

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #171; July, 2012 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Website: emahiser.christogenea.org

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and seventy-first monthly teaching letter and continues my fifteenth year of publication. I started this series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told* with WTL #137, and have been expanding on the seven stages of the story as follows: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage.

THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 30: "THE ESTRANGEMENT" continued:

In my last lesson, I explained how the individual, whether under Yahweh's Covenant or not, has no choice in the matter. The one exception is: that an Adamic White female of pure blood of the lines of Ham, Japheth, or some female of Shem's line not under the Covenant of Abraham, Isaac or Jacob, may marry a male under the Covenant, and thereupon she, or any children born to such a union will be brought under the Covenant. But if an Israelite female under the Covenant should marry a male Adamite not under the Covenant, neither he nor any children fathered by him will come under the Covenant. Yahweh's Covenant is for a family line, and must be kept within the male side of the family. We see such an instruction at Deut. 20:10-15:

"¹⁰ When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. ¹¹ And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, *that* all the people *that is* found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. ¹² And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: ¹³ And when Yahweh thy Elohim hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: ¹⁴ But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, *even* all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which Yahweh thy Elohim hath given thee. ¹⁵ Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities *which are* very far off from thee, which *are not of the cities of these [seven Canaanite] nations.*" [brackets mine.]

The criteria of this passage seems to conflict with the next three verses at Deut. 20:16-18, but it really doesn't, as it is identifying two genetically different peoples, and we should take that into account as we read it:

“¹⁶ But of the cities of these people, which Yahweh thy Elohim doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: ¹⁷ But thou shalt utterly destroy them; *namely*, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as Yahweh thy Elohim hath commanded thee: ¹⁸ That they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against Yahweh your Elohim.”

The first thing that we should notice is the fact that not all of the seven nations of the Canaanites are mentioned here. We have to remember that sometimes one (or portion of one) were often absorbed by another, (or a portion of another). When we consider the various Canaanite tribes in the land of Canaan and surrounding territory, we must think of them as city-states rather than countries. In addition, we must always consider them to be in a state of continual flux rather than an established people; each city-state with its own local monarchy. The situation was, which city-state kings were paying tribute to other city-state kings or queens. The only thing consistent about the Canaanite tribes is that wherever they go they carry their satanic genetics with them. Modern mestizos are shirttail relations to the Canaanites!

Consider that Yahweh instructed the Israelites to take other White Adamic people not under the Covenant captive, and if they didn't surrender peaceably and become tributaries, they were to kill all of the men, while keeping the women folk and children for themselves. We have to pause and ask the question: Why would Yahweh command such a thing? Thirteen hundred years before Abraham, Yahweh had to bring about a great flood to destroy all Adamites who had mixed their genetics with the nephilim (*i.e.*, fallen angels), allowing only Noah, his wife and their three sons and their wives to survive of the Adamic family tree. Maybe if we will review Hebrews 11:1-10, we will find the answer to our question (KJV translation):

“¹ Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. ² For by it the elders obtained a good report. ³ Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. ⁴ By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh. ⁵ By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God. ⁶ But without faith *it is* impossible to please *him*: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. ⁷ By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. ⁸ By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. ⁹ By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as *in* a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same

promise: ¹⁰ For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker *is* God.”

Now the same passage from William Finck's *The Christogenea New Testament*:

“ ¹ Now faith is expecting an assurance, evidence of the facts not being seen. ² For by this were the elders accredited. ³ By faith we perceive the ages to be furnished by the word of Yahweh, in which that which is seen has not come into being from things visible. ⁴ By faith Abel offered to Yahweh a better sacrifice than Cain, through which he was accredited to be righteous, having testified of Yahweh by his gifts, and being slain because of it he still speaks. ⁵ By faith Enoch was translated, not to see death, and was not found because Yahweh translated him; for before the translation he was accredited to be well pleasing to Yahweh. ⁶ But without faith it is impossible to please. Indeed it is necessary for one approaching Yahweh to believe that He is, and for those seeking Him, He becomes a rewarder. ⁷ By faith Noah was warned. Being cautious about things not yet seen he prepared a vessel for preservation of his house; by which he condemned the Society, and of that righteousness in accordance with faith he became heir. ⁸ By faith Abraham being called had obeyed, to go out into a place which he was going to receive for an inheritance, and went out not knowing where he would go. ⁹ By faith he sojourned in a land of the promise, as an alien having dwelt in tents with Isaak and Jakob, the joint heirs of that same promise. ¹⁰ For he was awaiting a city having those foundations of which Yahweh is craftsman and fabricator.”

