

BOOK REVIEW OF STEPHEN JONES': "THE BABYLONIAN CONNECTION"

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

We are about to do a book review on a book entitled *The Babylonian Connection* by Stephen Jones. The major theme in this book is the refutation of what is called "Two Seed-line teaching." This is a book review that is long overdue. This book was copyrighted in 1978 and published by America's Promise of Phoenix Arizona of Sheldon Emry fame. Many came to know their Identity as Israel through his ministry but at the same time were misled into error by such publications as the one we are going to review at this time. There is no bigger and more serious error in Holy Writ than the one we are now going to investigate. It is now time for all these doctrinal errors to be exposed and the truth brought to the light of Yahweh's Word. It is time for Israel to "pass under the rod", Ezekiel 20:37.

First let's take a very good look at the title of this book for Jones had a very ulterior motive for using it. For the first 33 pages he will try to gain the creditability of your confidence by convincing you he is an expert on the "Babylonian religion." Then once he feels he has "con"vinced you of his expertise, he will drop his bomb on page 34. Yes, Jones was real careful in picking out his title, *The Babylonian Connection*. He is very carefully leading you into his entrapment. He has designed his entanglement so you will unknowingly come under his spell. He is very savvy and deceptive in his use of words. Only the more alert will see through his cunning. I will point out his deceit and then you can decide for yourself if you still want to believe him. The bottom line is: If Jones is correct, we have no enemy and we can go back to sleep and rest assured in safety, and if Jones is wrong, we have an enemy of unprecedented proportions of all time and we are in a position of imminent danger. If Jones is wrong, he is like the south end of a horse pointed north and Sheldon Emry should be forever ashamed for ever publishing his book!

On page 1, he mentions that Nimrod was the founder of Babel and that Nimrod started to teach that he was "the promised 'seed of the woman'" (Gen. 3:15). Jones continues on in paragraph 4, "As we shall see, Nimrod and his priest taught a false interpretation of the religious history of Adam and Eve and of the nature of man." ... "All false religions have distinct similarities in doctrine or in ritual to the religion of Nimrod and Babylon. Once we see how Nimrod misinterpreted or mistaught the true Biblical account, we will be able to discover and expose Babylonian falsehoods in modern religions. The key to unlocking the shackles of the Babylonian deception is in the true interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis." Of course, Jones is going to be the one to "expose" and set the record straight.

On page 5 Jones continues: *One of the earliest writings of the mystery religions available today is "The Divine 'Pyramid of Hermes Mercurius Trismegistus.'" Though*

our present copy was probably revised during the first centuries A.D., it does contain much of the ancient religion. The story claims that Hermes received his teachings from the Great Dragon, the personification of 'Universal Life.' Because this was his source of 'wisdom', it takes no great imagination to connect it with the Edenic serpent. Notice, here, Jones admits that the connection is through "imagination." Later we will show just how great Jones' "imagination" is.

On page 7, Jones tries to nail down his premise a little stronger with this statement: In order to hide the truth of God's sacrifice for sin, the Babylonians exalted sin in the form of a serpent and worshipped the serpent as God.

On page 11, Jones says: We shall now examine the Biblical account of the temptation of Eve and show that the doctrine of inherent immortality was the serpent's original deception. To show what he means here, we will skip to page 61. This is his scenario of what took place in the garden when Eve was seduced (mentally according to him) : First they disobeyed God by eating from the Law-tree, and for that act they were made mortal. Then their eyes were opened to know both good and evil, and they recognized their mortality in contrast to God's immortality. (We will expand on this latter.)

Now that Jones has made an impression on his readers as to his great knowledge of the Babylonian Mystery religion, he next subtitles his next chapter V. on page 34 "THE SEXUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE FALL", and *WHAT DID THE MYSTERY RELIGION TEACH?* and he says:

"The Mystery religions of the ancient world taught that the tree of knowledge was a SEX TREE, and eating its fruit was symbolic of the sex act. According to this interpretation, the serpent seduced Eve sexually when she 'ate' of this 'tree.' Having learned the secret of procreation from the 'serpent', she then was said to have taught Adam this newly-found knowledge. Thus Eve first was said to have had sexual relations with the serpent, whereupon she went to Adam and did the same with him.

"The initiates of the Mysteries were taught that Adam and Eve became gods through their knowledge of sex. The serpent was the great benefactor of mankind, having been responsible for giving to us the great secret of attaining GODHOOD. It was further taught that the result of their sin was that Eve conceived twice in the same day. She was said to have had twins, one (Cain) was the seed of the serpent, while the other (Abel) was the seed of the woman.

"The world teaches that the 'sin' in Eden was sexual, and the Church by and large either agrees outright or remains silent on the issue. Thus, many, when they first hear the interpretation above, accept it as true, not knowing that they are accepting a false teaching of Mystery Babylon. We shall now reveal the Scriptural interpretation of Genesis 3, which will prove the sexual interpretation taught by Mystery Babylon to be false.

For the above three paragraphs, Stephen Jones has absolutely no documentation!!! If he would have had it, he would have used as in his bibliography he names 36 sources. The reason he didn't cite a source is because **he didn't have one** — he took it right out of the **thin air!!!** This is the main theme of his book and you know if he had any documentation he would have damn well used it here!!! Am I calling Jones a liar? — I think his work speaks for itself!!! I checked *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop and found nothing about what he indicates. I also checked “The Secret Teachings Of All Ages” by Manly P. Hall and he said nothing — and Hall doesn't miss much. Let's go on to see some more of the verbal gymnastics he uses to refute “Two Seed-line” teaching.

