

Analytical Review of Philip Jones' *The Negro, Serpent, Beast and Devil*, #6

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

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

As I was proceeding with my constructive criticism through Jones' book, I arrived at the end of page 29 and discovered that pages 30 and 31 were missing. So the reader will understand, several years ago Philip xeroxed his book (evidently selling out all of the books he had printed up) and voluntarily gave me a xeroxed copy of this work. By far, though, Philip Jones' best work was his *Racial Hybridity*, which everyone in Israel Identity should have a copy of in their personal library. However, on a few subjects, he and I don't exactly see eye-to-eye. But for now, we will concentrate on the subject at hand.

Although I don't have a copy of pages 30 and 31, the last three lines on page 29 gave me a clue to what Philip had addressed on these two missing pages. On the last three lines Philip states in part:

"Some writers say that Ham sinned against Noah by castrating or sodomizing him (Thomas F. Gossett, *Race: The History Of An Idea In America*, 2nd Ptg. Dallas. 1964), but it is more reasonable to see that Ham raped his own" [end of page]. Undoubtedly, Philip continued stating on the next page, "mother".

I next searched through Jones' bibliography to determine whether or not he cited anything concerning Noah, or Noah's flood, and I found what I needed at item #135, where it stated:

"135. -----. *Were all the people of earth drowned in the Flood?* Hollywood. n.d." It just so happens that Wesley A. Swift wrote a pamphlet entitled *Were all the people of earth drowned in the Flood?* The following is what Swift stated on page 29:

"... It is said that Ham's children were Negroes, Japheth's children were Asiatics and Shem's children were White. That, my friends, is just a silly bedtime story, because I am going to just clue you in to a little piece of biology, and that is, when Noah and his wife had three sons before the flood, the children were the same race as their parents. The Bible tells me 'kind begets like-kind, seed having life in itself.' Don't ever take a chance on raising a family if that doesn't hold true!"

[Question by C.A.E.: Does Philip believe this?]

[Back to Swift]: "You know as well as I do that Ham, Shem and Japheth, three sons of Noah and his wife, were just like their father and mother, the purest strain of the White race. But, you say, they married a bad set of women. Those three women were White women or they would not have gotten on the ark! You say they married, afterwards, outside their race. Their descendants did. – You say Ham was cursed and because of this he was made a Negro. No. He violated a moral code and his offspring was a child of incest, which meant he could never share with his brothers the inheritance; the curse that was put on Ham was one of authority and one of

administrative destiny. Ham did not, then, nor any time thereafter, turn black, and none of his children ever turned black”

[Critical note by Clifton A. Emahiser: If indeed Philip Jones wrote “... but it is more reasonable to see that Ham raped his own mother ...”, he was absolutely correct, as well as Wesley A. Swift! However, there are portions of Swift’s work that I question. The following is what I wrote on the same subject in my WTL #25 in part:

I established in the last lesson that Canaan, the son of Ham, was born of incest and pointed to a couple of scriptures to prove the point. It was a case of Ham looking upon his father’s nakedness which turns out to be his mother’s nakedness. It was hard to find anything of value in the various commentaries on the subject, as the writers seem to want to dance a jig around the topic, trying to suppose it means a stepmother or a concubine, and in some instances this is what is intended. They also try to insinuate that these prohibitions were for the prevention of disease, and in some cases this might also be the purpose. In other cases they will just generalize that it was an immorality of some kind, or just skip over the verse as if it weren’t there. I only found one comment from *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, page 99, which was worth quoting and I will repeat it here:

“The nakedness of thy father. These laws were addressed to men. Hence this verse contains a prohibition not against incest between father and daughter, but against incest between son and mother only. The shame brought upon the mother was brought also upon the father. As they were of one flesh (Gen. 2:24), any act committed against the mother could be considered to have been likewise committed against the father.”

