, will say to the Messiah, the son of David (May he reveal himself speedily in our days!), 'Ask of me anything, and I will give it to thee', as it is said, I will tell of the decree etc. this day have I begotten thee, ask of me and I will give the nations for thy inheritance. But when he will see that the Messiah the son of Joseph is slain, he will say to Him, 'Lord of the Universe, I ask of Thee only the gift of life'. 'As to life', He would answer him, 'Your father David has already prophesied this concerning you', as it is said, He asked life of thee, thou gavest it him, [even length of days for ever and ever] ... And the Lord showed me four craftsmen. Who are these 'four craftsmen'? – R. Hana b. Bizna citing R. Simeon Hasida replied: The Messiah the son of David, the Messiah the son of Joseph, Elijah and the Righteous Priest. R. Shesheth objected, If so, was it correct to write, These are the horns which scattered Judah, seeing that they came to turn [them] back? – The other answered him, Go to the end of the verse: These then are come to frighten them, to cast down the horns of the nations, which lifted up their horns against the Land of Judah, to scatter it etc. Why, said R. Shesheth to him, should I argue with Hana in Aggada?" *[underlining mine to emphasize the two proposed Messiahs]* End of quotation.

This is very similar to the Canaanite-jewish type of theory that Gen. 1:26-27 and Gen. 2:7-8 where they speak of two different creations of Adam-man (i.e., Strong H#120)! William Pascoe Goard believed this and it appears that Julius Wellhausen may have believed in three creations of Adam-man.

Goard stated about Wellhausen thusly: "They have represented that there is more than one story of the creation, and that these do not agree with each other. It was a fatal move for the wing of the enemy of the Bible when he entered into this citadel. *There are not two or more accounts of the creation.* There is one sequent account dealing with progressive stages of creation history. From this position modern scholarship will have to withdraw." Goard is correct by stating: "*There are not two or more accounts of the creation.*" But he is wrong where he wrote: "... dealing with progressive stages" Adam was a single creation in a single stage, except for his wife Eve ("... created he them." Gen. 1:27 & 5:2)!

So we end up right where we started, with the Apostle Paul at 1 Cor. 15:39 where he stated: "**All flesh is not the same flesh: but *there is one kind of flesh of men*^{G444}, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.**" Notice again that it categorically says: "**... *there is one kind of flesh of men*^{G444}**" According

to Acts 17:26, this flesh of “men”^{G444} has “one blood ... of men”^{G444}, and at Deut. 32:8-9, it states of these men: “⁸ **When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. ⁹ For Yahweh’s portion *is* his people; Jacob *is* the lot of his inheritance.**” Who else would we expect it to be but White Adamic men? Yahweh’s people are those with whom He made a conditional marriage covenant at Exo. 19:5, ending in divorce. Jer. 31:31-33 & Heb. 8:8-10 speak of Israel’s reconciliation! **Only His death on the Cross made the remarriage to the “one flesh” of Adam possible!** Its a no-brainer!