On page 38, Jones argues: *We have seen already that the serpent was the DECEIVER of the whole world. Satan obviously has not attempted to sexually seduce the entire population of men and women in the world.* If Jones would really take a good look at all the race-mixing that is going on today he would understand that Satan is, indeed, trying to seduce the whole world — and the Jews (Satan's children) are in charge of it.

Again on page 38, Jones says: *Often it is argued that the word translated BEGUILED actually means 'seduced' in a sexual manner. The original Hebrew word used here is NAWSHAW, and this word is defined by Strong's Concordance 'to lead astray. i.e. (mentally) to delude, or (morally) to seduce.'* Thus we can conclude that, depending upon the context of the passage, the word can mean either mental deception or moral (sexual) seduction. Notice here Jones says that the word can mean “moral sexual seduction.” He turns right around and in the next breath and says: We must keep in mind, however, that NAWSHAW does not have to mean seduction in a sexual way. It literally means TO LEAD ASTRAY. This is a good example of Jones' verbal gymnastics.

On page 42, Jones says:

“We conclude then that when Eve explained to God that the serpent had 'beguiled' her, she meant that he had mentally deceived her. He corrupted the truth of God's Word by preaching another Jesus (God), another spirit, and another gospel, just as Satan's ministers have done all through the ages. And when Eve believed Satan's doctrine, she too was corrupted. NAW-SHAW, as used in Genesis 3:13 had nothing to do with physical seduction.

Again on page 45, Jones continues:

“The Scriptures give us no particular reason to suspect that the trees in Eden (other than the trees of life and knowledge) are to be taken symbolically. ... but to attach symbolic significance to either of them in Genesis 1-3 simply leads to the sex-religion of Babylon.

On page 46, Jones makes one spurious statement right after another:

“Did God command Adam to be promiscuous and have sex with all the other 'trees' in the garden? The Babylonians believed this , and this interpretation that

the trees were other people was the basis for their sex-religion. ... Just two verses after God commanded Adam to eat of all the trees except the one in the middle of the garden, God stated that Adam needed a wife, BECAUSE HE WAS ALONE. ... If Adam was commanded to have sex with all the other 'trees' in the garden, there would be no reason for God to create Eve. Adam would have had an entire harem to keep him company. ... When Eve told the serpent that they were both allowed to eat of the other trees, are we to believe that Adam and Eve continued to be promiscuous, even after God had joined them in holy matrimony? ... If the trees of the garden are to be taken as being symbolic of other people, then we can only arrive at the blasphemous conclusion that God condones extra-marital sexual relations, and the marriage relationship becomes totally meaningless.

Then Jones continues:

The only trees in the garden that warrant any symbolic interpretation are the tree of knowledge and the tree of life.

If you listen real carefully, Jones just proved "Two Seed-line"! He is saying the [other] trees should not be taken symbolically, but the tree of knowledge and tree of life should be. If he would have used this rule, none of the rest of the things he quoted on this page would have been necessary. One thing I have noticed of the Jewish actors on the screen and television, they are real good at double-talk and this is what Jones is doing here.

Jones continues to make confusion on page 47:

"Neither of them ate of the serpent, but of the tree. ... In spite of this, those who teach the sexual interpretation always seem to confuse the serpent with the tree of knowledge. One moment they teach that the serpent is either Satan or some man who seduced Eve; but in the next breath they teach that the tree of knowledge was the being who seduced Eve. If we ever hope to come to a clear and consistent understanding of Genesis 3, we must understand that the serpent and the tree are TWO DIFFERENT ENTITIES that symbolize two different things.

I will answer Jones here as I did Charles Wiseman in my debate with him on "Two Seed-line." Mr. Charles Wiseman, the serpent and the tree of knowledge of good and evil are not two different entities — they are the same thing. I don't know whether you are aware of it or not, but you are getting close to the greatest tenet of the Christian Faith. You probably are not aware of it or you wouldn't have made this statement if you were. Let's take an example: The "tree of life" and "Yahshua" are the same thing and when we take Communion, we eat of the "tree of life", therefore if "the tree of life" and Yahshua are the same thing, so is the serpent and "the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Mr. Charles Wiseman, it appears that you are using any picayune trivial statement you can to gain your point. When you are starting with false doctrine, like you are, you must continue to build upon it with one lie on top of another to support it. When you

start with truth, that is not a problem. So this goes for you too Mr. Stephen Jones. One other thing should be observed here and that is: Ted R. Weiland and Charles Wiseman are quoting out of Jones' book *The Babylonian Connection* so we know where they are getting their garbage. They are just parroting Stephen Jones. That makes them all liars!

Jones goes on with his verbal gymnastics on page 47:

“Did Adam also sin by having sexual relations with the serpent (or tree)? In other words, whoever seduced Eve also would have had to have sexual relations with Adam. That would make the serpent (or tree) a bisexual creature. ... The other explanation that is often used is that after Eve was ‘taught’ the knowledge of sex by having intercourse with the serpent, she in turn ‘taught’ Adam by having relations with HIM. ... Furthermore, what could possibly be sinful about Adam having sexual relations with his own wife?”

