

FLYING UNDER FALSE COLORS

All About The Name "November" You'll Ever Want To Know

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries, 1012 N. Vine St., Fostoria, OH 44830
Website: emahiser.christogenea.org

This essay might also be entitled: "*The Name 'November' For Dummies*". If the reader is not already aware of it, there is an individual masquerading hither and thither with an a.k.a. of "Eli James". He wrote a book he entitled *The Great Impersonation*, which is nothing more than an accumulation of deceitfulness, for in reality he himself is **THE GREAT IMPERSONATOR!**

To understand this subject, one must comprehend the unequivocal difference between three entirely separate entities, (1) the house of Israel, (2) the house of Judah, and (3) the converso-Edomite-jews who were converted to Israelitism near 135 B.C. See Josephus' *Antiq.* 13:9:1. This paper will focus on an individual by the name of Joseph November (a.k.a. Eli James), who claims to teach Christian Israel Identity, while this essay will show evidence that the surname of "November" is Edomite-jewish in origin!

As the reader might remember, William Finck and myself completely separated ourselves from Joseph November's (a.k.a. Eli James') ministry in January of 2011, never to return. William wrote an announcement entitled *The Anatomy of my Split with Eli James*, and gave me permission to copy and circulate it among those on my mailing list. Our primary reason for splitting was due to a.k.a. Eli James' promotion of universalism (an attempt to bring non-whites under our exclusive Abrahamic Covenant with Yahweh).

Soon after our split from Joseph November's (a.k.a. Eli James') ministry in January of 2011, many of the number who supported William and myself began to question November's ethnicity, and as it turned out for good reason! Having doubts concerning this, some of us began to research the name of "November" basically but not entirely from the Internet.

A.K.A. Eli James had told William Finck that his ancestors came from Bavaria, a state in southeastern Germany, giving the false impression that Joseph November, a.k.a. Eli James, was German. Upon Finck's research of the census records there were no "Novembers" from Bavaria, but many from Poland. It can also be seen at a site that shows name distribution in Germany, that there are no "Novembers" residing there (Finck is given here as an example, other names may easily be searched): <http://www.verwandt.de/karten/absolut/finck.html> Jewish history verifies that there were numerous jews in Poland at that time. Slightly over two years since our split with a.k.a. Eli James, very substantial evidence has come to the fore by two witnesses from the following websites:

www.sharyn.org/name.html

To hit the road running, I will use only the pertinent excerpts and avoid all the other jewish gobbledygook:

“... As for ‘November’: My father tells me that in 1850s Poland all Jews were assigned arbitrary last names so they could be taxed. Someone knew German, obviously, because the Polish word for the month of November is ‘Listopad,’ which translates to ‘falling leaves’ – And yes, all Novembers are related, although it may be a reach to find the connection ... my parents knew exactly what they were doing” This is proof positive that Miss Sharyn November, with her name of “November” demonstrates as a matter of fact that it is a jewish name assigned by a Polish king.

* * * * *

If one is not yet convinced that the name “November” is Edomite-jewish, notice at this next website where “November” is mentioned 10 times, “Jew” 14 times, “Orthodox” 20 times, “Rabbi” 8 times, and “Synagogue” 5 times which I have underlined. As I will only use excerpts, the text may not make a lot of sense. But I don’t believe we are interested in jewish dating agencies:

www.nytimes.com/2008/08/10/nyregion/thecity/10orth.html?_r=0

“... The Westmont is home to large numbers of young Orthodox Jews, and because pressing elevator buttons is forbidden on the Sabbath, which begins Friday evening ...”

“One of the dinners took place in the 12th-floor apartment of Baruch November, a 31-year-old Orthodox man ... Mr. November and his three roommates laid out a buffet of roast turkey, stewed meatballs and noodle kugel.

“Although dating is a major preoccupation of the vast number of single twenty- and thirtysomethings, it’s hard to think of a group that so completely chooses to live in a neighborhood based on dating opportunities as the city’s young Orthodox Jews. And the Upper West Side, an increasingly Orthodox enclave, has over the past four decades emerged as courting central for modern Orthodox singles from across the country and around the world ...”

“In the past 10 years particularly, the community has undergone what Michael Landau, the chairman of the Council of Orthodox Jewish Organizations of the West Side, described as ‘exponential growth.’ The dating fever will spike this week with the celebration of Tu B’Av, a Jewish holiday ... A matchmaking party on Thursday night ... draw 1,000 people, most of them young Orthodox Jews.

