

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #175; November, 2012 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830 / 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-fifth 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 its seven stages ever since: (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 34: THE ESTRANGEMENT continued:

In the last lesson, #174, we left off by discussing Jeremiah 2:11-12. We will now continue with Jeremiah 2:13-17:

“¹³ For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. ¹⁴ Is Israel a servant? is he a homeborn slave? why is he spoiled? ¹⁵ The young lions roared upon him, and yelled, and they made his land waste: his cities are burned without inhabitant. ¹⁶ Also the children of Noph and Tahapanes have broken the crown of thy head. ¹⁷ Hast thou not procured this unto thyself, in that thou hast forsaken Yahweh thy Elohim, when he led thee by the way?”

We will not comprehend verse 13 above, concerning “living waters” and “broken cisterns”, unless we examine Prov. 5:15-20:

“¹⁵ Drink waters out of thine own cistern [*i.e., genetic clan*], and running waters out of thine own well [*i.e., race*]. ¹⁶ Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad, and rivers of waters in the streets. ¹⁷ Let them be only thine own, and not strangers' with thee. ¹⁸ Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice with the wife of thy youth. ¹⁹ Let her be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy thee at all times; and be thou ravished always with her love. ²⁰ And why wilt thou, my son, be ravished with a strange woman, and embrace the bosom of a [*racial*] stranger?”

Therefore, a “broken cistern” can be no other than the product of a racially-mixed affair! I say an “affair”, as a racially-mixed union is not a legitimate marriage, but a pernicious violation of Yahweh’s marriage law of kind after kind! We can safely proclaim that “Yahweh hates the products of racially-mixed affairs”, as He hates the mixed-race offspring of Esau, who mixed his seed with Hittite women (Mal. 1:2-3)! I can say “safely proclaim”, inasmuch as Yahweh created a donkey, and He created a horse,

but He didn't create a mule! Even nature itself teaches us segregation of kind after kind. For instance, one will never behold a robin mating with a blackbird, or a blue jay mating with a sparrow! To declare otherwise, one has to be stark raving, foaming at the mouth mad! Hence, it is high time for mentally healthy people to condemn multiculturalism! To remain mute on the subject is the sin of omission, which gives the advocate of racial promiscuity license to commit racial violence!

We are warned concerning "**blood toucheth blood**" at Hos. 4:2, but I will cite vv 1-6: "**¹ Hear the word of Yahweh, ye children of Israel: for Yahweh hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because *there is* no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of Elohim in the land. ² By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood. ³ Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth therein shall languish, with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven; yea, the fishes of the sea also shall be taken away. ⁴ Yet let no man strive, nor reprove another: for thy people *are* as they that strive with the priest. ⁵ Therefore shalt thou fall in the day, and the prophet also shall fall with thee in the night, and I will destroy thy mother. ⁶ My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy Elohim, I will also forget thy children.**"

It is interesting that in the margin of my KJV on Hos. 4:2, where it states "**blood toucheth blood**", it indicates "Heb. *bloods*." Therefore the context must be plural! Many of my commentaries verify that "blood", in this case, is indeed "bloods". The problem with the commentaries is that they do not separate the words "killing" from "bloods", essentially giving both words the same Hebrew meaning. Primarily the Hebrew word for "killing" is Strong's #7523 *raw-tsakh'* and means:

"A primitive root; properly to *dash* in pieces, that is, *kill* (a human being), especially to *murder*: - put to death, kill, (man-) slay (-er), murder (-er)."

Whereas the Hebrew word for "blood" is Strong's #1818 *dawm* and means: "From H1826 (compare H119); *blood* (as that which when shed causes *death*) of man or an animal; by analogy the *juice* of the grape; figuratively (especially in the plural) *bloodshed* (that is, *drops* of blood): - blood (-y, -guiltiness, [-thirsty]), + innocent."