Jones continues on page 48 after setting up this false premise:

“It is inconceivable that God would ordain marriage in chapter 2, telling them to be ‘one flesh’, and then punish Adam in chapter 3 for having sexual relations with his own wife. If Adam originally sinned by having sexual intercourse with Eve, then the entire institution of holy matrimony is called into question and with it God’s honor.

“We see then that Adam could not have sinned by having sexual relations with his own wife. The only other option left to the sexual interpretation is that Adam and Eve were both seduced by one bisexual individual.

These last remarks on pages 47 and 48 only show Jones' ignorance of the Yahweh's Law of adultery. Adam was well aware that Eve had an extramarital affair with Satan and when Eve offered Adam to have sexual intercourse with her after this affair, and Adam accepting, then Adam became as guilty as Eve. Satan's and Eve's penalty according to the Law is spelled out in Deuteronomy 22:22 as follows:

If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, BOTH the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shall thou put away evil from Israel.

That is why 1st Timothy 2:14 says:

And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.

Adam's sin, if you can call it that, was not demanding justice and in the face of all the facts accepting Eve as a whore. The problem Stephen Jones has here is: he is basing all of his erroneous conclusions on faulty premises. If he would have taken the Law into account, he could not have made these idiotic statements. Then we have people like Ted R. Weiland and Charles Wiseman walking as so-called Bible experts right in Jones' steps. Then we have the blinded sheep of Israel following right behind them. I

can hardly wait for the day when Jones, Weiland and Wiseman have hell to pay for their misdeeds in leading Israel astray! They are not qualified to be leaders in Israel! Well, let's go on.

Next on page 49, Jones gives his erroneous interpretation of what happened in the garden:

“There is only one thing in the entire Bible that fits the description given in Genesis 3:6. The tree of knowledge is not symbolic of Satan, nor is it symbolic of sex, for the Bible does not teach either of them to be our source of wisdom or of our knowledge of good and evil. This tree can only represent the LAW OF GOD.

“One of the simplest Scriptural proofs that the tree of knowledge of good and evil must be God's Law is Moses' explanation of what Gods' Law was and would do:

“See, I have set before thee this day LIFE and GOOD, and DEATH and EVIL;

“I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you LIFE and DEATH, blessing and cursing; therefore chose LIFE, that both thou and thy seed may live. (Deut. 30:15,19).

Then repeating Jones' statement on page 61 along the same vein:

“First they disobeyed God by eating from the Law-tree, and for that act they were made mortal. Then their eyes were opened to know both good and evil, and they recognized their mortality in contrast to God's immortality. ... Because they had broken His Law, and they stood naked (mortal) and without excuse.

From these remarks on pages 49 and 61, Jones is implying that Eve's sin was a thought crime and she was corrupted for a wrong “mental” thought. If Eve's seduction was mental only, Why didn't Yahweh just set her straight and tell her to change her mind back again? If we are all condemned for a wrong “mental” thought — then we are all in of a lot of trouble!!!!!! No, it wasn't something that easy to fix up — once a woman is pregnant, its carry the child to full term or abort it. It was something that couldn't be reversed once it was started. Now if it were the partaking of a so-called “Law-tree” which had both “curses” and “blessings”, Why didn't Eve get some “blessings” out of it as well as a “curse”??? Just a little detail that Jones might help us get straight here! Where there two different colors of apples on the tree and Eve got the wrong color maybe?

Next we are going to quote Jones from pages 65 and 66:

“Most of the controversy of Genesis 3:15 surrounds the identity of the seed of the serpent. Those who teach the sexual interpretation claim that Cain was physically fathered by the serpent. They further teach that Abel was the seed of the woman. and that he was fathered by Adam. When Cain killed his brother, Abel was subsequently replaced by Seth, who was another seed (descendant) of the woman.

“However, this interpretation does not take into account that Cain was as much the seed of the woman as was Abel and Seth. All three sons were born of the same woman (Eve), regardless of who their father was. If Cain was truly fathered by the serpent, while Abel was fathered by Adam, then God would have told the serpent: ‘And I will put enmity between thee and Adam. and between thy seed and Adam’s SEED.’

“However, the Bible does not prophesy conflict between Adam’s seed and the serpent’s seed. Instead, it speaks of a conflict between the seed of the WOMAN and the seed of the SERPENT. If the sexual interpretation were true, then we would have to teach that Cain was BOTH the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent at the same time.

“It should be obvious that the woman was the mother of both Cain and Abel. There were not two fathers.

“Furthermore, seed (the power of procreation) is a physical thing, and outside of God alone, only physical fleshly beings have seed and can reproduce sexually. Satan is supposedly a spirit-being like the angels in heaven, which ‘neither marry nor are given in marriage’ (Luke 20:34-36).

“The sexual interpretation again firmly runs aground on Genesis 4:1, 2, which reads:

‘And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord. And she again bare Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.’

“This verse plainly states that Cain was the result of Adam knowing Eve his wife. The Genesis account is very brief, but if it had meant to tell us that the serpent had fathered Cain, God would have not told us plainly that ‘Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain.’