“... your parents are going to say you shouldn’t be living at home anymore,’ said Rabbi Allen Schwartz of Congregation Ohab Zedek, a synagogue on West 95th Street near Columbus Avenue that is heavily attended by young Orthodox singles ... Mr. November, an English professor and poet from Pittsburgh who moved to the Upper West Side five years ago, put it this way: ‘It’s like all roads lead to the West Side.’ ... Many people trace the development of the dating scene on the Upper West Side to the mid-’60s, when a charismatic young rabbi named Shlomo Riskin took the helm at the new Lincoln Square Synagogue, near Lincoln Center.

“... the rabbi soon drew crowds of more than 1,000 to his Wednesday night lectures and Sabbath sermons. Throughout the ’70s, young people from Orthodox enclaves ... to be part of Rabbi Riskin’s community ... ‘What happened was the influence of secular society,’ said Rabbi Ephraim Buchwald, ... the synagogue’s educational director ... There’s no question that that influenced the Orthodox as well ... By the 1990s, Congregation Ohab Zedek had replaced the Lincoln Square Synagogue

as the heart of the community ... at the 95th Street synagogue, hundreds of singles spill onto the sidewalk to mingle ... Mr. November's story is a typical one among these young transplants ... that has long been home to the city's Jewish community ... But he quickly realized that his dating prospects in his hometown were nil. (His Orthodox high school class had only 10 boys and 3 girls.) ... he said not long ago in a cafe near Columbus Circle, a black yarmulke pinned to his chin-length hair ... Touro College — its founders were Orthodox Jews — and promptly dived into the West Side social scene ... Mr. November said. 'But if you have charisma, you can meet people easily' ... as a compromise of Orthodoxy's emphasis on tradition and family ... if you put two Jews together, it will work,' Mr. November said. 'But that's a shtetl mentality' ...

"The party was a celebration of Purim, the Jewish holiday that combines the costumes of Halloween with the alcohol consumption of Mardi Gras ... Milling near the bar with a friend dressed as a T-bone steak, Mr. November reflected on the scene ... Isaac Galena, a cofounder of bangitout.com, a popular modern Orthodox Website that was sponsoring the evening for the third year, struck the same note ... 'In a way, the West Side is like Never-Never Land,' Mr. November said. 'People tell their parents they're going to meet someone, but it's an extended childhood.' ... While some of these complaints are specific to the Orthodox community, others are common to many young New Yorkers ... 'It's the cable TV syndrome,' explained Rabbi Schwartz of Congregation Ohab Zedek ... 'Some singles are here for 20 years,' Rabbi Schwartz said ... At that point, they marry and typically move to nearby Orthodox areas ... One fixture on the Orthodox social circuit is Congregation Ohav Sholom, on 84th Street near Broadway, where a few dozen Jews assembled on a Monday evening last spring for a class in kabbalah, the study of Jewish mysticism ... The class was part of a series of events sponsored by Jewish International Connection, an organization that aids Jews from abroad ... Despite the grumbling among some Orthodox singles about the pressures of dating, Mr. Eisenberg believes that they are still better off than many of the city's singles ... Even as the young, unattached Orthodox Jews of the Upper West Side gravitate to such scenes

"My parents don't want me here,' Mr. November confided after the dinner in his Westmont apartment. 'They don't think it's a good atmosphere' ... By the end of that night, with the wine bottles empty, shots of schnapps were passed around as Mr. November and his friends chatted comfortably with one another.

"Gradually, most of the guests trickled out. But two remained, a married pair who had made the sort of connection that many young Orthodox yearn for" **Did you notice "November" 10 times?**

* * * * *

Added From Finck's Website, February 2nd, 2011:

"It is now the 5th day, and the proof of my accusations, sent out to the Christogenea mailing list in the article which follows, has not been answered.

"I do not want to continue agitating the situation that has developed since last week, however I have made the claim that Eli James misrepresented Clifton Emahiser in his Beast of the Field paper, found at:

<http://anglo-saxonisrael.com/site/beastofthefield>.

Here is one point of the proof substantiating that claim. Eli not only misrepresents Emahiser, but he also misrepresents Thomas A. Davies. My points of contention with Eli's paper are boundless, however I will try to remain very brief and focused here.