There still may be some of you who are not convinced that Ham had incest with his mother. For those of you who are not convinced one way or the other, I will quote every passage in Scripture referring to such an incident between son and mother. You may be surprised at how much is said in Scripture along this line:

Genesis 9:22: **“And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without.”**

Leviticus 18:7-8: **“⁷ The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she *is* thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. ⁸ The nakedness of thy father’s wife shalt thou not uncover: it *is* thy father’s nakedness.”**

Leviticus 20:11: **“And the man that lieth with his father’s wife hath uncovered his father’s nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be upon them*.”**

Deuteronomy 22:30: **“A man shall not take his father’s wife, nor discover his father’s skirt.”**

Deuteronomy 27:20: **“Cursed *be* he that lieth with his father’s wife; because he uncovereth his father’s skirt...”**

Ezekiel 22:10: **“In thee have they discovered their fathers’ nakedness: in thee have they humbled her that was set apart for pollution.”**

1 Corinthians 5:1: **“It is reported commonly *that there* is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles [*sic nations*], that one should have his father’s wife.”**

Amos 2:7: **“That pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek: and a man and his father will go in unto the same maid, to profane my holy name.”**

Genesis 35:22: **“And it came to pass, when Israel dwelt in that land, that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father’s concubine: and Israel heard *it* ...”**

Genesis 49:4: **“Unstable as water, thou [*Reuben*] shalt not excel; because thou wentest up to thy father’s bed; then defiledst thou *it*: he went up to my couch.”**

1 Chronicles 5:1: **“Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, (for he was the firstborn; but, forasmuch as he defiled his father’s bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph the son of Israel: and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright.”**

2 Samuel 16:22: **“So they spread Absalom a tent upon the top of the house; and Absalom went in unto his father’s concubines in the sight of all Israel.”**

Matthew Poole’s *Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 1, page 236, says the following concerning Leviticus 18:7:

“Here it notes that *the nakedness of the father, and the nakedness of the mother, are one and the same thing*, because they two are one flesh, and therefore her nakedness is his also; which further appears, because the mother only is mentioned in the following words, which contain the reason of the law. *She is thy mother*; and therefore even nature teacheth thee to abhor such incest. Yet the Persians used to marry their mother; therein worse than the very camels, whom no force will drive to that act with their dams.”

What else Philip may have addressed on pages 30 and 31, I am not sure, but on page 32 Philip continues in part, a theme against Noah’s flood being worldwide in nature, to which I must agree, but not necessarily every aspect:

[Beginning of paragraph on missing page 31, which I don’t have, probably pertains to the conditions after the flood] “... probably never apprehended any difficulty with respect to the inhabitants of the water; supposing that no provision was needed for their preservation. It may therefore be proper to notice some particulars. Such an additional quantity of water as their interpretation requires, would so dilute and alter the mass as to render it an unsuitable element for the existence of all the classes, and would kill or disperse their food; and all have their appropriate food. Many of the marine fishes and shell animals could not live in fresh water: and the fresh water ones would be destroyed by being kept even a short time in salt water. Some species can indeed live in brackish water; having been formed by their Creator to have their dwelling in estuaries and the portions of rivers approaching the sea: but even these would be affected, fatally in all probability, by the increased volume of water and the scattering and floating away of their nutriment.

[Philip is quoting someone named Nott found in his Bibliography under #91. Nott, Josiah, M.D. 1866]:

“Thus, in a variety of ways, it is manifest that, upon the interpretation which I conceive to be erroneous, the preservation of animal life in the ark was immensely short of being adequate to what was necessary.

“Further; if we admit that interpretation, and also accede to the usual opinion that the Ararat upon which the ark rested was the celebrated mountain of that name in Armenia, and which tradition points out as being such, – we are involved in another perplexity. That mountain is nearly the height of our European Mont Blanc, and perpetual snow covers about five thousand feet from its summit. If the water rose, at its liquid temperature, so as to overflow that summit, the snows and icy masses would be melted; and, on the retiring of the flood, the exposed mountain would present its pinnacles and ridges, dreadful precipices of naked rock, down which the four men and four women, and with hardly any exception the quadrupeds, would have found it utterly impossible to descend. To provide against this difficulty, to prevent them from being dashed to pieces, – must we again suppose a miracle? Must we conceive of the human beings and the animals, as transported through the air to the more level regions below; or that, by a miracle equally grand, they were enabled to glide unhurt down the wet and slippery faces of rock?

