

Analytical Review of Philip Jones' *The Negro, Serpent, Beast and Devil*, # 1

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

There is a scheme going on today to demonize anyone who would use the term "black" in Latin (i.e., *nig'er*) as politically incorrect. There is one thing that Philip Jones and I have in common; we are both White. "White" translated into Latin is *albus*, like in "albino". I am quite sure that neither Philip nor I would consider it an insult to be called an "albus". Rather, we would regard it as a badge of honor! I would state that Philip Jones is quite an accomplished scholar and researcher, but there are a few areas where we don't agree, and I would like to share these points of dissent.

Jones states: "**INTRODUCTION:** The assumptions which we make in this book are that Adam was not the first man on earth, he was the father of the White Race alone, made in God's image and likeness, and that the negro was created before Adam and not in the likeness or image of God. We also hold, like 'Ariel' and Professor Charles Carroll, that there were originally only two races, the negro and the White, placed on this earth. The rest are thus hybrids of the two. Originally we had intended to include the negro and an explanation of hybridity together in one volume, but we decided against it due to the abundance of relevant facts uncovered in our extensive research. Therefore we would suggest that the reader consider this book to be Part 1 on the subject of race. What questions are not cleared up in this volume we trust will be answered in one of the other volumes soon to follow.

"We use the term *negro* rather than *black* to describe the darker race, because the race has traditionally been known by that name. In Hebrew the term is *niggar*, in Syro-Chaldaic *nig'ar*, in Latin *nig'er*, in Portuguese and other modern languages *negro*. Furthermore, there are very few pure blacks alive today, even in Africa."

I fully agree with Philip Jones that "Adam was not the first man on earth, but was the father of the White Race alone, made in God's image and likeness ..." I also agree with Philip that "the negro was ... not in the likeness or image of God." And as for Professor Charles Carroll's statement, 'that there were originally only two races, the negro and the White', it might be well for the reader to verify this one way or another. (See Jones' *Racial Hybridity*, "Chinese Not A Race", pp. 115-128 to grasp his theory.) I view 3: 1 Adam; + 2 debased mixtures.

I highly disagree that the negro was a created creature. Rather, at 2 Peter 2:4 & Jude 6 we are informed there are angels "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness" and that God "cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." But, what is the nature of the binding power of the "chains"? Too often, it seems, the authors of sundry Biblical commentaries envision some kind of dungeon-like cave deep below the surface of the earth, a holding chamber for these dreadful creatures until the day of judgment.

To prepare us for a word study on these two passages, I will quote from the E-Sword program which matches all of the Strong's numbers to the text:

2 Pet. 2:4: "For¹⁰⁶³ if¹⁴⁸⁷ God²³¹⁶ spared⁵³³⁹ not³⁷⁵⁶ the angels³² that sinned²⁶⁴, but²³⁵ cast *them* down to hell⁵⁰²⁰, and delivered³⁸⁶⁰ *them* into chains⁴⁵⁷⁷ of darkness²²¹⁷, to be reserved⁵⁰⁸³ unto¹⁵¹⁹ judgment²⁹²⁰ ..."

Jude 1:6: "And⁵⁰³⁷ the angels³² which kept⁵⁰⁸³ not³³⁶¹ their¹⁴³⁸ first estate⁷⁴⁶, but²³⁵ left⁶²⁰ their own²³⁹⁸ habitation³⁶¹³, he hath reserved⁵⁰⁸³ in everlasting¹²⁶ chains¹¹⁹⁹ under⁵²⁵⁹ darkness²²¹⁷ unto¹⁵¹⁹ the judgment²⁹²⁰ of the great³¹⁷³ day⁰²²⁵..."

If the reader will take notice here, the Strong's number for "darkness" is 2217, and the numbers for "chains" are 4577 and 1199. However, the Strong's *Greek Dictionary* is so abbreviated on these words, it's about as useless as a tit on a boar, and in this instance I will not waste my time in citing it! On the other hand, *The Complete New Testament Word Study* by Spiros Zodhiates does much better, but one must be careful, as he will sneak some nominal churchianity dogma into his definitions. To his credit, though, in addition to his Greek definitions, for which he is usually quite honest, he also includes synonyms and antonyms which are very helpful.