"First, however, I must note that Eli James said this in his paper, referring to Clifton's interpretation of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2: 'Mr. Emahiser calls his thesis the Recapitulation Theory'. Yet this is not true. Clifton has never called any "theory" any such thing. Eli should be careful in his writing, not to place words in other people's mouths. I tried to warn him about this on November 17th, however he ignored that warning.

"From Eli's Beast of the Field:

"In addition, the correlation between Gen. 1:26-31 and Gen. 2 is not exact; and there are some major differences, which make the Recapitulation Theory suspect. But the major problem of this thesis is that Mr. Emahiser must ignore the 7th Day, the 'day of rest,' as if it didn't happen. Either that, or we are still living in this 'day of rest.' It is unclear from Clifton's thesis whether this Day of Rest ever took place or whether we are currently living in this Day of Rest. With this argument, Clifton Emahiser has introduced an entirely new concept, which no one else has ever before suggested, namely, that the Day of Rest can be ignored. I will be arguing against this idea, as I consider it to be a major error in his theology. The question that must be answered by Clifton Emahiser is this: 'When, if ever, did the 7th Day take place?' Can we ignore words contained in Gen. 2:1-4?"

"This a sophistical argument, invented by Eli. Clifton is not at all ignoring the 'day of rest', since Clifton's premise – as Eli admits – is that the events of Genesis 2 are a "recapitulation" of events in Genesis 1.

"From Eli's Beast of the Field:

"Based upon the grammar, he concluded that Gen. 1:26-27 is about the creation of the White Race; but Gen. 2 is talking exclusively about this particular man, Adam, and his particular descendants through Eve, exclusive of the other Whites in Gen. 1.'

"But Davies was not distinguishing Genesis 1 Adam from Genesis 2 Adam, as Eli argues for, and uses Davies to support that argument. Rather, anyone who would actually read Davies' book (the entire text is posted at Eli's website) would see that Davies distinguished Genesis 1:26 Adam from Genesis 1:27 Adam! Davies presents a long and convoluted argument, but here is a portion of his text which represents his conclusion: 'The Genesis i. 27 records three separate acts of creation. First. The creation of HA-ADAM, or THE ADAM. Second. The creation of male. Third. The creation of female. There is no Scriptural connection between the male and female created here and the male and female made in Gen. i. 26.' The only valid conclusion is that Eli's theory is very different from Davies' theory, and Eli either did not notice this crucial difference, or did not care and used him as a source anyway. Eli's argument is to distinguish the Genesis 1 Adam and the Genesis 2 Adam. I myself trusted that Eli had quoted Davies properly, and for that reason I was wrong about Davies in my own paper, *The End of Genesis Heresy*. Eli's *Beast of the Field* paper relies very heavily on

Davies' work, but Eli never explains the crucial difference between his own and Davies' theories. Either way, however, I believe both Davies and Eli to be very much in error.

“From Eli’s Beast of the Field:

“This is where the core of our disagreement comes out. Are the ‘trees’ of the Genesis 2 account other races or not? We agree that the ‘tree of life’ is the Adamic Race; but Clifton asserts that the other ‘trees’ are not races. I say they are. If they are not races, then what are they? So, the question becomes, ‘When and where did these other races appear?’ Clifton’s answer is ‘They are hybrids.’ But when and where did they appear? He does not address this question.

“Here is one opinion: ‘Basically, ‘trees’ are metaphorical people, nations and races, just like the ‘trees’ in the Garden of Eden in Genesis.’ - Stephen Anderson, Book of Ezekiel, Chapter 31 notes.

“Having demonstrated that the word chay cannot be used to exclude any category of living beings, we now must determine whether the chay of the earth, of Gen. 1:24-25, are forbidden hybrids or Yahweh’s own creation’.”

“Here is where Eli seriously misrepresented Clifton. Eli has taken a dispute over the “chay” of Genesis Chapter 1 and has transferred it to the “trees” of Genesis Chapter 2. He has then taken his own contrived version of the dispute and he has placed his words into Clifton’s mouth. This is a very sophisticated and dishonest approach.

“Eli fails even more miserably, once it is realized that – from the actual text of Genesis 2 – the trees of the garden which were pleasant to the eye and good for food, were not made to grow out of the ground until after Adam was formed, so they could not have been the ‘chay’ of Genesis Chapter 1! Secondly, Eli also attempts to include ‘beasts’ in the category of ‘metaphorical people, nations and races’, a bait-and-switch which is even more dishonest!