“A ‘LOCAL FLOOD’ MORE LOGICAL

“One fact more I have to mention, in this range of argument. There are trees of the most astonishing magnificence as to form and size, which grow, the one species in Africa, the other in the southern part of North America. There are also methods of ascertaining the age of trees of the class to which they belong, with satisfaction generally, but with full evidence after they have passed the early stages of their growth. Individuals of these species now existing are proved, by those methods, to have begun to grow at an epoch long before the date of the deluge; if we even adopt the largest chronology that learned men have proposed. Had those trees been covered with water for three-quarters of a year, they must have been destroyed; the most certain conditions of vegetable nature, for the class (the most perfect land plants) to which they belong, put such a result out of doubt. Here then we are met by another independent proof that the deluge did not extend to those regions of the earth’. (*Two Lectures On The Natural History Of The Caucasian And Negro Races*. Mobile. 1844).

Nott continues: “Some have attempted to ascribe the formation of all the stratified rocks to the effects of the Mosaic Deluge; an opinion which is irreconcilable with the enormous thickness and almost infinite subdivisions of the strata, and with the numerous and regular successions which they contain of the remains of animals and vegetables, differing more and more widely from existing species, as the strata in which we find them are placed at greater depths. The fact that a large portion of these remains belong to extinct genera, and almost all of them to extinct species, that lived and multiplied and died on or near the spots where they are now found, shows that the strata in which they occur were deposited slowly and gradually during long periods of time, and at widely distant intervals. These extinct animals and vegetables *could therefore have formed no part of the creation with which we are immediately connected*’.” (*Two Lectures On The Natural History Of The Caucasian And Negro Races*. Mobile. 1844). From this we may conclude that the flood was merely local, not universal, and that the negro as well as certain mongrels could have existed in lands unaffected by the flood. [Note by C.A.E.: On this we can agree in part.]

“James Hammond, a former governor of South Carolina, once said: ‘They make God the Creator but restrict him to the Creation of a single pair of human beings and in

the animal and vegetable Kingdoms to only so many species as Noah could crowd into the Ark. Whence then has come the infinite [number] of animals and vegetables now known and the very marked varieties of the human species? If there was no other Creation all these things must have been effected by *secondary causes* What use have we for [God] if nature *without his aid* can change the Caucasian into the Malay and the Negro, and develop myriads of animals and plants unknown to Noah?" (Stanton, William. *The Leopard's Spots*. Chicago. 1960). [Back to Philip.]:

"If Noah, his three sons, and their wives, all *pure-whites*, were the only people saved from a worldwide flood, we would have no way to explain the presence of the negro on earth today.

"NIMROD WAS A MULATTO

"The purpose of Noah's flood was, of course, to end the wickedness of racial intermarriage between the sons of Adam and the 'daughters of men'. Adam, the father of these *sons of God* (Lk. 3:38), was a righteous *seed*, therefore God wanted the seed-line to remain undefiled by negro beasts. Had these 'sons of God' been 'angels' from heaven, they certainly were not sent by God, nor can we imagine 'angels' so lacking in morals. But even if they had been 'angels', they certainly were acting strangely for angels that can 'neither marry' nor be 'given in marriage' (Mt. 22:30). Angels are sexless and cannot produce flesh-and-blood offspring, nor could they have been drowned in Noah's flood.

"The 'daughters of men' were 'fair', not because they were White, but because they were desirable in a sensual sense. The 'men of renown' (Gen. 6:4), the 'giants' born of them, were mighty in terms of strength (they were tyrants and bullies), but they were *anshey hash shem* – degraded men, mongrels, without a resurrection after death (Ariel (Rev. Buckner H. Payne). *The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?* Cincinnati. 1872). Ariel calls race-mixing 'a crime, *in the sight of God*, that can not be *propitiated* by any sacrifice, or by any oblation, and can not be forgiven by *God* – *never* has been forgiven on earth, and never will be" (4:30). [Philip continues.]:

"Hislop writes that Nimrod was a negro (Hislop, Rev. Alexander. *The Two Babylons*. 2nd American Ed. Neptune, N.J.) and black in color (Hislop, Rev. Alexander. *The Two Babylons*. 2nd American Ed. Neptune, N.J. 1959). But since Nimrod was born of a White mother and a mulatto father (Cush), Nimrod had to have been a mulatto himself. Hislop undoubtedly understood Nimrod to have been a mixed-blood, since he describes Cush as a negro and Semiramis as a beautiful, blond-haired, blue-eyed woman. Since Cush was a son of Ham, either Ham or Ham's wife was a negro, and this writer prefers to believe that Ham married a negress in Egypt. Rogers adds that Mizraim, Cush's brother, was a negro as well (*Sex and Race*. Vol. 1, 9th ed. N.Y.), so, even if Ham did have a white wife on Noah's ark, he may not have been able to have children by her. Perhaps he just chose not to." [*Pile it higher and higher!*]

[Critical note by Clifton A. Emahiser: I fail to see how Philip Jones, and his sources, can make Ham someone other than a pure White Adamite, refuting Scripture at Gen. 6:9-10; 7:13; 9:18-19; 10:1 & 1 Chron. 1:1-4 which state:

Gen. 6:9-10: **"⁹ These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations [i.e., genetic DNA], and Noah walked with Yahweh. ¹⁰ And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth."**

Gen. 7:13: “In the selfsame day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah’s wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark ...”

Gen. 9:18-19: “¹⁸ And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan. ¹⁹ These are the three sons of Noah ...”

Gen. 10:1: “Now these are the generations [*i.e., genetic DNA*], of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were sons born after the flood.”

1 Chron. 1:1-4: “¹ Adam, Sheth, Enosh, ² Kenan, Mahalaleel, Jered, ³ Henoch, Methuselah, Lamech, ⁴ Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.”

[Critical note by Clifton A. Emahiser: Neither could Semiramis have been the wife of Nimrod; quoting from Jeffrey Crosby’s *The First Open Church, Followers Of “The Way”*, Part 9 (showing the untrue foolish folly of Alexander Hislop:

“However, many of those teachings, such as *Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, written over a century ago, are just not necessarily affirmed as true. Others have continued to pass on as sound doctrine things which are untruthful. One falsehood is the story of Semiramis, the alleged wife/mother of the Biblical Nimrod. The fact is that the Noahadic flood occurred in 3245 B.C. (by the Septuagint text). Yet here is an analysis (in part) from the *World Scope Encyclopedia*, vol. 10 (no pagination): ‘**Semiramis** (*se- mir’ a-mis*), a legendary queen of Assyria and Babylonia, reputed one of the most powerful rulers of Asia. Tradition makes her a daughter of Derceto, the fish goddess of Ascalon, and of a Syrian youth. Onnes, governor of Nineveh, was attracted by her beauty and made her his wife, but she won the love of King Ninus by a heroic exploit ... She was proclaimed Queen of Assyria, ruling over that mighty empire for 42 years. She travelled in all parts of her dominion, founded Babylon, and made it the most powerful city in the world ... [L]arge regions were added to the empire, particularly Libya, Persia, and Ethiopia. The Hanging Gardens of Babylon are attributed to her time, and there are other antiquities that give evidence of her long and successful reign. She was succeeded by her son, Ninyas. According to tradition, she disappeared after assuming the form of a dove and was long worshiped as a deity. If there is any historical basis for the figure of this princess, she might have lived in the first millenium B.C.’ So here we find more than a 2,000 year lapse between Nimrod and Semiramis”

[Critical note by Clifton A. Emahiser: As one can plainly see, there is absolutely no way that Semiramis could have been the wife of Nimrod! In my WTL #65 for Sept. 2003, I quoted William Finck thusly:

“With Nimrod we may very well have mention of both the **first Adamite tyrant**, a man who would rule over his kin outside of the laws of God, and the first multicultural ‘empire,’ since the cities mentioned had long existed and were populated with peoples of other races ...” Here Nimrod was a pure-Adamic White man! This essay will not allow the space needed to address all of the indiscriminate conclusions arrived at.