As a matter of fact, contrary to what Jones says, Cain and Abel were fathered by two different fathers. Most people reading Genesis 4:1-2 assume that the birth of Cain was the result of Adam knowing Eve his wife, but this wasn’t the case, for Eve was already pregnant with Cain by the time Adam knew her. To really see this, we should take legal status into account. Let’s do this at this time:

LEGAL STATUS

I believe that some of the confusion over Genesis 4:1 is a misunderstanding of legal status! Have you ever read a legal contract where they would use the terms, “party of the first part”, “party of the second part”, “party of the third part” etc.? This is done so someone in the contract doesn’t get mixed up with another person which could be disastrous for all other parties in the contract. Let’s apply this same method with the Bible. Let’s apply it this way:

- ⇒ Satan, party of the first part.
- ⇒ Eve, party of the second part.
- ⇒ Adam, party of the third part.
- ⇒ Cain, party of the fourth part.
- ⇒ Abel, party of the fifth part.
- ⇒ Seth, party of the sixth part.

Genesis 3:13, *And the woman said* (party of the second part) *The serpent* (party of the first part) *beguiled me* (party of the second part), *and I* (party of the second part) *did eat*. Genesis 4:1, *And Adam* (party of the third part) *knew Eve his wife* (party of the second part); *and she* (party of the second part) *conceived, and bare Cain* (party of the fourth part); *and said, I have gotten a man* (party of the fourth part) *from the LORD*. Genesis 4:2 *And she* (party of the second part) *bare his brother Abel* (party of the fifth part). Genesis 4:25 *And Adam* (party of the third part) *knew Eve his wife again* (party of the second part); *and she* (party of the second part) *bare a son* (party of the sixth part), *and called his name Seth* (party of the sixth part): *for God, said she* (party of the second part), *hath appointed me another seed* (party of the sixth part) *instead of Abel* (party of the fifth part), *whom Cain* (party of the fourth part) *slew*.

If we understand that Eve was already pregnant by Satan when Adam knew her, Genesis 4:1 would be correct in saying that “Adam knew Eve his wife.” and then “she conceived and bare Cain.” You will notice that it doesn’t say that Able was conceived! This is important! The sequence of events are like this: Satan seduced Eve and got her pregnant. Then Adam knew Eve and fertilized an extra egg that didn’t get fertilized by Satan. Then Eve bare Cain fathered by Satan firstly. Then Eve bare Abel fathered by Adam secondly. If we can understand this chain of events, then we can understand the reading of Genesis 4:1!

Now we shall quote from James E. Wise in his booklet, *The Seed Of The Serpent*:

“At the time that God told Eve (Genesis 3:16) that she would bring forth children, Eve had already had unchaste relations with both the serpent and Adam. God was here making known to her that two seeds had been planted in her womb, one by the serpent and the other by Adam. This is verified in the subject verse when God, speaking to the serpent, mentioned the two seeds, ‘thy seed and her seed.’

“In Genesis 4:1 we read, *And Adam knew Eve his wife: and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord*. Even though Cain was her firstborn and she thought him to be her **promised seed**, she later **acknowledges that Abel, not Cain, was her promised seed**. Therefore, if Abel was her promised seed, then Cain would have to be the **seed or progeny of the serpent**. This is confirmed by the Apostle John and is recorded in 1 John 3:12 and reads: *Not as Cain who was ‘of that wicked one...* The word ‘of’ plainly denotes offspring or progeny of the **wicked one**.

“In Genesis 4:1 notice that Eve thinks Cain to be her seed, but in verse 25 she acknowledges that she was wrong. It reads, *And Adam knew his wife again, and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: for God, said she, **hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel**, whom Cain slew.* A perusal of the Bible dictionary shows the name ‘Seth’ to mean ‘substitute’, while the name ‘Cain’ means ‘acquired’ or **gotten from another source. Nowhere in all the Bible is Cain’s name mentioned in the lineage of Adam.** The place where Adam’s lineage occurs are Genesis 5:3, 1 Chronicles 1:1, and Luke 3:38.

“Bible teachers and preachers are in agreement that Cain and Abel were twins. To this God’s word agrees, for in Genesis 4:3 and 4, **they came of age at the same time and presented their offerings on the same day**, Too, in Genesis 4:1, the Bible states that Adam ‘knew’ his wife, Eve, and she conceived by him; yet verses 1 and 2 **show two births and only one conception** is attributed to Adam. Verse 2 says, *And she again bare his brother Abel... .*

SETH KEEPS LEVIRATE LAW

We read in Genesis 4:25 the following:

And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Able, whom Cain slew.

We should see right away, here, that Cain is left totally out of the picture — he is not even considered! Yes, Cain was born first and was in line for the birthright, but he was disqualified because he was a mamzer (a bastard). This is why the names of Cain and Able are reversed in Genesis 4:2! This made Abel officially the firstborn of Adam. Then Abel was murdered by Cain leaving no children. It is the Law that a younger brother is to raise up seed to his childless brother. That is why Genesis 4:25 says: *God hath appointed another seed instead of (or in place of) Abel.* Rousas John Rushdoony in his book, *The Institute Of Biblical Law* has this to say about the levirate Law:

***The Levirate**, Mace observed, concerning “the true cause of Hebrew polygamy,” that “There can be no doubt that this was the desire for an heir.” This is true if we realize that the desire for an heir was more than simply a love of a son. The family was basic to Biblical society and culture; The bastard was cut off from church, and state, insofar as any legal status was concerned, to the tenth generation (Deut. 23:2). He might be a godly man, but he was not a citizen. In cannon law, the church barred bastards from church orders, although exceptions were made by papal dispensations. The purpose of Hebrew polygamy, which was usually bigamy, to be accurate, was thus the perpetuation of the family. Moreover, in terms of the facts, as Mace pointed out, “we are bound to envisage the community as being in general almost entirely monogamous.” ... The one exception permitted is the law of the levirate (Deut. 25:5-10). According to the law, if a man died childless, his next of kin had the duty to take the widow as wife*

and rear up a family bearing the name of the dead man. This law was older than Moses, and was applied in Judah's household (Gen. 38:8).