“It was at this point that my critique of Eli’s paper ended, although there were many more pages. I tried to warn him about this – privately in email and on the phone – hoping to encourage a longer discussion between us. Among other things, I told him plainly, ‘Not necessarily. They may simply be other Whites – even from your own words. You are jumping to this conclusion. You are also putting answers into Clifton’s mouth’ and ‘This is not the argument, Eli. You are misrepresenting the argument. Yahweh clearly created the chay of Genesis. The argument is only whether any of the ‘other races’ that we know today were in that Genesis 1:24-25 creation. Reconsider this section.’ But he ignored my notes and my pleas, and published his paper. The situation exacerbates ...”

“From Eli’s Beast of the Field:

“Nevertheless, the definition [of ‘chay’ - WRF] preferred by orthodox theologians is ‘animal life.’ But their reason for preferring this definition is universalistic. Clifton does not acknowledge this fact in any of his writings on this subject’.”

“Yet we see the following in Clifton’s paper, A Study on the Word Chay, available at his website, and my only conclusion could be that Eli has not read all of Clifton’s writing on this subject, but has rather chosen only that which it pleased him to address:

“Some use the word ‘chay’ (Strong’s H2416) at Genesis 1:24 in order to make an argument that somehow the Almighty created the nonwhite races at this point, and

that somehow these nonwhite races were considered 'beast of the earth'. Actually, H2416 is not translated 'beast' until Genesis 1:25 where the context is '... animal or ... living thing, animal ... animal, as a living, active being ... wild animals, on account of their vital energy and activity ... wild animal of the reeds ... unclean beast ... destroyer among beasts ... living beings, appetite, activity of hunger ... appetite of young lions ... revival, renewal ... thou didst find renewal of thy strength ...' Brown - Driver - Briggs - Gesenius, *Hebrew And English Lexicon*, page 312. Starting with page #4 of this study I will show every verse in the Old Testament where H2416 appears, and the context in each case will become clear.

“From the Enhanced Strong’s *Lexicon* found in the Libronix Digital Library: 2416 ... From 2421; *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* 644a; The NIV Exhaustive Concordance by Goodrick-Kohlenberger 2644 and 2645 and 2646 and 2651 and 2652 and 2653; 501 occurrences; AV translates as ‘live’ 197 times, ‘life’ 144 times, ‘beast’ 76 times, ‘alive’ 31 times, ‘creature’ 15 times, ‘running’ seven times, ‘living thing’ six times, ‘raw’ six times, and translated miscellaneously 19 times. 1 living, alive. 1A green (of vegetation). 1B flowing, fresh (of water). 1C lively, active (of man). 1D reviving (of the springtime). 2 relatives. 3 life (abstract emphatic). 3A life. 3B sustenance, maintenance. 4 living thing, animal. 4A animal. 4B life. 4C appetite. 4D revival, renewal. 5 community.”

“From Eli’s Beast of the Field:

“Historically, agriculture did not make its appearance until the days of Adam, which happened around 5,000 BC. Agriculture is not mentioned in Gen. 1. This is a problem for Emahiser’s Recapitulation thesis, because the science of archeology clearly documents the existence of non-agricultural hominids predating THE ADAM. They are called the hunter-gatherers, usually ascribed to the Stone Age. But Clifton does not want to admit that either Whites or non-Whites existed before THE ADAM!!! ... Clifton Emahiser has not thought about this.

“From Clifton’s perspective, Nachash is the very first two-legged beast, since all non-Whites would have descended from him. If Nachash is the ONLY two-legged beast on the planet on the 6th day, then we come back to the old problem of “Where did Cain get his wife from?””

“Here again, Eli has not only changed the nature of the argument, but he has mischaracterized Clifton’s teachings and he has once again placed words into Clifton’s mouth. His attempt to do this is obviously – to me – an attempt to discredit Clifton in the minds of his readers, purposely trying to make him look foolish, in order to gain an advantage for his own agenda.

“Here are some quotes from two of Clifton’s Teaching Letters, elucidating Clifton’s position on this matter, where Clifton clearly explains that there were many races of people (for want of a better word) before Adam:

WTL #113: “The ‘serpent’ of Genesis 3 is a member of that race of angels which revolted from Yahweh God, and were cast out into the earth, as described in Revelation chapter 12. We are not told when this happened, but can only imagine that it happened some time before Adam, but during the latter ages of creation. The fossil record shows that there were many races of humans here before Adam, the first Aryan White man,

such as Neanderthal man, Cro-Magnon man, etc., any one of which may have been of that race of angels. Throughout Scripture angels appear as men, and are often even indistinguishable from men (i.e. Gen 18:1-33; 19:1-14).”