Zodhiates on **#2217**: "ζόφος *zóphos*; genitive *zóphou*, masculine noun. Darkness, foggy weather, smoke (Heb. 12:18 [Textus Receptus], *skótos* [4655], darkness). Elsewhere spoken of the darkness of Tartarus or Gehenna (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6); of the darkness or thick darkness associated with the region of those who are lost (2 Pet. 2:4, 17; Jude 1:6, 13).

"**Synonyms**: *gnóphos* (1105), blackness, gloom, associated with a tempest; *achlús* (887), a mist, especially as a dimness of the eyes; *homíchle*, occurs only in certain MSS in 2 Pet. 2:17 where the Textus Receptus has *nephélai* (3507), cloud.

"**Antonyms**: *phos* (5457), light; *phéggos* (5338), brightness, light, such as the light of the moon which reflects the light of the sun and not possessing its own source of light; *óρθρος* (3722), dawn; *apaúgasma* (541), effulgence, brightness."

Zodhiates on **#4577**: "σειρά *seirá*; genitive *seirás*, feminine noun from *eíro* (*not found in NT*), to fasten. A cord, band, chain. In 2 Pet. 2:4, the chains mentioned are not to be understood as literal material shackles. The expression 'of darkness' (*zóphou*, genitive of *zóphos* [2217], darkness) indicates that darkness itself somehow serves to restrain these fallen spirits. If taken as a parallel passage, Jude 1:6 states that these creatures have been bound by 'eternal' (*aídios* [126]) chains and are being kept (*tetereken*, perfect active indicative of *teréo* [5083], to keep) under (*hupó* [5259]) darkness. The phrase 'under darkness' suggests that darkness exercises some kind of dominion over these immured angels. It is something under the control of which the angels remain imprisoned. [*underlining mine*]

"**Synonyms**: *hálusis* (254), chain or bond for binding the body or any part of it; *desmós* (1199), usually in the plural neuter *desmá*, bonds, chains."

Zodhiates on **#1199**: "δεσμός *desmós*; genitive *desmoú*, masculine noun from *déo* (1210), to bind. Band, bond, ligament.

"(I) In the singular, spoken of a ligament or whatever matter may cause some member of the body such as the tongue to be impeded (Mark 7:35); or the limbs (Luke 13:16, see also Luke 13:11; Sept.: Judg. 15:13; Dan. 4:12).

"(II) In the plural *oi desmoí*, and Attic *ta desmá* (neuter plural), bonds, imprisonment, for example:

“(A) Hoi *desmoí* in Phil. 1:13 and probably elsewhere in the writings of Paul (Phil. 1:7, 14, 16; Col. 4:18; 2 Tim. 2:9; Phile. 1:10, 13, in bonds or imprisonment for the sake of the gospel; Heb. 10:34; 11:36; Jude 1:6; Sept.: Judg. 15:14; Job 39:5; Ps. 2:3; Jer. 27:2).

“(B) In the neuter plural *tá desmá*. In Luke’s writings (Luke 8:29; Acts 16:26; 20:23; 22:30; 23:29; 26:29, 31) meaning that which holds someone bound, without freedom.

“**Derivation:** *desmeúo* (1195), to bind, chain; *desmeo* (1196), to bind with chains; *desmophúlax* (1200), a prisonkeeper.

“**Synonyms:** *súndesmos* (4886), something that binds closely; *zeuktería* (2202), that which yokes; *speíra* (4686), anything wound, a twisted rope, a body of men at arms; *sustrophe* (4963), a secret coalition, riotous crowd forming a conspiracy; *hálusis* (254), a chain.

“**Antonym:** *eleuthería* (1657), freedom.”

I would encourage everyone who has the Strong’s *Exhaustive Concordance* to compare the data given here on these three Greek words with that offered by Strong, and one will quickly grasp the insufficiency of that source. I’m not implying that one should get rid of his Strong’s, for it is a valuable tool, but one should not rely solely on it in order to arrive at an informed conclusion. I should also comment on the mention of the “Textus Receptus” by Zodhiates, for it only amounts to a publisher’s advertisement, contrary to the claims by the advocates of the KJV.

From Zodhiates’ view of the Greek, “hell” is a dark foggy place lacking light, with a secondary meaning of “mental confusion”, elsewhere alluded to as the darkness of Tartarus (or hell), a place of blackness, gloom and tempest. For the English word translated “chain”, there are two Greek words numbered by Strong as 4577 and 1199. In Zodhiates on “chain” #4577 is described as a cord, band or chain, and is akin to a binding mechanism or agent. In Zodhiates on “chain” #1199 is described as, “to bind ... band, bond, ligament (or a band of tough tissue that holds bones together), akin to a yoke or twisted rope, or to be locked in prison.