We can see here that it was not only the honorable thing for Seth to raise up seed for Abel, but it was his duty, as next of kin, to do so. Cain was not next of kin, therefore all you would have gotten would have been more bastards.

By Seth raising up seed to Abel makes all Israelites and like people, including Yahshua, descended from Abel through Seth, therefore Cain is absolutely left out of the Adamic genealogies.

One other thing should be pointed out concerning seed. In Genesis 3:15 it speaks of "her seed" (meaning Eve). Technically the woman doesn't have any seed, so her seed is her husband's as they are considered, when married, as one. Therefore Eve's seed was Adam's seed, so Genesis 3:15 is correct when it speaks of "thy (the serpent's) seed" and "her (Adam's) seed." If Cain and Abel were both of Adam, as Jones asserts, Genesis 3:15 would have to read, "I will put enmity between 'her seed' and 'her seed'" which wouldn't make any sense at all, and it doesn't say that for good reason.

On page 67, Jones makes this statement:

"It is true that Cain is nowhere listed in the genealogies of the descendants of Adam. However that is not strange, since his murderous act disqualified him from carrying on the birthright and lineage which was to culminate in the birth of Christ. It is not unusual at all to omit the unimportant births. In the first 'book of the generations of Adam' found in Genesis 5:1-5, we do not find even Abel listed. Why? Because he died childless and could not provide the lineage to Christ.

Abel is listed in Genesis 4:25. Seth was only a substitute for Abel, so that makes Abel in the lineage of Yahshua (Christ). Seth's seed was identical to Abel's, so there is no difference. And, yes, Cain did lose his birthright, not because he murdered Abel but because Cain was a mamzer (bastard).

CAIN DISQUALIFIED AS FIRSTBORN

Hardly had Cain been born that he is put in second place. Many writers and commentators point out the fact that in Genesis 4:2, the order is changed from "Cain and Abel" to "Abel and Cain." We have to ask the question, then, Why would this be? Cain had not murdered Abel yet, so we can't say that was the cause. Moses was writing this, And why would he change the order of the names? You will remember that Reuben was disqualified from being the firstborn for an impropriety with his mother and was replaced with Joseph. The order of Esau and Jacob was reversed to Jacob and Esau, Genesis 25:23. Being that Cain was fathered by Satan would be enough to disqualify him for the position of firstborn, or priest of the family! Let's read Genesis 4:1-2 to see how this reads:

1 And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and **bare Cain**, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD. 2 And she again **bare his brother Abel**. And **Able** was a keeper of sheep, but **Cain** was a tiller of the ground.

WHY, THEN, WAS CAIN DISQUALIFIED AS FIRSTBORN?

In verse 7 of this same chapter, the subject of the birthright is brought up. Let's read verses 6 and 7 to see it:

6 And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? 7. If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. **And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.**

You can see here it is speaking about the birthright real plain! As Cain was the firstborn, he would be in line for the family priesthood as well as the inheritance. We are talking about big stakes here! There is more to this than just the acceptance of the sacrifices. Cain evidently wanted to kill Abel all along for losing his position as firstborn and used the rejected sacrifice for an excuse to justify it.

Secondly, there is something here that should stand out real big to everyone who reads it, and that is: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." What does this mean, "**and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door???**" A lot of people try to read this as if Cain had a choice in the matter. That is not what it is saying at all! What is it saying then? Yahweh through Moses is speaking of Cain's conception and birth here — his natural tendency toward sin as a result of the character of his father. Cain's conception was therefore his "door." Yahweh knew that he wouldn't "do well" and wasn't fit for the birthright and He told him as much!!! Let's see what the words "sin", "lieth" and "door" mean in the Hebrew:

Sin — #2403 **chattâ'âh**, khat-taw-aw ' ; or 'chattâth, kat-tawth ' ; from 2398; an offence (sometimes habitual sinfulness), and its penalty, occasion, sacrifice, or expiation; also (concretely) an offender: — punishment (of sin), purifying (-fication for sin), sin (-er, offering).

Lieth — #7257 **râbats**, raw-bats ' : a prime root; to crouch (on all four legs folded, like a recumbent animal); by implication to recline, repose, brood, lurk, imbed: — crouch (down), fall down, make a fold, lay, (cause to, make to) lie (down), make to rest, sit.

Door — #6607 **pethach**, peh'-thakh; from 6605; an opening (literally), i.e. door (gate) or entrance way: door, entering (in), entrance (ry), gate, opening, place.

In other words, Cain's opening place into the entrance of life was his conception and birth — the word here refers to #6605 which means to *open wide* or *break forth*. Thus we can see the implication here of conception. The word here for sin means *habitual sinfulness* like in Isaiah 3:9:

*The shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare **their sin** as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they have rewarded evil unto themselves.*

The word “sin” here is the same as used in “**sin lieth at the door.**” If we understand the sin of Sodom, then we understand the sin of the serpent and his offspring, Cain!!! The word “*lieth*” means to crouch (sin is lurking in a resting position ready to lurch out) — the Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament says , page 755, (a) *used of a beast of prey lying in wait, and also, Gen. 4:7 (and indulgest in secret hatred) ... i.e. sin will always be a liar in wait at the door for thee, like a wild beast, lying at thy door.* All Jews have this secret hatred lying in a crouched position ready to spring like a roaring lion at an unsuspecting victim.

