SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #7

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

This is the seventh in a series of *Special Notices* to all anti-seedliners who are opposed to the proposition that there are a literal walking, talking, breathing, genetic Satanic seedline people among us in this world. To proclaim otherwise is a declaration that we have no enemy, and neutralizes and undermines our defenses against them. To concede such a position is beyond all responsible comprehension, and only those who assume the obligation of pointing out and identifying the enemy are Israel's true watchmen. To brazenly obstruct the message of the true watchmen's warnings is the height of treason. The judgment for interfering with the true watchman in his appointed duty is not a very pretty one. But, sad to say, this is what many are doing. Again, I would warn you, we are at WAR. This WAR has been going on now for over 7,000 years. It is a WAR between YHWH and His children and Satan and his children. It is a battle to the death for one or the other.

In the last *Special Notice To All Who Deny Two Seedline #6,* we were looking into the writings of Lt. Col. Jack Mohr. As Mohr refuses to identify the enemy, he is actually giving them aid and comfort in a time of WAR, and there is no greater act of sedition against YHWH's Kingdom. In *Special Notice #6,* I used two illustrations of how Mohr shot himself in the foot with his thesis *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* In his booklet of 27 pages, he misapplied the word "enmity" in Genesis 3:15 and "beguiled" in 2 Corinthians 11:3. With this *Special Notice* we will scrutinize more of his suppositions. In analyzing Mohr's writings on his anti-seedline argument, one can make some interesting observations. I notice that Mohr is working with a limited source of information. It is obvious he has a *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible* along with some unnamed Bible dictionary. It also appears he is quoting entirely from the *King James Version.* Equipped with this limited source of data, he desires to dictate to everyone else his own unqualified views which are based on his personal reasoning. From what I can observe so far, if he doesn't like what he reads in *Strong's* he will switch to his unnamed Bible dictionary in order to pick and choose that which best suits "his" likes. It is conspicuously obvious he did this with the meaning of Seth's name on page 11. If you want to understand what has been cited so far concerning Mohr's writings, you might want to get a copy of that *Special Notice.* We will now continue where we left off with *Special Notice #6.*

In order to show you the next place in his article where Mohr shoots himself in the foot, it will be necessary for me to quote a couple of paragraphs from his booklet *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative,* page 11:

"... But Wise [James E. Wise] states again without any Scriptural backing, when Eve stated 'I have gotten a man from the Lord', she thought Cain was her firstborn and she thought he was the promised seed, she later acknowledged that Abel, not Cain, was the promised seed. Therefore, if Abel was her promised seed, then Cain would have to be the seed or progency [sic. progeny] of the serpent. There is absolutely no Scriptural evidence which indicates that Eve thought that Abel was the 'promised seed.' Verse 25, which Wise quotes as confirmation of this statement merely says that when Eve had Seth, she said: 'God has appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.' She is merely stating that God gave her a son to replace the one who had been killed. Nothing is said here about 'promised seed.' 1 John 3:12 does not 'plainly denote that Cain was the offspring or progeny of the wicked one.' The Bible dictionary says the word Cain means 'acquisition', which means: 'the act of having one's own; to get or gain through one's efforts.' Seth means to 'compensate; a sprout', it has nothing whatsoever to do with being a substitute as Wise avers. I wonder where this man got his information or if he just dreamed it up, the latter seems the more possible."

Mohr's last statement here, concerning the name of Seth, highly suggests his own theological dishonesty. I will show you why. As we know, according to his own words, Mohr has both a *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible* and an unnamed Bible dictionary. Mohr said this on page 3: "The word 'serpent' as used here and throughout this chapter is #5175 in Strong's Concordance ..." From this statement we can irrevocably conclude beyond all doubt that he has a copy of the *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible.* The question is: why didn't he quote from it in this instance? Again, Mohr's statement is: "Seth means to 'compensate; a sprout', it has nothing whatsoever to do with being a substitute as Wise avers." This is what the *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible* has to say of the name Seth: "#8352 ... Sheth, *shayth;* from 7896; *put,* i.e. *substitute; Sheth,* third son of Adam: — Seth, Sheth." If you will notice very carefully, it speaks of the meaning as being **"substitute"** and mentions absolutely nothing about "compensate" or "sprout." You can even go to the word #7896 from which #8352 is taken and it suggests no such meaning! Futhermore, *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* agrees with *Strong's* on both words. You will find #7896 on page 819 of *Gesenius'.* I myself have 14 Bible dictionaries/encyclopedias including *Zondervan's* (a 5 volume set), *Interpreter's* (a 4 volume set) and *The Popular Critical Bible Encyclopedia,* (a 3 volume set). In addition to the Bible dictionaries/encyclopedias, I have 13 Bible commentaries including the *Interpreter's* 12 volume set. In checking through all these references on the name Seth, I only found one which suggested a meaning of "compensate", and another one which suggested a meaning of "sprout." These last meanings seems to be an invention of a person by the name of Ewald, see *Unger's,* page 999. Outside of these two references, most all of the other dictionaries/ encyclopedias and commentaries are generally agreed to the meaning of Seth as