From this passage in Hebrews, it is clear that Abraham was the last Adamic man that believed Yahweh. Like Noah, Abraham was singled out to receive Yahweh's inheritance in the form of a Covenant. Had there been any other Adamic man living that believed Yahweh at the time as Abraham did, Yahweh being a just Almighty One, He would have had to include that other person with Abraham. But there wasn't any other! In other words, Abraham, in his day, was Yahweh's last chance to select a chosen people; (possibly forever). We can only conclude that all other Adamic men (whether of Ham, Japheth, or the remaining portion of Shem) were excluded from the Abrahamic Covenant. Another way to put it is: The first ten chapters of Genesis concerns itself with the creation of the White Race, and the rest of the Bible pertains to one man and his family! This family is to be “patriarchal” in nature, not “matriarchal”, although our women hold a special honor in our White Israelite society, only if they don't contaminate their wombs by a sexual encounter with an alien male. As a result of Yahweh's Covenant with Abraham, those under the Covenant become “free”, while those not under the Covenant become “tributary” or servants to the “free”.

When we come to a comprehension of these things, we can better understand Paul where he wrote at Galatians 4:22-31:

“²² For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. ²³ But he *who was* of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman *was* by promise. ²⁴ Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. ²⁵ For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and

answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. ²⁶ But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. ²⁷ For it is written, Rejoice, *thou* barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. ²⁸ Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. ²⁹ But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit, even so *it is* now. ³⁰ Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. ³¹ So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.”

Now the same passage from William Finck’s *The Christogenea New Testament* reads:

“ ²² For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one of the servant woman and one of the free. ²³ Yet indeed he of the servant woman was born in accordance with the flesh, but he of the free by a promise. ²⁴ Such things are, being allegorized: For these are two covenants, one from Mount Sinai having resulted in bondage, which is Hagar. ²⁵ So Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to the present Jerusalem: for she is enslaved with her children. ²⁶ But the Jerusalem above is free, which is our mother. ²⁷ For it is written, ‘Be gladdened, barren who is not bearing; break fourth and shout, she who is not travailing; because many more are the children of the desolate than of she who has the husband.’ ²⁸ And we, brethren, down through Isaak, are children of promise. ²⁹ But just as at that time he who was born according to flesh had persecuted him according to Spirit, so also now. ³⁰ But what does the writing say? ‘Cast out the servant woman and her son, for by no means shall the son of the servant woman inherit along with the son of the free.’ ³¹ Well, brethren, we are not children of a servant woman, but of the free.”

Paul, in this passage, is speaking only of and to White Adamic people of the tribes of Ham, Shem and Japheth. What makes a difference between them is: some are under the Abrahamic Covenant, and many are not. To understand this, one must realize that Yahweh’s Covenant to Abraham divides the “servant class” from the “free class”, and that the “free class” are under the Covenant, and the “servant class” are not. And, to be under the Abrahamic Covenant requires that one be born of a family line, who down through their generations, have been under the Covenant. Here, a White Adamic woman not under the Covenant has an advantage over a White Adamic man not under the Covenant, as she can marry a White Adamic man under the Covenant, whereupon her or any children born to such a union will automatically come under the Abrahamic Covenant. Thus, this last cited woman, by marriage, can change her status from a “servant class” to a “free class”. Evidently, this is what is meant at Gen. 9:27:

“God [Elohim] shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.” We don’t want to make more out of this verse than we honestly should, for this blessing and curse by Noah was 1300 years before Abraham, and the state of affairs were not entirely the same. What we do have in this verse is the record where Noah blessed Shem and Japheth, while cursing Ham’s

illegitimate son, Canaan. What we can take from this verse is; Ham was neither blessed nor cursed at this time. We can only conjecture why Ham was not mentioned in this verse. The main point which should be made here is that the population of Japheth would increase while living under the roof of Shem. As I see it, this could only happen if one of Jacob's sons or grandsons, whose ancestors throughout their generations were of Shem, took a Japhethite woman to become his wife. And, the instructions at Deut. 20:10-15 demonstrate how this could happen!

I will next use three paragraphs from *Insight On The Scriptures*, vol. 1, p. 1017, to show what Paul was referring to at Galatians 4:22-31:

“HAGAR (Ha'gar). Sarah's Egyptian maidservant; later, Abraham's concubine and the mother of Ishmael. While in Egypt because of a famine in the land of Canaan, Abraham (Abram) came to have menservants and maidservants, and it may be that Hagar came to be Sarah's maidservant at this time. – Gen. 12:10, 16.