Zodhiates’ best observation was: “... the chains mentioned are not to be understood as literal material shackles ...”. Well, if they’re not “literal material shackles”, what are they? From Zodhiates, it is obvious we are not dealing with the literal, but the figurative. The Bible (both in Old Testament Hebrew and New Testament Greek) is simply filled with figurative idioms, euphemisms and parables unique to the time period when they were written. For instance, in Joseph’s dream, his father was the sun, his mother the moon, and his brothers stars (not literally, but figuratively).

Simply defined, a parable is *to set alongside*. From *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. K-Q, we read in part concerning parables on page 649:

“**Parable** ... An extended metaphor, or simile, frequently becoming a brief narrative, generally used by men of biblical times for didactic purposes. Since an allegory is also an extension of a simile and since every metaphor presupposes a simile, confusion between the forms of parable and ALLEGORY has frequently and understandably occurred. The wide range of literary types designated as parables by biblical authors has also contributed to this confusion. The most familiar type of parable is the brief narrative which forcefully illustrates a single idea ...”.

Once we understand that many of these terms are veiled in idiomatic language, it behooves us to break the hidden code in which they are written. In particular, "... anything wound (or coiled in a spiral), a twisted rope ...". This definition is a perfect description of the DNA "double helix" within every cell of a mammal, vegetation or other form of life. It is a violation of Yahweh's genetic laws, once two alien types of DNA are locked together it forms a half breed plant or animal, which can never be reversed. Such creatures become a type of a third-kind. Therefore, the term "third world", as used today to describe nonwhite peoples, is not out of order. For instance, a mule (from which we get the term mulatto) is a creature of a third-kind. There is one thing we can be very sure of, and that is the fact that Yahweh never created a creature of a third-kind! So, that brings up a very important question: Where did all of those nonwhite creatures of a third-kind come from?

It may come as a surprise to some, but the Ante-Nicene Fathers also understood that the fallen angels "**commingled**" and formed "**that most infamous race.**" *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Irenaeus Against Heresies, Bk. IV, ch. XXXVI. ¶4:

"Since the Son of God is always one and the same, He gives to those who believe on Him a well of water [springing up] to eternal life, but He causes the unfruitful fig-tree immediately to dry up; and in the days of Noah He justly brought on the deluge for the purpose of extinguishing that most infamous race of men then existent, who could not bring forth fruit to God, since the angels that sinned had commingled with them, and [acted as He did] in order that He might put a check upon the sins of these men, but [that at the same time] He might preserve the archetype, the formation of Adam. And it was He who rained fire and brimstone from heaven, in the days of Lot, upon Sodom and Gomorrah, 'an example of the righteous judgment of God,' that all may know, 'that every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit shall be cut down, and cast into the fire.'" [*brackets not mine*]

After establishing some of the basic elements of our subject, it is time we consider Rev. 12:7-9 where we read:

"7 And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, 8 And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. 9 And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

Some people errantly place this entire passage in the future, whereas the preliminary confrontation ignited into a war long before the creation of Adam, and has continued to this very day. It's just a matter of identifying the various "*men*" or "*pieces*" on Satan's chessboard. What is more, this war has developed in stages, three of which should be identified as, (1) the pre-Adamic rebellion of 1/3rd of the angels, (2) the sexual seduction of Eve, and (3) the sons of heaven raping the daughters of Seth at Gen. 6:2, producing mutated giants (a trace left in the Jewish gene-pool of today, as we see that Rephaim survived through Genesis 15 and beyond).

Of these three incursions by fallen angels, the occurrence at Genesis 6:1-4 is the least questioned by critics. The second incidence, with the sexual seduction of Eve by Satan himself, is only comprehended by a few who understand it is a cardinal doctrine on which the remainder of the Bible rests. The pre-Adamic rebellion by the fallen angels is the least understood of all.

There is one very important factor about angels the serious Bible student should understand, and that is the fact that an angel has the ability to change his physical form between that of man, animal, or bird. This is verified for “man” at Enoch 68:5 where it states:

“The name of the second is Kesabel, who pointed out evil counsel to the sons of the holy angels, and induced them to corrupt their bodies by generating mankind.”