"substitute" or "in place of." I submit, therefore, Lt. Col. Jack Mohr had both of these meanings before him, yet he rejected *Strong's* in favor to his unnamed Bible dictionary in order to fabricate his point, which he thought nobody would ever notice!!! This is the epitome of blatant, unabashed, brazen treachery and deceitfulness of the most evil kind!!!

Now for a few references to show that James E. Wise was correct when he made his statement that Seth was a "substitute" or "appointed" in the place of Abel:

The Pictorial Bible Dictionary, Merrill C. Tenny, general editor, page 774: "SETH (*seth,* Heb. *sheth* [so KJV in Num. 24:17; 1 Chron. 1:1], ...) ... His name (meaning 'appointed', i.e., 'substitute') signifies that he was considered a 'substitute' for Abel (4:25) His birth recalled man's tragic loss of divine image (5:1f). He became the founder of the line of faith (4:25; Luke 3:38)."

The Wycliffe Bible Commentary page 11: "The Hebrew word shows marked similarity to the word *shat*, translated 'appointed' or 'set.' In reality, Seth became the one on whom God could depend as the foundation stone for His family. He was 'set' or 'appointed' to take up the work and mission of Abel."

The *Adam Clarke's Commentary* abridged by Ralph Earle: "Eve must have received on this occasion some divine communication, else how could she have known that this son was appointed in the place of Abel, to continue that holy line by which the Messiah was to come?"

Matthew Poole's *Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 1, page 14: "*Instead of Abel;* to succeed his father Adam, as Abel should have done in the priesthood, and administration and care of holy things in the church of God."

The New World Dictionary Concordance to the New American Bible, page 619: "... The name is explained in popular ethnology which sees it deriving from the verb sith, to replace. Eve stated 'God has granted me another offspring in place of Abel'."

Now that it is conspicuously obvious, and we can plainly see this man's agenda, let's take a look at how ridiculous some of his conclusions are. Everything he is accusing James E. Wise of, he is guilty of himself. Let's take a look and see what Mohr says about Wise on page 12:

"But let's analyze Gen. 4:1 very carefully and see what it really says, not what some man [Wise] thinks it says. Read it for yourself, it is very clear. I can find no hint in this chapter, that Even [sic. Eve] thought Abel was the 'promised seed.' How could he [Abel] have been when he was killed. Do you mean that God would have given a 'promised seed' to Eve, only to be murdered? It doesn't make much sense, does it? The promised seed was 'Seth', who God gave her to take the place of Abel. It becomes a gross assumption on the part of the author [Wise], when he states: 'because of this, Cain could only have been the progeny of the serpent.' When we quote the 1 John 3:12 verse about Cain 'wicked one', we must see vs. 12 in its context, it cannot be lifted out of its proper setting just to prove a point that someone wants to make ..."

Mohr is totally lacking any insight on this one. We have read several references which show that Seth was an appointed seed in Abel's place, and that this is the very meaning of Seth's name. If Abel was not a "promised seed", there would have been

no need for his blood to cry from the ground. Why, then, did Abel's blood cry from the ground? Abel's blood was crying for revenge! Seth became the revenger of blood for Abel! Yahshua became the ultimate revenger of that blood, and will, in time, destroy all the descendants of Cain. This whole WAR is a blood-feud. The revenger of blood is spoken of in Numbers 35:19: **"The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer: when he meeteth him, he shall slay him."** It appears that Lt. Col. Jack Mohr has shot himself in the foot on this one also!