The *Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, p. 805, states in part on v. 2:

"2. They break out into acts of violence, and **blood toucheth blood**. One murder led to another, and the trail of blood was continuous. Idolatry and crimes of violence are closely related in Hosea's thinking"

From the 6-volume *Commentary* by Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, vol. 4, p. 470, we read in part: "... Thus, presently after Shallum murdered Zachariah after six months' reign, Menahem smote Shallum after reigning a full month: then he attacked Tirzah, and ripped up the women with child"

What the commentaries fail to do is separate (1) "**swearing**" #422, (2) "**lying**" #3584, (3) "**killing**" #7523, (4) "**stealing**" #1589, and (5) "**committing adultery**" #5003, **they break out**, and (6) **blood** #1818, (7) **toucheth** #5060 **blood** #1818." I hope the reader can now grasp how these commentaries are substituting "**killing**" #7523 for "**blood**" #1818. Not only that, but they are completely overlooking the

Hebrew word used as an idiom in many cases, “**toucheth**” #5060. We will now review what I wrote in my *Research Papers Proving Two Seedline Seduction Of Eve*, in part:

**WHAT WAS IT THAT EVE DID “EAT” ?
AND WHAT DID EVE “TOUCH” ?**

RE. “EAT”, #398 (akal, to eat, also to lay), Scripture – Genesis 3:13, *And Yahweh said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. Supporting Scripture* – Proverbs 30:20, *Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she [eateth], and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness. Another Supporting Scripture* – Proverbs 9:17, *Stolen waters are sweet, and bread [eaten] in secret is pleasant. Note: The word “eat” of Genesis 3:13 is the same word for “eateth” and “eaten” of Proverbs 30:20 ... !!!*

RE. “TOUCH”, #5060 (naga, to touch, also to have sexual intercourse) Scripture – Genesis 3:3, *But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. Supporting Scripture* – Genesis 26:10-11, *10 And Abimelech said, What is this thou hast done unto us? one of the people might have lien with thy wife, and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us. 11 And Abimelech charged all his people, saying, He that toucheth this man or his wife shall surely be put to death. Second Supporting Scripture* – Genesis 20:6, *And Yahweh said unto him (Abimelech) in a dream, Yea, I know that thou didst this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to touch her (Sarah). Third Supporting Scripture* – Proverbs 6:29, *So he that goeth in to his neighbour’s wife; whosoever toucheth her shall not be innocent. Note: The word “touch” of Genesis 3:3 is the same word for “touch” or “toucheth” of Genesis 26:11, Geneses 20:6 and Proverbs 6:29! [end of citation]*

My contention is that regarding **committing adultery** and **bloods toucheth bloods** Hosea didn’t flippantly and randomly go from one topic to another, but stayed on the same subject where he stated: “... **and committing adultery, they break out, and blood[s] toucheth blood[s]**” In addition to this, the Hebrew word for “toucheth” (Strong’s #5060) at Hosea 4:2 is the same as the word “touch” at Genesis 3:3 where Eve was instructed:

“But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, Elohim hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch⁵⁰⁶⁰ it, lest ye die.” Of course, if we don’t understand that “touch” in this case is a Hebrew idiom for sexual intercourse, we’ll not grasp what either this passage or Hosea 4:2 are saying! Nor will we comprehend what a “**broken cistern**” is at Jer. 2:13-17. Actually, Cain was the first “**broken cistern**” (as all half-breeds are), as he was conceived by “**bloods touching bloods**”!

Before we go any farther, it is paramount that we discern the meaning where the Biblical word “**blood**” is used in a singular sense! We find a clarification at Acts 17:26:

“And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation”

If this passage meant all the races on the earth, as nominal churchianity insists, there would be no need of "... appoint[ing] ... the bounds of their habitation" Rightly, my KJV center-reference from Acts 17:26 sends me to Deut. 32:8, which states:

"When the most High divided to the (the Genesis 10 White Adamic) 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." Therefore, it is **blatant heresy** to attempt to include all races of men at Acts 17:26 & Deut. 32:8!

From these two passages we can clearly see that all of the White nations that descended from Adam are considered as **"ONE BLOOD"**! So when we read at Hosea 4:2, "... **committing adultery, they break out, and blood[s] toucheth blood[s]**, we can comprehend that there were some hanky-panky, illicit sexual encounters going on among some of the members of the tribe of Judah with unclean, nonwhite aliens!

Jeremiah at 23:13-14 spells it out in clear language what kind of **"adultery"** the nation of Judah was committing: **"¹³ And I have seen folly in the prophets of Samaria; they prophesied in Baal, and caused my people Israel to err. ¹⁴ I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing: they commit adultery, and walk in lies: they strengthen also the hands of evildoers, that none doth return from his wickedness: they are all of them unto me as Sodom, and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah."**