This passage shows, if an angel can change himself into the shape of men and procreate with Adamite women, undoubtedly he could also change his shape into an ape or monkey and procreate with them. You will notice Enoch says “generating”, not “creating”. Josephus records where an angel appeared as an owl, *Antiquities* 19:8:2.

From all of this evidence, I strongly hold to the idea that Yahweh never created the other races, but they are the result of angel-animal unions. I know there are many in Identity teaching a sixth and eighth day creation. They conjecture the other races were created during the sixth eon, and Adam during the eighth. My own premise reached from reading Scripture is: the other races are genetic misfits never created by Yahweh. Therefore, Yahweh never classified them as “kind after kind”, or that they were “good.”

Now it should be evident why I disagree with Philip Jones where he stated in part, “... the negro was created ...” and “... there are very few pure blacks alive today, even in Africa ...”

Philip Jones continues by stating: “In this book we have tried to show the negro as he is in three aspects – all three primarily Biblical – as a serpent, as a beast and as a devil. One might call him the *unholy trinity*. We know that many *learned men* and clergymen will find cause to dispute what is written herein, perhaps because of their estimation of the modern-day negro, who is in reality of mixed flesh, that is to say, mongrelized. In our following book we will show that mongrels do not qualify as negroes or White men, for they are neither. God’s Law rejects such offspring and so do we. Yet we show in this book that mongrels do play a part (on the side of the negro) in the destruction of the White Man.

“The reader is cautioned to remember that there is a wide divergence in individual negroes today as there are [sic] between Whites. Some negroes have learned to *adapt* and to mask certain traits and instincts. This impresses the observer and helps the negro to gain the approval of the community, to acquire friends and white associates, and to advance in social position. But, the latent traits of the negro are still present in his genes. This makes him a negro always and forever, and no amount of race-mixing will change him into becoming an equal of Whites. We must remember to follow God’s Law first in our estimate of him. The most fundamental truth is that of race. Without race we are nothing in God’s sight, and with it we have the promise of being conformed to the heavenly image by our White racial kinsman *Jesus Christ*.

“We have attempted to combine our footnotes and bibliography together by numbering the books and magazines in our bibliography

“Our book is meant to be a guide for students of race, and we aim to make this a permanent text on the subject. We believe that this book has a place in the library of every serious racist, because of the many books digested to produce it. However, we do not believe that this book is for the curious or the casual learner. We have written to inform serious members of the White Race to better enable them to withstand the

forces which move against them to destroy them. May the White Race be preserved and Yahweh be glorified.” (End of Introduction, with more to come.)

While, by-and-large, Philip Jones shows himself to be an extraordinarily talented scholar and researcher along the lines of racial hybridity, and the dangers it imposes, he surely fumbled the ball in declaring the negro to be a created being, and the one who seduced Eve.

From *the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, ch. 4, Dialogue of Justin Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, there is something that would account for the negro: “... 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[n Adam-]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 ½ & ½ 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.

The first thing the detractors do to discredit such evidence is to cry: “Such a thing as ½ angel and ½ animal couldn’t happen”. Well, tell that to the big-six chemical companies which are already majoring in genetic engineering: Monsanto; DuPont; Syngenta; Dow; BASF; and Bayer Cropscience, plus dozens of others! Don’t say the fallen angels couldn’t have done such a thing when these chemical companies are already accomplishing unimaginable achievements in test tubes. Remember the TV series *Touched By An Angel*, where the leading role was played by a negress? A better title might have been “Touched By A Fallen Angel”.

In researching this subject, I also find it strange that “devils” in the Old Testament is Strong’s #8163 “sâ’îyr”, and has essentially the same meaning as “satyr” in the Greek, so evidently they have a similar etymology. In fact, the KJV translators translated #8163 as “satyr” at Isa. 34:14! I will show evidence that the Greek term for the Hebrew #8163 “sâ’îyr” also has connotations of an “ape”.

The *World Scope Encyclopedia*, under the topic “Satyrs”, cites Pliny the Elder. Pliny used the word “satyr” to indicate a kind of ape. Pliny the Elder majored in “Natural History” (zoology). He and Pliny the Younger were Roman citizens, and Pliny the Elder published upward of 2,000 volumes of his works, and I am sure he knew the difference between an ape and a goat!

[Note: Although Philip Jones and Stephen E. Jones are brothers, doctrinally they are 180° apart.]