If one continues to shoot one's self in the foot long enough, one will find one doesn't have a leg to stand on. This is exactly what Lt. Col. Jack Mohr seems persistent in doing, as he shoots himself in the foot again on page 20. As he attempts to show you his great intellect on the subject of race, he goofs again. This is what he said:

"Here again we see Wise [James E. Wise] as he does some more 'supposing', when he states that the word GENERATION could be translated RACE. If you check your Strongs's Concordance, you will find the word Generation has five meanings. In the Old Testament we find the Hebrew word ('daur' — 1755, which means: 'an age; a dwelling'; posterity.') It is used thusly in Gen. 7:1— 'And the Lord said unto Noah, come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this GENERATION.' (Nothing here to do with RACE!) We find a second meaning to the word in Dan. 4:3 — where the word is (#1859 'dar' meaning 'generation.') In the New Testament, three Greek words are used for GENERATION. In Matt. 1:1— 'The Book of the GENERATION of Jesus Christ ...' Here the word is 'genesis', (#1078) which means: 'nativity; figurative, nature; generation'). In Matt. 3:7 we read: 'O GENERATION of vipers, who hath warned thee to flee from the wrath to come?' (Here the Greek word is 'gennema': — #1081, meaning: 'offspring; produce; fruit; generation.') Finally in Matt. 12:41 we read: 'The men of Ninevah shall rise up in judgment with this GENERATION, and shall condemn it.' (Here the word is 'genea' — #1974 [sic. 1074], meaning: 'a generation; an age; nation; time'). This is the only occasion in the entire Bible where the word GENERATION could mean RACE, but we see from the context that this is not what it means here. Once again, Wise has borne 'false witness' to what a word means."

As you will shortly see, the "false witness" is not James E. Wise, but rather Lt. Col. Jack Mohr! Let's start with the Hebrew word # 1755 which Mohr mistakenly interprets. *Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies,* page 184 says this concerning this word. (The Hebrew characters are exactly the same as shown in *Strong's*.): "... an age, a generation of men; <u>a race</u> of men contemporary, Gen. 6:9, *or,* implying conformity, Prov. xxx. 10-14. So it may be understood in that disputed passage, Isaiah liii. 8, 'his generation', <u>the race</u> conformed to the Messiah, equivalent to 'the seed', verse 10: Gen. vi. 9, &c., all, many generations, Heb. generation and generation; every generation. Heb. *id* ... Dan iv. 3, 3, 34, 34." How would you like to be serving under a jester like Mohr on a battle front, where you and the lives of several thousand others depended on his ludicrous judgment? Continuing now with the *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* on the Hebrew word #1755. Among the other

meanings *Gesenius'* says this on page 194: "The idea of *age,* or *generation* being neglected, it often means *a race of men* ..."

We will not go into every *Strong's* number reference that Mohr mentions here. However, it should be obvious, from this last example, that Mohr doesn't have the slightest idea of what he is talking about concerning the Old Testament. Let's see what Mohr says about the New Testament, besides that which is quoted above. If you will recall, Mohr is saying the only verse in the Bible that can be rendered "race" is Matthew 12:41, and there he states that it doesn't mean "race" in that case either. In other words, Mohr is, in effect, saying there is not one case in the entire Bible that refers to race. Now, that is a bold statement. Let's see if it will hold up under the magnifying glass. In *The Complete Word Study Dictionary, New Testament,* by Spiros Zodhiates, the Greek word #1078, *genesis,* is described in part as: "In the passive *genesis* means race, lineage, equivalent to *genea* (1074), genealogy, book of genealogy ..." Zodhiates then describes the Greek word #1074, *genea* in part: "Metaphorically spoken of the people of any generation or age, those living in any one period, a race or class ..." You can see very clearly, then, contrary to what Mohr says, these two words, *genesis* and *genea,* do imply race.

On page 22, Lt. Col. Jack Mohr says this: "God had appointed His Israel people to be a 'special, holy people' who according to 1 Peter 2:9 were to be: 'a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar (set aside for a special purpose); that ye (Israel) should show forth the praises of Him who called you out of darkness, into His marvelous light'."