“Since Sarah (Sarai) remained barren, she requested that Abraham have relations with Hagar, giving her to Abraham as his wife. But upon becoming pregnant, Hagar began to despise her mistress to such an extent that Sarah voiced complaint to her husband. ‘So Abram said to Sarai: ‘Look! Your maidservant is at your disposal. Do to her what is good in your eyes.’ Then Sarai began to humiliate her so that she ran away from her.’ (Gen. 16:1-6) At the fountain on the way to Shur, Jehovah's [*sic Yahweh's*] angel found Hagar and instructed her to return to her mistress and to humble herself under her hand. Moreover, she was told that Jehovah [*sic Yahweh*] would greatly multiply her seed and that the son to be born to her was to be called Ishmael. Abraham was 86 years old when Ishmael was born. – Gen. 16:7-16.

“Years later, when Abraham prepared ‘a big feast on the day of Isaac's being weaned’ at the age of about 5 years, Sarah noticed Hagar's son Ishmael, now about 19 years old, ‘poking fun.’ This was no innocent child's play. As implied by the next verse in the account, it may have involved a taunting of Isaac over heirship. Here Ishmael was making early manifestation of the antagonistic traits that Jehovah's [*sic Yahweh's*] angel foretold would be shown by him. (Gen. 16: 12) Apparently fearing for the future of her son Isaac, Sarah requested Abraham to drive out Hagar and her son. This displeased Abraham, but at Jehovah's [*sic Yahweh's*] direction he followed through on his wife's request. Early the next morning he dismissed Hagar with her son, giving her bread and a skin water bottle. – Gen. 21:8-14.”

Inasmuch as Egypt was known as “the land of Ham”, Hagar may have been a Hamite, but we have no solid evidence that she was. We are not even told specifically how Abraham acquired Hagar as a handmaid. All we are told of Abraham's sojourn in Egypt is found at Gen. 13:1-2: **“¹ And Abram went up out of Egypt, he, and his wife, and all that he had, and Lot with him, into the south. ² And Abram was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.”** We learn a little more at Gen. 24:34-35 where it is stated: **“³⁴ And he said, I am Abraham's servant. ³⁵ And Yahweh hath blessed my master greatly; and he is become great: and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and menservants, and maidservants, and camels, and asses.”** We can see that it is only assumed that Abraham received Hagar as a

maidservant from the Pharaoh of Egypt. But the thing we can be absolutely sure of is that Hagar was an Egyptian.

If you will also remember, the Bible narrative relates that the Egyptian pharaoh gave Joseph his wife. We also know that Joseph's wife was of the House of Shem, for her father was a priest of On. On was called "Beth Shemesh", meaning House of the people of Shem. Unless the pharaoh that gave Joseph his wife was also of the House of Shem, he wouldn't have had the authority to do so. At this point, I will relate to you what one of my proofreaders pointed out in one of his letters to me on this subject:

"Concerning Beth-Shemesh, and we may have discussed this, and from your letters certainly you see it, but I am compelled to discuss it again here. 'Shemesh', I am convinced is surely a double-entendre. For the word means 'sun' in Hebrew, obviously from the Greek translation 'Heliopolis' which means 'city (polis) of the sun (helios)', but also, and just as well in palaeo Hebrew, means 'people of Shem.' For the people of Shem are the 'light of the world' (Matt. 5:14), and just like the ancient Pharaohs, Yahshua is represented as the source of light, Rev. 21:23; John 1:4-9; 8:12; Rev. 22:16.

"About this Greek word ἥλιος, helios, Strong's 2246 'hay-lee-os' which means 'the sun', I am certain it is simply a version of the following Hebrew words: 1966 heylel 'hay-lale' from 1984 ... the morning star:– lucifer. 1984 halal 'haw-lal' a primitive root '... to shine ...' which of course gives us 'halo', 'halogen', etc." *William Finck*

Many are unaware that before the city of On was named "On" it was called Beth-shemesh, or house of Shem, also meaning house of the sun, and called Heliopolis by the Greeks. This information can be found in *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia Of The Bible*, vol. 4, page 535. From this it is quite evident that Joseph's wife, Asenath, was as racially pure as the falling snow. How some of the tribe of Shem settled in Egypt, I have no answer, other than this evidence.