This is more serious than recorded at Jer. 5:7-8: **"⁷ How shall I pardon thee for this? thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods: when I had fed them to the full, they then committed adultery, and assembled themselves by troops in the harlots' houses. ⁸ They were as fed horses in the morning: every one neighed after his neighbour's wife."** This informs us that the men of Judah (like the men of Israel before them) were flocking themselves like herds into Canaanite whorehouses. It should be apparent to all that this is even more grievous than, **"... every one neighed after his neighbour's wife."** Both situations are intolerable! And if one is of the opinion that women back then didn't engage in such activities, just take a look at what kind of activities our beautiful White women are indulging in today with nonwhite alien races! There is no doubt about it, it is still like Hos. 4:2, **"... blood[s] toucheth blood[s]"** Brenton's Septuagint reads on Hos. 4:2:

"Cursing, and lying, and murder, and theft, and adultery abound in the land, and they mingle blood with blood." Charles Thomson's Septuagint also reads similar, **"... and blood mingleth with blood."** I checked on how the original Greek reads on this verse, and William Finck advised me that the Septuagint Greek reads **"... they mingle bloods with bloods"**! On top of this evidence, both Gesenius' (p. 532) and Strong's under #5060 define *nâga* in part: Gesenius: **"... to touch a woman, to lie with her"** Strongs: **"... euphemism, to lie with a woman); by implication to reach"**

Also, it should be pointed out that often the term "blood" simply means near of kin, or one's own race. In the *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*, p. 152, under the word "blood", five of the thirteen definitions read: **"... 7. parental heritage; family line; lineage 8. racial heritage; race; a loose unscientific usage, for there are no ethnic differences in blood 9. relationship by descent in the same family**

line; kinship **10**. descent from nobility or royalty **11**. descent from purebred stock ...” It appears like the lexicographer added a very inappropriate excerpt “... for there are no ethnic differences in blood ...” in order to confuse the unwary (*i.e.*, easily fooled). I have to agree that it is a very “... loose unscientific usage ...” Otherwise the segment “... racial heritage; race ...” under definition #8, is outstandingly proper! [*underlining mine*]

To get an idea of how the Hebrew word translated “blood” (Strong’s #1818) is used in the Old Testament in relation to kinship, I will quote from the 6-volume *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. #1, p. 422 in part: “**AVENGER OF BLOOD** ... In the Old Testament the *go’el* (Redeemer, Avenger) is one – usually the nearest relative (which ‘goel’ consequently has also come to mean) – charged with vindicating justice either by redeeming family property expropriated or sold under constraint or (in the case of *go’el had’dam*, the avenger of blood) avenging the unlawful slaying of a family member.

“The avenger of blood is a figure that appears in primitive justice. By ancient custom it was the right, indeed the duty, of persons (the nearest of kin) to avenge the slaying of a relative. This is perhaps why Cain feared for his life after slaying Abel (Gen. 4:14), and why Lamech justified himself (Gen. 4:23-24). It also is likely that Jehovah [sic Yahweh] sanctioned this kind of retributive justice in the still un-institutionalized society of the immediate post-flood period when He announced the principle of reckoning and reprisal reported in Genesis 9:5-6.

“Since individual blood vengeance was widespread in the Near East before the formation of the people of Israel, it is evident that Moses did not institute the custom. The Mosaic legislation did, however, recognize and allow it; the Avenger of Blood was a figure wellknown in Israel at least until the time of David (2 Sam. 14:7-8).

“Significant however, is the fact that the Mosaic legislation did not leave the custom of individual blood vengeance unregulated. For one thing the Mosaic law made a distinction between accidental and deliberate homicide (Deut. 19:4-5; Num. 35:22). Second, it provided escape from the wrath of the avenger by establishing cities of refuge to which any killer might flee in order to escape the immediate and non-judicial judgment of the avenger (Num. 35:9-15). Third, it interposed between the killer and the avenger the judicial judgment of the elders, the acknowledged representatives of society as a whole (Deut. 19:12). Fourth, it stipulated that no person should be put to death on the testimony of merely one witness (Num. 35:30). By these provisions the ancient custom of individual blood vengeance was in effect outlawed; the avenger now becoming little more than the public executioner”

What I would like the reader to comprehend is that when the KJV reads “**blood toucheth blood**”, or the LXX “... **and blood mingleth with blood**” at Hos. 4:2, it has reference to race-mixing, a violation of Yahweh’s law of kind after kind! Here is an example:

- Genesis 1:4: “And God saw the light, that *it was good* ...”
- Genesis 1:10: “... and God saw that *it was good* ...”
- Genesis 1:12: “... and God saw that *it was good*.”
- Genesis 1:18: “... and God saw that *it was good*.”
- Genesis 1:21 “... and God saw that *it was good*.”