If Mohr had had an *American Standard Version of the Bible,* he could have observed that "chosen generation" in this particular verse is rendered "an elect race." Mohr is way off base when he claims: "This is the only occasion in the entire Bible where the word 'generation' could mean 'race', but we see from the context that this is not what it means here." Evidently, Mohr is unaware of how to find the subject of race in the Bible. If we will turn to the word "generation" in W. E. Vine's *An Expository Dictionary Of New Testament Words,* it will direct us to go to page 291 for the word "kind." Here is what it says under this heading: "GENOS ..., akin to *ginomai,* to become, denotes (a) a family, Acts 4:6. 'kindred'; 7:13, R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'kindred'); 13:26, 'stock'; (b) an offspring, Acts 17:28; Rev. 22:16; (c) a nation, a race, Mark 7:26, R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'nation'); Acts 4:36, R.V. '(a man of Cyprus) by race', A.V., 'of the country of Cyprus'; *genos* does not mean a country, the word signifies parentage (Jews[?] had settled in Cyprus from, or even before, the reign of Alexander the Great); 7:19. R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'kindred'); 18:2, 24, R.V., 'by race' (A.V., 'born'); 2 Cor. 11:26, 'countrymen'; Gal. 1:14, R.V., 'countrymen' (A.V., 'nation'); Phil. 3:5,, 'stock'; 1 Pet 2:9 R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'generation'); (d) a kind, sort, class, Matt. 13:47, 'kind'; in some mss. in 17:21, A.V., 'kind'; Mark 9:29, 'kind', 1 Cor. 12:10, 28 'kinds' (A.V. 'diversities'); 14:10 (ditto) ..." With this kind of a foundation to work from, one should be able to find hundreds of passages on race. Lt. Col. Jack Mohr couldn't be more mistaken in his assertions on these Hebrew and Greek words. Now, who is really the one doing the "assuming" and being "intellectually dishonest"?

We should take note that Jeffrey A. Weakley highly recommends Jack Mohr for his expertise concerning the so-called fallacy of the subject of the Seedline doctrine. This is what he said in his *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History* on page 29: "There are other arguments, but the ones addressed here are the major ones that I have encountered. If you have encountered an argument and you are sincerely seeking an answer, I suggest that first you completely study it out in God's Word (look up definitions, check parallel passages, be sure of contest, etc.). After that, I suggest you contact men such as Pete Peters, Dan Gentry, Earl Jones, Jack Mohr, etc. ..." I guess the old saying is still true: birds of a feather really do flock together!

CONFUSION CONCERNING TREES

On page 6 of Mohr's *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* he continues to lambaste James E. Wise. As we will see, Mohr's criticism of what Wise was saying is totally unwarranted. This is what Mohr says in his supposed conjecture:

"Wise then goes on to make some very positive statements. which I do not believe he can back with Scripture. At least he doesn't do it here. He says: 'Therefore (because of the explanation he has given), that which is spoken of or called the 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil', was the devil. In other places he is called the devil, Belial, etc.' But there is no Scripture which will back up his contention, no matter how much you want to believe there is. The Idea that Satan or the devil was the seducer of Eve in the garden, may fit in with your theological concept, but it's not what the Word says.

"The author then mentions other trees in the garden when he says: 'In Gen. 2:9, God first mentions the stationary trees, pecan, peach, apricot, etc.' For the life of me, I can't find any of these trees listed anywhere in the Bible. The apple tree is listed, but no pecan, apricot or peach. If he's imagining these trees in the Garden, maybe he [sic. he's] imagining when he says Satan was there too. If a man will add words which aren't there, in order to 'sell his point', he's not to be trusted in his explanation. This man is 'intellectually dishonest', and willing to twist Scripture to make it say what he wants it to.

"He then goes on to the 'tree of life.' He indicates that these 'trees' were personalities of some kind or other, although the Bible says they were trees in the original language that is what they were. No chance to make them anything other than trees."

There you have it, Mohr just called our Messiah a wooden tree. Who else but our Savior is the "TREE OF LIFE"? How else do we eat of Him but by taking Communion? How much more blasphemous a remark can there be made than this? Mohr is totally inaccurate when he claims the pecan, peach and apricot trees are not mentioned in Scripture. He just didn't look for it. These trees are included in Genesis 1:29 when it says: "**And YHWH said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which *is* upon the face of all the earth, and every tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.**" Mohr is making an insinuation that this couldn't include a pecan, peach or apricot tree which have seeds. Mohr is not only blasphemous but totally unskilled in YHWH's Word. Yet, inasmuch as all the trees "bearing seed" were permitted by