WTL #136: “Again, Who Are These Called Beasts?: Evidence is mounting from various sources, such as the *Book Of Giants* found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, that the fallen angels came to this planet thousands of years before Adam and committed ‘miscegenation’ with certain animals, producing creatures appearing half-animal and half-human-like. This evidence can be found in a book entitled *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation*, ©1996, by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., & Edward Cook, chapter 33, pages 246-250. For all of those who would like further data on this, check my Watchman’s Teaching Letter, #114 in an article written by William Finck entitled *The Problem With Genesis 6:1-4*. The Hebrew in chapter 1 of Genesis does not support the hypothesis that they were ever created by Yahweh Elohim (but it does support that the ‘man’ at Gen. 1:26-27 is the same ‘man’ as at Gen. 2:7 & 8). Not only this, but the Almighty has said that He is going to root-up everything He did not plant, Matt. 15:13!”

WTL #141: “To understand the glorious courtship of Yahweh toward Israel we must envision it by perceiving a view of the earth before the fall of Adam, at which time the archangel Satan had usurped Yahweh’s rightful sovereignty. Not only did our adversary rebel against Yahweh, but he (Satan) influenced one-third of the angels to rebel with him, as recorded at Rev. 12:7-9: ‘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.’ Many falsely place this event in the future, whereas it happened in the remote past! If this passage is pointing to a future event then Christ was giving false witness when He said at Luke 10:18: ‘And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.’ It is at Rev. 12:3-4 where it reveals the number of angels who fell with Satan: ‘3 And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. 4 And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth ...’ From this verse, we can see that two-thirds of the angels stayed faithful to Yahweh and followed Him, whereas one-third of the angels joined Satan in his rebellion against Yahweh.

“For all of these reasons and more, my break with Eli James is not about personality, it is not about personal feelings, but rather it is about Scriptural, moral and intellectual honesty.

“William Finck, Christogenea.org

[The above critique is entirely the work of William Finck, which he posted to his primary website, for which I’m in full agreement. On September 9, 2011, Bill gave me permission to reproduce it, and urged me to circulate it among my readers.]

“Submitted by William Finck on Mon, 03/25/2013

Christogenea.org News
The Minor Prophets”

“The latest installments of our ongoing presentation of the Minor Prophets cover the Book of Amos. We have used Amos as an occasion to present much of the

archaeological data proving the historicity of the Bible. Detailed Assyrian records and other discoveries, such as the Moabite Stone and the Lachish Ostraca, have been presented and discussed at length. The series on Amos, nearing completion, already includes eight segments.

“Christogenea Saturdays - 2013-03-16 - The Universalism of Eli James: “This program is based upon a selection of Eli James’ own statements, recordings included so they can be heard directly, which prove beyond all doubt that Eli does not understand the basic concept of ‘kind after kind’, what White is, and the nature of the Wheat and the Tares.

“The program also completely deconstructs Eli’s claims concerning certain Scriptures which he uses to support his artificially constructed eschatology, including Isaiah chapter 13 and Ezekiel chapter 18.

“Everyone and anyone familiar with the rift between William Finck and Eli James should listen to this program! As should anyone who cares about or is interested in Christian Identity Theology.

“Amos, Part 6 - Christogenea on Talkshoe 03-08-2013:

“This program is especially relative to the subsequent program mentioned above, since it addresses another of Eli James’ recent universalist heresies.

“In relation to Amos 3:2, it includes a lengthy discussion of the phrase ‘all the families of the earth’, a phrase which also appears in the promises to Abraham in Genesis 12:3. Proven from relative Scriptures is the fact that this phrase applies only to all of the Adamic Genesis 10 families of the land, and not, as Eli James has stated in his recent programs, to ‘all other peoples’, including non-Adamic (non-White) peoples. The quote directly from Eli where he makes such an assertion is played from his own podcasts in the March 16th program described above.”