- Genesis 1:25 "... and God saw that *it was good.*"
- Genesis 1:31 "... And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, *it was very good.*"

You will notice from all of this that God didn't create anything in Genesis chapter 1 that was not good. Any living being that has DNA from two different genetic species, are two kinds of seed encapsulated into one genetic mule-type hybrid. This brings us to the Bible's most serious offense. Everywhere in the Old Testament the Hebrew word for "seed", "sperm" or "descendant" (*i.e.*, "offspring") is Strong's #2233 "zera", except Lev. 19:19 and Deut. 22:9, where the Strong's #3610 is used for "seeds", "diverse kind", "mingled seed" and "mingled"; (once for "seeds" at Deut. 22:9, and three times as "diverse kind", "mingled seed" and "mingled" at Lev. 19:19) in the KJV. These two passages, with their four occurrences, are an exception to the rule. I will now quote these two verses from e-Sword, with words for Strong's #3610 underlined along with each of the four King James Version renderings:

Deut. 22:9: "**Thou shalt not**³⁸⁰⁸ **sow**²²³² **thy vineyard**³⁷⁵⁴ **with divers seeds**³⁶¹⁰. **lest**⁶⁴³⁵ **the fruit**⁴³⁹⁵ **of thy seed**²²³³ **which**⁸³⁴ **thou hast sown,**²²³² **and the fruit**⁸³⁹³ **of thy vineyard**³⁷⁵⁴, **be defiled**⁶⁹⁴²."

Lev. 19:19: "**Ye shall keep**⁸¹⁰⁴⁺⁸⁵³ **my statutes**²⁷⁰⁸. **Thou shalt not**³⁸⁰⁸ **let thy cattle**⁹²⁹ **engender**⁷²⁵⁰ **with a diverse kind**³⁶¹⁰: **thou shalt not**³⁸⁰⁸ **sow**²²³² **thy field**⁷⁷⁰⁴ **with mingled seed**³⁶¹⁰: **neither**³⁸⁰⁸ **shall a garment**⁸⁹⁹ **mingled**³⁶¹⁰ **of linen and woolen**⁸¹⁶² **come**⁵⁹²⁷ **upon**⁵⁹²¹ **thee.**"

I will repeat again that these four occurrences are the only places where Strong's Hebrew #3610 is used, and from the KJV it is rendered once as "seeds" at Deut. 22:9, and three times as "diverse kind", "mingled seed" and "mingled" at Lev. 19:19. But, the KJV cannot always be trusted. Sometimes, when the lexicographers can't find a root word in Hebrew, they will often turn to the Arabic because of the similarity of the two languages.

Strong's *Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary*:

"**3610.** ... **kil'ayim**, *kil-ah'-yim*; dual of 3608 in the original sense of *separation*; *two heterogeneties*:— *divers seeds* (-e kinds), *mingled* (seed)."

#s 3610 and 3608 seem to be a strange pair of Hebrew words! #H3610 is rendered "divers seeds", "diverse kind", "mingled seed", and "mingled", from #H3608 which means "a prison". It would appear what we have here are two individual seeds with dissimilar genetics imprisoned or locked into one capsule from which neither can escape. In other words, "two, of a twofold kind" imprisoned in a single living being or plant. In Bible times, the prophets and priests knew nothing about DNA or chromosomes, so they used other descriptions.

From *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, ch. 4, Dialogue of Justin, Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, speak of something similar: "... The Soul of Itself Cannot See God." – "Tell me, however, this: Does the soul see [God] so long as it is in the body, or after it has been removed from it?" – "So long as it is in the form of a man, it is possible for it,' ... 'And what do those suffer who are judged to be unworthy of this spectacle?' said he. – 'They are imprisoned in the bodies of certain wild beasts, and this is their punishment.'" [*emphasis mine*] (See my *Angels That Sinned "Chained In Darkness"*, 2

Pet. 2:4 & Jude 6 (#1). It would appear “the angels that sinned” are genetically mixed $\frac{1}{2}$ & $\frac{1}{2}$ with animal-kind/s! Until we comprehend that there is no record that Yahweh created the nonwhite races, we are naïvely doomed to adopt dangerous premises. It is my desire that the reader is beginning to grasp the meaning of the Hebrew word “**kil’ayim**”, being two dissimilar seed[s] permanently imprisoned together, which in reference to people it would be in the body of a beast, along with the offspring thereafter. I hope the reader can now see the difference between “kil’ayim” and “zera”!