YHWH to be eaten as food in Genesis 1:29, the trees of Genesis 3 couldn't have been fruit trees. Why would YHWH allow the fruit of the trees of Genesis 1:29 to be eaten, and then turn around and go back on own His own Word and make it unlawful to eat of one of them in Genesis 3? Talk about something that "don't make any sense", as Jack Mohr has said himself several times in this booklet. There simply is no better argument, that the trees of Genesis 3 were not wooden trees, than this passage. As Lt. Col. Jack Mohr said himself: "**God is not the author of confusion.**"

I wonder how Lt. Col. Jack Mohr might interpret Mark 8:22-24 which says: "**22 And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. 23 And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw aught. 24 And he looked up, and said, I see <u>men as trees walking</u>.**"

Oddly enough, the word tree in this passage also means a solid wooden tree. Let's now check *Strong's*, *Thayer* and Zodhiates to see what they have to say about the Greek word #1186: *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible*: "#1186 ... dendron from drus (*an oak*); *a tree:* —tree ."

Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, page 128: "#1186 ... to grow to the shape and size of a tree."

The Complete Word Dictionary, New Testament by Spiros Zodhiates, TH.D.: "#1186 ... dendron ...neut. noun. A Tree ... 'to become a tree' (a.t.) means become like a tree in size (cf. Mark 4:32). 'I see men as trees' means not distinctly, in an unusual size."

Question: When was the last time you saw a solid oak tree, just down the street, about 175 feet high with a trunk 5 feet in diameter, pull up its roots and start walking? It is obvious the Bible is using figurative language many times when it speaks of "trees." Hence the answer to Lt. Col. Jack Mohr's question on his thesis, *Seed of Satan, Literal of Figurative?* Lt. Col. Jack Mohr goofs again on page 5 of this booklet. Mohr argues thusly about the word "tree" in Genesis 3:17:

"While Eve had been warned by God not to eat of the 'tree of knowledge of good and evil', He has said nothing to her, which is recorded, about 'touching it.' (See Gen. 3:17). Eve was the one who added the 'touching business', when she talked with the serpent. Like so many of our people, she thought she had to add to the Word. The author [James E. Wise] then goes on to 'surmise', since he has no Scriptural proof, that the 'trees', in the Garden were not made up of 'sap, bark, and foliage.' In other words, these trees were not really trees, since trees cannot 'discern between good and evil.' Yet nothing written in this Scripture indicates that these 'trees', whatever they may have been, were supposed to do any discerning. The word TREE as used in this passage comes from the Hebrew word 'ets', 6095 and means 'a tree for firmness; hence wood; gallows; helve; stock; timber; tree; wood.' Absolutely no indication here that it refers to a 'person', or 'being' of any kind, such as a 'serpent' or 'Satan.' He goes on to compound his strange explanation by stating that these 'trees' were endowed with the gift of speech. Show me anywhere where the Scriptures so states."

What is noticeable here is that Mohr says the word for "trees", in Genesis 3:17 is #6095. It is not, however, it is #6086. It is from #6095, but it is not #6095. The Hebrew word #6095 is *atsah,* not *ets.* Actually, what Mohr does here is to correctly apply *ets,* but then goes on to use *Strong's* definition for *atsah.* Quite a deceptive maneuver, I would say. Anything to make his point! There can be quite a difference between #6086 and #6095. This is what *Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies* has to say about the word "tree" on page 453 (In this case, the Hebrew characters are identical to *Strong's* #6086):

"... a tree; often collective. trees: Gen. i. 11 &c. Figuratively, trees represent men, green trees the righteous, dry trees the wicked, Ezek xx. 47; xvii 24, all the trees of the field, all men, the high tree the lofty and powerful, the low tree the weak and contemptible ..."

From this definition by Wilson we can clearly see the Hebrew word #6086, *ets,* as used in Genesis 3:17 can be used both literally and figuratively. Mohr's argument that it can only mean a literal "tree" is completely flawed. This goes for all the other anti-seedliners who use this point of contention to establish a false premise. When one considers how dangerous it is, to life and limb, to present the Two Seedline message, it is quite inconsiderate of the anti-seedliners to harass the messenger in his duty to his Maker and His Kingdom! By doing this, the anti-seedliners are actually aiding and abetting the enemy in this time of WAR. It's tantamount to defecting over to the enemy's side when millions of lives of our brethren are at stake. Such treason is more damaging, in effect, than the evil, Satanic enemy can bring about.