THE LIE OF UNIVERSALISM, by Clifton A. Emahiser

With this essay, we scrutinized a spurious, non-Biblical doctrine called, “universalism.” The idea of “universalism” actually started with the Edomite-jews and, therefore, falls under the category of “the leaven of the Pharisees.” Later, this doctrine was adopted by the “universal” Catholic Church. Today, “universalism” is taught generally throughout all the mainstream churches of all denominations. One surely would think that such a doctrine would not be found in Christian Israel Identity, for upon discovering our heritage as Israelites, we would grasp we are the **ONLY PEOPLE** of the Book. Unfortunately, there are those who have dragged this “mainstream” Pharisaical doctrine into the Israel Identity Message. Foremost among these are Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks. Not surprisingly, those two are also against the teaching of the two seeds of Genesis 3:15, and fall into the category of antichrist, anti-seedliners. Ironically, the doctrines of “universalism” and “anti-seedline” are co-companion teachings, for when one is adopted, the other soon follows on the other’s heels.

In a brochure entitled *The Hebrew Foundation of Christ’s Church*, Jory S. Brooks attempts to bring non-Israelites into the Kingdom. In a diagram in column 4, he tries to show there is a “physical” Israel and an “allegorical” Israel. Then under the subtitle “Israel’s Relation To The Church”, he says the following:

“The second illustration above demonstrates the true relationship between Israel and the church. The Bible shows clearly that Israelites were the first converts to the faith, came to knowledge of Christ in great numbers, and formed the core of the Church. Not all Israelites believed in Christ, but a large proportion of them did, and formed the foundation of the New Testament Church. These Israelites then went out and converted others, Hebrews and non-Hebrews; these latter becoming a form of allegorical Israel. In Old Testament times, non-Hebrews could join themselves to the Chosen Nation through faith in Israel’s God. (Isa. 56:3-8) Under the same principal in New Testament times, by faith in Israel’s Savior and God-In-Flesh, Jesus Christ, non-Israelites in a sense inherit some of the blessings given to Israel. We might therefore say that they are ‘EXPERIENTIAL ISRAELITES’ [pile it higher and higher], a term coined by Bible teacher and author, Dr. Stephen E. Jones, for those who, while not physically Israelites, come under some of the Israel covenantal blessings through faith in Christ. The combination of both groups, Christian physical Israelites and Christian ‘Experiential Israelites’, constitutes Christ’s true Church. The body of Christ is therefore physically and allegorically Israelite throughout. This explains the otherwise inexplicable fact that the New Covenant was made only with Israel (Heb. 8:8-9), a point which has caused untold confusion among those who teach that Christ’s Church is non-Israelite.”
[pile it higher and higher]

This statement is totally unscriptural and is a lie right out of the pits of hell, and “Dr.” Stephen E. Jones holds a Master Degree in subterfuge. Not only does Jones teach universalism, but he is a vicious antichrist, anti-seedliner (antichrist in-the-sense that he denies the Satanic seedline that was to bruise the Messiah, and if He was not bruised, then we have no Salvation). Universalism is also antichrist inasmuch as it nullifies both the Old and New Covenants which our Kinsman Redeemer died for. If, as both Brooks and Jones imply, non-Israelites can come under those Covenants, then He is no longer a “Kinsman Redeemer.” There is no such DAMNABLE thing as “universal Redemption”!

Once we understand that the northern Ten Tribes had been divorced by the Almighty along with most of Judah, they were cut-off from the Covenant and became **estranged** to Him. The tribes, being cut-off from the Covenant, became like a “eunuch” or a “dry tree.” For that period, Israel’s seed had been cut-off, so figuratively, the simile of a “eunuch” is appropriate. Upon understanding that Israel was the “eunuch”, there is no longer a conflict with Deut. 23:1. This passage is not talking about bringing non-Israelites under the Covenant, but quite the opposite. Once Yahshua died for our Redemption, we were then brought back under the New Covenant, which **includes only** the House of Israel and the House of Judah, (Jeremiah 31:31; Hebrews 8:8).

While Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks are overt “universalists”, Joseph November (a.k.a. Eli James), is a closet “universalist”. But Joseph November has one thing more, as described by Miss Sharyn November:

“As for ‘November’: My father tells me that in 1850s Poland all Jews were assigned arbitrary last names so they could be taxed. Someone knew German, obviously, because the Polish word for the month of November is ‘Listopad,’ which translates to ‘falling leaves’ – And yes, all Novembers are related, although it may be a reach to find the connection ... my parents knew exactly what they were doing.”

Question: How much more pertinent evidence do we need to once and forever settle the “November” question? Secondly, how can anyone deny such straight-forward documentation with the required Biblical “two witnesses”?