This has been an over-protracted amount of comprehensive Biblical research in order to comprehend how a single verse at Jeremiah 2:13 fits the context of the rest of Scripture, which reads:

“¹³ For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.”

In short, a “broken cistern” is a person of mixed-race. In 2012 America has a “broken cistern” for a president! What’s more, a “broken cistern” cannot be fixed, as it is the unforgivable sin! When a “broken cistern” is conceived, the White party contributes 23 beneficial chromosomes while the nonwhite party contributes 23 non-compatible, defective chromosomes. During the nine months gestation period, from conception until birth, these two incompatible pairs of 23 chromosomes unite to become 46 discordant chromosomes to begin the development process which becomes the organs and extremities of the baby’s body. And because of the confusion of the DNA, the final product is distorted and misshapen in many unusual ways, both mentally and physically. Should one pontificate that this condition could be remedied, consider the following: First of all, one must understand that every single cell making up the body of a person contains the original chromosomes contributed by the father and the mother! Inasmuch as the body of a man [or woman] has more than a million million (1,000,000,000,000) cells, if a medical procedure were developed to remove and replace the defective 23 chromosomes from each individual cell, it would require a million million (or 1,000,000,000,000) separate medical operations! This would take a multitude of lifetimes on the operating table to complete! And where would they find a chromosome bank to obtain the genetically pure chromosomes to replace the defective ones? Is it any wonder that Yahweh is so strict on maintaining racial purity? It appears we White Israelites should take this “**blood touching blood**” thing very seriously!

To demonstrate just how grievous this matter is, I will quote from a very excellent 241-page book entitled, *Racial Hybridity*, by Philip Jones B.A., page 38-41, under the subtitle, “Once Mixed, Always mixed”. Before I make this citation, I would explain that Philip Jones is a brother to Stephen E. Jones, whom I have had to criticize big time. But I would advise the reader that, although Philip and Stephen are brothers, their belief systems are 180° opposed to each other! Stephen Jones has a daughter of color (and since I served in the Navy in 1945-1946 in the Philippines, I am familiar with Filipino appearance). Therefore I believe Jones’ daughter of color is a Filipino. From my observation, Stephen teaches the false doctrine of “universalism”, while Philip is strongly non-universal, and highly promotes purity of race.

“ONCE MIXED, ALWAYS MIXED

“When the races mix, genes become hopelessly intertwined and nothing can ever be done to unscramble the mixture. No amount of breeding will breed back a mongrel into a pure-bred. It has been said that once the chromosome is halved, it is lost irretrievably.

“David Jordan says: ‘Two individuals of diverse race differ in a very great number of genes: In crosses the genes of the two races become inextricably intermingled in many different combinations. Consequently the different characteristics of the two races likewise become inextricably combined. After a cross, there is *no chance of recovering either pure race in later generations.*’ (emphasis added by Philip).

“Reuter agrees with Mr. Jordan: ‘But however wide the variations, however numerous the varieties, the mixed race can never become, biologically, either Negro or white. Interbreeding or further crossing produces new hybrids. No amount of interbreeding or of crossing can ever produce a White man or a negro from a hybrid ancestry. The hybrid individual is a biologically unstable type and he and his descendants remain hybrid and physically unstable ...’

“Scheinfeld explains: ‘... the same gene which directed the fashioning of your big toe, will also be found in your eye cells – or in your ear and liver cells, for that matter. Probably, then, in addition to every special task that each gene performs, it also takes part in general activities which makes its presence required everywhere.’ We see then that one alien gene is capable of influencing many of the workings of the body. In race-mixing the genes for building hair in the negro desire to build kinks, while Nordic genes work to make the hair smooth and straight. The result is either dominance by one over the other or compromise. Dawkins says: ‘More usually when two alternative genes are not identical, the result is some kind of compromise – the body is built to an intermediate design or something completely different.’

“Morris states that each gene ‘affects many characteristics and every characteristic is controlled by many genes ... ‘Every character of an organism is affected by all genes, and every gene affects all characters. It is this interaction that accounts for the closely knit functional integration of the genotype [the genetic constitution of an individual or a group] as a whole.’ The genes affect all parts of the organism and determine the color, size, and shape which each part must assume. Man has been given the responsibility to set his own genes into motion, to impart his genes to the right mate for the purpose of building his own race. Since this is not taught in school, our children must be instructed thus in the home.