The Wycliff Bible Commentary, Editors: Charles F. Pfeiffer & Everett F. Harrison has this to say on page 8, and this quote will cover Genesis 3:14-15:

14. Cursed (arûr) art thou. *The Lord singled out the originator and instigator of the temptation for special condemnation and degradation. From that moment he must crawl in the dust and even feed on it. He would slither his way along in disgrace, and hatred would be directed against him from all directions. Man would always regard him as a symbol of the degradation of the one who slandered God (cf. Isa 65:25). He was to represent not merely the serpent race, but the power of the evil kingdom. As long as life continued, men would hate him and seek to destroy him. **15. I will put enmity.** The word ’êbâ denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man (cf. Num 35:19,20; Ezk 25:15-17; 35:5,6). **Thou shalt bruise (shûp).** A prophecy of continuing struggle between the descendants of woman and of the serpent to destroy each other. The verb shûp is rare (cf. Job 9:17; Ps 139:11). It is the same in both clauses. When translated crush, it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in describing the attack of the serpent on man’s heel. It is also rendered lie in wait for, aim at or (LXX) watch for. The Vulgate renders it conteret, “bruise” in the first instance and insidiaberis, “lie in wait,” in the other clause. Thus, we have in this famous passage, called the protevangelium, “first gospel,” the announcement of a prolonged struggle perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of woman. God’s promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. This assurance fell upon the ears of God’s earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption.*

You can see here, by these comments, that I was not using the Hebrew incorrectly with the words “sin”, “lieth” and “door.” Sin was not something Cain chose, but sin chose Cain — he got it from his father, Satan. It just came natural to him.

WHAT KIND OF A SEDUCTION?

There are some, like Ted R. Weiland, Charles Wiseman and Stephen Jones here, who try to indicate that the “seduction” of Eve was only a matter of mere “mental deception” on Satan’s part. While it is true that Eve was deceived in word, it is also true that Eve was physically sexually violated, and I am going to prove it. We can read the account of this in Genesis 3:13:

And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.

Now the word “eat” here is from the Hebrew word #398, and one of its meanings is “lay.” In other words, Eve was telling Yahweh, here, that “*The serpent beguiled me, and I did lay.*” At this point you may still not believe me. Well in the center reference of the KJV it refers us to 2 Corinthians 11:3 and 1 Timothy 2:14. Now both of these shed light on the situation, but 2 Corinthians 11:3 is simply outstanding! In order to understand verse 3, we are going to have to read from verse 1 through 3. Before we read it though, let’s preview it just a little. We find Paul here in a state that he wishes to brag about his ministry — we all like to that occasionally. Paul was probably a little proud of himself for doing such a good job of presenting the gospel to these Corinthians but at the same time he warns them that someone might come along to undo all that he had done. Now Paul is concerned about someone subverting their minds such as Eve’s was, but the way it is stated there can be no doubt that Eve was also physically seduced. Let’s read it:

*1 Would to God Ye could bear with me a little in my folly: and indeed bear with me. 2 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: **for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ** 3 But I fear, lest by any means, **as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty**, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.*

Now I know Paul is speaking of mental seduction here, but at the same time he is comparing this mental seduction to Eve’s physical seduction or why even bring up the idea of a “chaste virgin.” In other words, Eve was a “chaste virgin” until Satan physically seduced her. **There is no possible way Satan could have taken away Eve’s virginity through mental seduction!!!!!!** Of course if you don’t understand that Israel was divorced by Yahweh, and that the only way He could remarry her was by his dying according to the Law, you will not understand why it is important that we become as “chaste virgins” so He can remarry us.

On page 76, Jones in his conclusion, to that point, makes a very serious doctrinal error. I cannot overstate the seriousness of this doctrinal mistake. But before we get into it, let’s see what he says:

*“The story told in Genesis 3 lays the foundation of the doctrine of man’s sin under the Law, his sentence of death, **and his redemption** to eternal life by grace alone. These doctrines are the core of the Christian religion as taught in the Bible.*

I don't know just what Jones is trying to pull off here, but he is incorrect about the "doctrine of Redemption!!! **I will now present a small segment from an article I wrote about Redemption and I believe you will quickly see his lie:**

YAHWEH MARRIES ISRAEL

We cannot understand "redemption" unless we understand that Yahweh married Israel. This wedding took place in Deuteronomy 26:17-18 as when both the people and Yahweh took their vows:

17 Thou hast avouched the LORD this day to be thy GOD, and to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken unto his voice: 18 And the LORD hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and thou shouldest keep all his commandments.

In other words Israel was ask: Do you take Yahweh this day to be your Elohim? And they answered: "We will." Yahweh was ask: Do you take this people Israel to be your "peculiar" people? Yahweh said: "I will." Therefore Israel became Yahweh's own possession. With this there came a wife-husband relationship between Yahweh and Israel. We do not have any record where Yahweh covenanted or married any other people as He did Israel!