There is another aspect concerning Joseph's wife Asenath, and that is the fact that she was not under the Covenant given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but she would come under the Covenant by her marriage to Joseph, so her two sons Ephraim and Manasseh were not half-breeds in any sense of the word! On the other hand, a male non-Israelite (not of Jacob's lineage) from the house of Shem could not come under the Covenant by marrying an Israelite woman. Inasmuch as the house of Shem had a priesthood in Egypt during the time of Joseph, it is doubtful that Hagar was a Shemite, since she was a maidservant, which would be an unlikely rank for a priestly class.

After Hagar and her son, Ishmael, were banished from the home of Abraham, we are informed that they evidently attempted to go to Hagar's home country, but fell short of that objective at Gen. 21:21-22:

"²⁰ And God was with the lad; and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer. ²¹ And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran: and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt."

From *The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia*, vol, 2, p. 750, under "Hagar ... Expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael" states in part: "Of the subsequent history of Ishmael we have no account further than that he established himself in the wilderness

of Paran, in the neighborhood of Sinai, was married by his mother to a countrywoman of her own, and maintained both himself and family by the produce of his bow,”

Since Hagar is declared to be an Egyptian at Gen. 16:3; 21:9 & 25:12, we can be sure she was headed for her homeland with her son Ishmael. We can also be confident that Sarah would have chosen a pure White Adamic woman to have mothered a son for Abraham. But we are not certain of the ethnicity of the woman that Hagar found for Ishmael. Gen. 21:21-22 seems to imply that Hagar and her son Ishmael didn't make it all the way to Egypt, but settled in Paran in the vicinity of Mt. Sinai.

To demonstrate how some ethnic groups become mixed, I will refer how Egypt, much later, had gotten into a conflict with the Hittite empire, and after a long protracted war (which neither side was able to win) they declared a truce. As a token of goodwill they exchanged women, from which Hittite women entered the Egyptian royal harem and polluted the pharaonic line. To show the reader that Mt. Sinai has something to do with the story of Hagar and Ishmael, I will quote Paul at Gal. 4:22-31:

“²² For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. ²³ But he *who was of the bondwoman* was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. ²⁴ Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is [H]Agar. ²⁵ For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. ²⁶ But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. ²⁷ For it is written, Rejoice, *thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.* ²⁸ Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. ²⁹ But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was born after the Spirit*, even so *it is now.* ³⁰ Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. ³¹ So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.”

The sundry commentaries really have twisted this passage up like a pretzel. Adam Clarke, in his 6-volume Commentary, did manage to make a couple of observations on vv. 23 & 29, which are worth mentioning where it reads: **“²³ But he *who was of the bondwoman* was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. ... ²⁹ But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was born after the Spirit.*”** Clarke states in part, vol. 6, p. 228: **“... Was born after the flesh –** Ishmael was born according to the ordinary course of nature, his parents being both of proper [reproductive] age, so that there was nothing uncommon or supernatural in his birth **... By promise –** The birth of Isaac was supernatural; the effect of an especial promise of God, and it was only on the ground of that promise that it was either credible or possible.” In other words, Sarah's womb, along with her other female reproductive parts were essentially dead! Therefore, for Sarah to conceive past her childbearing time of life was an act of Yahweh's Spirit resurrecting her womb along with her other female reproductive parts from the dead! For one who is a descendant of Isaac through Jacob, you in like manner are brought forth from the dead womb of

Sarah. Hence, to be lineally from Sarah is to be categorically “free”. Otherwise one is categorically a “bond-servant.”

This last passage at Gal. 4:22-31 is based on Gen. 21:9-12 where it states:

“⁹ And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking. ¹⁰ Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. ¹¹ And the thing was very grievous in Abraham’s sight because of his son. ¹² And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.” It should be very clear here that Sarah caused Ishmael, the son of Hagar, to be disinherited! Sarah goofed up once by suggesting that Hagar produce Abraham an heir, but she wasn’t about to blunder again by letting Ishmael become that heir instead of Isaac! This is Covenant Theology at its highest level! Its the difference between being “bond” or “free”! Covenant Theology began with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and his twelve sons, and comes on down to us through the patriarchal father of each succeeding family. We can be thankful for our mother Sarah, and how she unyieldingly stood her rightful, lawful ground! (Can anyone imagine Yahweh telling Abraham, “In Ishmael shall thy seed be called”?) Had not Sarah stood up to Abraham, that is what might have happened! This is not the only time that a Covenant lady had to step into the fray and rectify an injustice. After all, Sarah was just acting like a she-bear protecting her natural-born cub.

THE SILLY NOTION THAT MAN CAN CHOOSE YAHWEH!