“Dr. Clarence Oliver, former president of both the Genetics Society of America and the American Society of Human Genetics, says that ‘a gene in its customary combination with the other genes in the pool can lose its beneficial effects if other alleles are brought into the pool.’ Race-mixing not only introduces disunity and disharmony but it also destroys the excellence which God placed in White seed.

“Ruth Benedict tells how long it takes for scientists to breed out certain impure strains of character in animals to their satisfaction: ‘Geneticists count that with the strictest inbreeding for some seventeen generations – which would mean today the continuous inbreeding of some strain since before Columbus was born – they can get a

strain which satisfies *genetic requirements* of purity; it would breed true. To get this strain in the laboratory they cross only descendants of one pair and are satisfied with nothing less.' Let this be a warning to those who take the issue of racial purity so lightly.

"Some ministers use Deut. 23:2 as justification that a mongrel can become pure in the 'tenth' generation, but this is a precarious idea, and a false supposition! It is based on the assumption that the mongrel strain, over a nine-generation span (maybe 300 years), would concentrate genetic efforts repeatedly in order to purify itself by the tenth generation. A second supposition is that women of pure seed over a ten-generation span would be willing to transgress God's law against such unions so as to bring the errant seed back to a state of purity. Such 'propositional marriages' do not exist in reality, and these problems point out the fallacy of such an interpretation of Deut. 23:2 and the re-purification idea.

"The Bible clarifies itself in Deut. 23:3 and Neh. 13:1-3 that mongrels may not enter the congregation of Yahweh at any time (i.e. forever). A mongrel cannot be accepted on the basis of outward looks or acts or by any amount of education, religiosity, or even by genetic surgery.

"God offers the following solution. The judges of Israel were instructed by Moses to slay anyone who joined himself to Baalpeor (the god of race-mixing). While many Israelites did repent of this sin, Phineas saw a man named Zimri walk brazenly into camp with a Midianite woman and enter his tent. Phineas was so incensed at the sight of this that he took his javelin, went to the tent, and drove his spear through the two people. God was so pleased with Phineas' zeal that the plague upon Israel was stopped immediately! God does not believe in 'rehabilitation by mongrelization' as moderns do, because He knows that neither the body, the mind, or the spirit of mongrels can be made holy once the genes are adulterated. This is the thrust behind the command 'Thou shalt not adulterate!'"

While I have to highly agree with Philip Jones, in this excerpt from his book he holds a few views with which I cannot accept. By-and-large his work is excellent. I will here cite one instance where I feel he could have done better. On pp. 43-44, Philip cites Alexander Winchell's *PreAdamites* on pp. 248-249, a superb eye-opener which I have also made use of in several papers. Philip states:

"Dr. Winchell says that 'In every particular in which the skeleton of the Negro departs from that of the Adamite, it is *intermediate* between that and the skeleton of the chimpanzee' That the negro is specifically different from the White Man and more closely resembles the ape is evident: 'All genera of animals and vegetables embody the elements of those *below* them, but some principle *above* or superior to them, which gives or embodies a *specific* difference; yet the lowest as well as the highest is perfect in itself. Thus the negro, being the lowest type of man, embodies all the attributes and senses of the lower animals in a much greater degree than the white; but in addition he possesses the faculty of speech ... which distinguishes him from the gorilla and monkey; yet the positive and absolute *limit to his mental development* fixes him in a different sphere or *species* to the Adamic race, which has no *limit*, but is created *after-the-image* of-God'. The fact that the negro is the head of the animal kingdom and Man

the overseer of the negro is very important. The negro's superiority consists of his faculty of speech. That alone distinguishes him from the apes."

I have to highly disagree with Philip Jones on his last two sentences in the above paragraph. Scripture clearly states that Yahweh placed Adam-man directly in charge of the animal kingdom, and the negroes are in charge of nothing (Gen. 2:19-20; Psa. 8:4, 6-8)! My position concerning how the negroes gained the faculty of speech was from the fallen angels who mixed their seed with the primate family of apes or monkeys. Philip cited one important source in this excerpt from his book, where he quoted thusly:

"Dawkins says: 'More usually when two alternative genes are not identical, the result is some kind of compromise – the body is built to an intermediate design or something completely different'." If Dawkins is correct, it is very possible that Winchell's evaluation was plausible, stating, "In every particular in which the skeleton of the Negro departs from that of the Adamite, it is *intermediate* between that and the skeleton of the chimpanzee." If the reader wishes to critique more of Philip Jones' book, I would suggest he search for a copy, that is, if a copy can still be found! Philip also wrote, *The Negro, Beast & Devil*.