To verify that this was actually a wedding that took place between Him and His people, let's consider some Scriptures which prove this:

Jeremiah 3:14, 20

*14 Turn, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; **for I am married unto you:** and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion.*

*20 **Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband,** so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the LORD.*

Jeremiah 31:32:

*Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, **although I was an husband unto them,** saith the LORD.*

Once we understand this husband-wife relationship between Yahweh and Israel, then we can begin to understand what "Redemption" is all about. This husband-wife relationship went well at first, but then Israel began to break her marriage vows by incorporating pagan religions and thus adulterating the true tenets of Yahweh. Because of this, it became necessary for Yahweh to divorce Israel for her unfaithfulness. Now let's see some Scriptures which confirm the reason for the divorce and that actually Yahweh did divorce Israel:

Jeremiah 3:8:

*And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery **I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce**; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.*

Deuteronomy 24:1:

*When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: **let him write her a bill of divorcement**, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.*

Isaiah 50:1:

*Thus saith the LORD, **Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement**, whom I have put away? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away.*

Now that Yahweh has married and divorced Israel, Where in this story does it bring us? Being divorced from Yahweh, Israel can no longer call herself by His name, therefore she became known by other names, Gentiles being one of them. At this stage of the game, things look hopeless as neither Yahweh nor Israel can marry again legally. The only way, by Law, that either can remarry is if one or the other's spouse were to die. To verify we shall go to Romans 7:1-4:

*1 Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? 2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; **but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband**. 3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.*

Redemption is a very simple story then. Yahweh came Himself in the flesh to die so he could remarry Israel. This is not all of the story, **but it isn't what Jones said it is!**

You can see here that Stephen Jones cannot be trusted with the "doctrine of Redemption." If Stephen Jones cannot be trusted with "Redemption" , he cannot be trusted on any subject in the Scriptures. Neither can his disciples like Ted R. Weiland, Charles Wiseman or others whoever they may be!!!!!!

Before we leave Stephen Jones, we should take note of some of the other things he believes for it identifies just what kind of a man he is. Let's take a quote from page 44-45 and analyze it:

"In the same way, both the Assyrian and the Egyptian empires were formed by the descendants of Adam and Eve in the years after the flood.

Evidently, Stephen Jones believes the flood of Noah to be a universal flood. This alone should disqualify him from being a teacher in Israel! These proclaimers of authority usually claim that all the descendants of Cain were drowned in the flood and no longer exist. All you need do is check the numbers 7014 and 7017 in the Hebrew in the Strong's Concordance **and you can quickly tell there were descendants of Cain spoken of in Scripture well after the flood of Noah.** The Egyptian Empire antedates the flood of Noah by quite some time so it couldn't have been a universal flood! So, again, this Jones disqualifies himself as a teacher in Israel.

Another proof that Jones believes in a universal flood of Noah is found on page 67 where he says:

God saw fit to list Shem, Ham and Japheth, so that we would know the origins of the modern nations and their purposes on the earth.

You can see here that Jones believes that all the peoples were drowned in Noah's flood and that all the peoples of today are descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth. He would probably try to tell you that all the blacks came from Ham, all the Mongolians came from Japheth and the White peoples came from Shem. Jones doesn't say it in word here, but he highly implies that all "the modern nations" came from Shem, Ham and Japheth.

Again on page 14 Jones makes a spurious statement;

"There is another event, however, which separates the believers from the unbelievers."

By this statement you can tell he believes that we chose to believe on "Christ" where Scripture teaches, John 15:16, *Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you.*

Stephen Jones has another book he entitled *Creation's Jubilee*, copyrighted 1991 by God's Kingdom Ministries, P.O. Box 3929, Batesville, Arkansas, 72503. I am going to take a few quotes from it to show you another very serious error of his of huge proportions. These quotes are from pages 92, 95, 96 and 97:

*pg. 92 "The promise must come, not only to all of Abraham's seed, **but also to 'all families of the earth'** (Gen. 12:3).*

*pg. 95 "Because the Abrahamic Covenant in essence promised salvation to all of Abraham's seed, and through him to **'all the families of the earth'**, this Covenant forever settled two questions: (1) IF salvation would indeed come, and (2) HOW MANY beneficiaries are there?"*

*pg. 96 "In the same manner, on the largest scale, God has made a Covenant with **'all families of the earth'**", which Paul goes all the way back to Adam (Rom. 5 & 1 Cor. 15).*

*pg. 97 "... but God has bound Himself unconditionally by a five-fold Blood Covenant **to bring all mankind** to salvation.*

You can see here very plainly that Stephen Jones would bring all the unclean races including Jews and mamzers under the Abrahamic Covenant. The “all the families of the earth” spoken of in these references that Jones is using are “the [Israelite] families of the earth” (not all the other races). No doubt, Stephen Jones is a mamzer baptizer too along with his disciples Weiland, Wiseman and such!

Not only is Stephen Jones a false prophet, a false teacher and a false watchman, but he is out to destroy the teachings of Bertrand L. Comparet and Wesley A. Swift and you can detect it in a statement he makes on page 76:

“The natural result of the sexual interpretation is to teach that the good people pre-existed in the heavens with God until the devil and his race defiled the earth with sin. Then Adam’s descendants were sent to earth to take it by storm and save it from the devil for God.

This is exactly what Comparet and Swift taught, and Jones is deliberately aiming his remarks at them.

Jones makes another interesting statement on page 76:

“Genealogy makes no man righteous before the Law or immortal before God.