It is clearly stated at John 15:13-17: **“¹³ Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. ¹⁴ Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. ¹⁵ Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his master doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. ¹⁶ Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and *that* your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you. ¹⁷ These things I command you, that ye love one another.”**

This should convince one that if one is not “chosen” by Yahweh, one has no hope of ever coming to Him. Not only that, if one is not “drawn” by Yahweh, there is no hope that one can be “drawn” to Him, John 6:44-45, 65 (KJV): **“⁴⁴ No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. ⁴⁵ It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. ... ⁶⁵ And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.”**

Another passage that spells this out loud and clear is 1 John 4:9-10. We shall see that Yahweh in the flesh came to us, not we to Him!: **“⁹ In this was manifested the love of God [i.e., Yahweh] toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son**

into the world, that we might live through him. ¹⁰ **Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.**

Yet again, Titus 3:4-6 explains Yahweh's "kindness" toward man, not man's "kindness" or affection toward Yahweh: "⁴ **But after that the kindness and love of God [i.e., Yahweh in the flesh] our Saviour toward man appeared,** ⁵ **Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;** ⁶ **Which he shed on us abundantly through Yahshua Christ our Saviour ...**"

Commenting on John 6:44, Adam Clarke states in vol. 5 of 6, page 337: "... **Except the father ... draw him** – But how is a man drawn? St. Augustine answers from the poet, *Trahit sua quemque voluptas*: A man is attracted by that which he delights in. So God draws man: he shows him his wants – he shows him the Savior whom he has provided for him. Unless God thus draw, no man will ever come to Christ; because none could without this drawing, [nor] ever feel the need of a Saviour. [All outward influences and inward perceptions and dispositions, which lead men to God, and all the powers by which they seek him are divine bestowments, and the salvation of the sinner is therefore purely a matter of grace on God's part toward him]" [*underlining mine*]

When are we ever going to learn that we as descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob can do absolutely nothing to bring ourselves to Yahweh! I have said it before, and I will repeat it again, "The highest level of Israel Identity is Covenant Theology." I have spent many of my 85 years in churchianity, and I can attest that the churches I attended and the many sermons I have heard taught very little about the Biblical Covenants, and when they did, they twisted them up like pretzels. In the book of Genesis, we have a very abbreviated story of the creation; Noah's flood; the tower of Babel; and starting with Genesis chapter 12, we have the call of Abraham. With the call of Abraham, and throughout the rest of the Bible, the context is about one man (Abraham) and his family, and **no one else!** There were eight other Covenants with Adam-man, and all of Adam's descendants will be in the resurrection. However, all those born of Sarah will be "free", while those not born of Sarah were/will be "bond". Other than these, I believe that the priest-line from Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, Kainan, Salah, Heber, Peleg, Rue, Serug, Nahor, and Terah, as firstborn priests of the order of Melchizedek, (of which Christ became the greatest) will hold a special place among the Patriarchs, equivalent to those under the Abrahamic Covenant. (The Bible does not record the origin of the nonwhite races, nor do they fall under any of Yahweh's nine covenants with Adam-man!) It's a joke to believe otherwise!

Nominal churchianity attempts to tell us that John 3:16 is the "golden text of the Bible". While John 3:16 is truly in the Scripture, it is best rendered in William Finck's *The Christogenea New Testament*:

"For Yahweh so loved the Society, that He gave the most-beloved Son, in order that each who believes in Him would not be lost but would have eternal life."

In order to properly understand the context for this verse, it is imperative that we ask: what, when, where, why, how and to whom it is referring to. Inasmuch as the

whole context of the Bible hangs on Covenant Theology, the “whom” can only be Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his twelve sons! In other words, Yahweh loved whom? or which Society?

When Yahweh had taken one of Adam’s ribs and created Eve, then presented her to him, he exclaimed: **“This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh ...”**, Gen. 2:23.

At Eph. 5:29-30 we read: **“²⁹ For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Yahshua the church: ³⁰ For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.”** To rightly interpret this passage, it can only be referring to the Adamic race. And of that race, primarily Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his twelve sons, and the offspring of Jacob’s twelve sons. That is why I still insist that the highest level of Christian Israel Identity (C.I.I.) is Covenant Theology! The problem is (and I include myself), when we first learn C.I.I., we drag a lot of excess baggage out of the various denominations. My experience has been that I had to scrutinize everything I thought I had learned (or I thought I knew) and start all over from the very beginning! It’s known as becoming as a “child”, Matt. 18:4! Needless to say, its a never ending submission to the truth.