If genealogy is of no importance, Why is it mandatory that we have a “kinsman Redeemer”? Mr. Stephen Jones, GENEALOGY makes all the difference in the world!!!!!!

NO, MR. STEPHEN JONES, IT IS YOU WHO IS TEACHING “ANOTHER JESUS” AND “ANOTHER GOSPEL”!!!!!!

Have you ever wondered what Jewry’s Luciferian priesthood mean in protocol #14 which says: *“Our philosophers will discuss all the shortcomings of the various beliefs of the non-Jews. But no one will bring under discussion our faith from its true view since this will be learned by none save ours, who will never betray its secret”*? You can see from this that the Jews have infiltrated into “Israel Identity” and it appears that Stephen Jones is one of their boys!

Pray Yahweh that our people, Israel, will awaken from their blindness of who they are and recognize their “enemy.”

Again on page 76, paragraph 5, we should take a look at another statement made by Stephen Jones:

“If we are to be pleasing to God, we must in humility recognize that all our righteousness is as filthy rags. Genealogy makes no man righteous before the Law or immortal before God.”

Here Jones is saying that “Genealogy” makes no difference — that all races are the same before Yahweh! In his book here, he will make more statements to this effect.

SO, WHAT IS THE PROBLEM WITH THIS?

The problem is about how everyone is trying to bring all the other races and sub-races into the Kingdom of Yahweh when the Scriptures expressly states otherwise, Amos 3:2:

- ❖ *You (Israel) only have I (Yahweh) known of all the families of the earth..*
- ❖ *Again, Yahshua stated, Matthew 15:24, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*

Now, What is there that is so hard to understand about these two verses? How much plainer can it be?

It appears that Yahweh doesn't want blacks from anywhere! He doesn't want Eskimos! He doesn't want the kind of American Indians that can't blush! He doesn't want the aborigine from Australia! He doesn't want the cat and dog eaters from Asia! He doesn't want the Arabs (the children of the bond woman)! He doesn't want the Japanese! He doesn't want the Kurds from Kurdistan! He doesn't want the "chinks" from China! He doesn't want the "gooks" from the Philippines! He doesn't want the Polynesians from Malaysia or Borneo! He doesn't want any Hottentots from South Africa! And if it's anything other than White Israelites, He doesn't want them either!

Is it too hard to understand that Yahweh only wants Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Germanic, Lombard, Celtic, Scottish, Irish, Danish, Icelandic, Welsh and related peoples? Well, from the "Identity" materials I have been reading for the last 18 years, (Jones included), it would appear that this is not understood generally by our people. Yes, there are a few of our people who understand this important fact but they are of a minor few. It is now time to face this issue and bring it out into the open so it can get aired out. Once it is, maybe then we can get a breath of fresh air instead of this old moldy stench we have been getting from Stephen Jones, Ted R. Weiland, Charles Wiseman, Pete Peters and James Bruggeman. The Scriptures do not teach anywhere that these other races are going to be brought into the Kingdom, **NOWHERE!!!** In fact, the Scriptures teach quite the contrary! Now before we get into this matter, we need to lay some ground work to establish this truth.

IT IS NOW TIME TO RID OURSELVES OF ERROR.

Let's take a moment and consider why there are so many spurious teachings among Israel Identity. Today we have people coming out of all the denominations (and thank Yahweh they are coming out), Protestant, Catholic and what have you, into Israel Identity and they have a tendency to bring their isms with them. As a result, we have a multiplicity of ideas among them. Another problem, and probably much more serious, is that there are those coming among us who are alleged not to be racially pure Israel. Some of these are even becoming leaders and teachers among us such as Pete Peters who is alleged to be part Pueblo Indian. We can now begin to see why these alleged people promote "one seed-line." And these alleged people, because of their alleged

mixed blood, will take a soft stand on the racial issue. It is time to ferret out all of these “mamzer” half-breed not of pure Israel stock (if they are so) which are among us. If you will remember, it was the “mixed multitude” that was among early Israel that was always causing the trouble. Now if we allow these half-breeds (if they are so) to be among us, you can count on it, there is going to be trouble. They are going to try to hide their alleged polluted blood with false doctrine (just like the Pharisees). Oh, you say, my God, our numbers will dwindle if we kick them out. All I can say is: Remember Gideon. By what authority, then, shall we ferret out these (alleged) unqualified so-called “ministers” or “pastors.”

WE HAVE THE AUTHORITY!

Ezekiel 20:37-38 gives us all the authority we need to remove these half-breeds. This passage will be one of many that we will be considering in this article:

37 And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: 38 And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the LORD.

THE GENTILES

At this point we shall divert to a portion of writing I did on another article. The reason for bringing this to you at this time is to show Israel’s unique position with Yahweh and how we are His “special” “separated” people to Him and that **race is everything** in spite of what Jones says.

Before we go very far into the subject of “Israel Only” (the article which I wrote), it would be well to take up the term “Gentile” or the so-called conversion of the “Gentiles.” There is no other mistranslated word which has done so much violence to Scripture. The term “Gentile” is an unfortunate translation from the Greek to the Latin and means a non-Roman. Its like the Greeks calling anyone who was not Greek a barbarian. You can see from this that Yahshua and all of His disciples by Roman standards were “Gentiles” with the exception of Paul who was a Roman citizen from birth. The word Gentile in Hebrew is #1471, and means foreigner or heathen and is compared to animals. In the Greek it is #1484, ethnos, and means foreigner or (non-Israelite), heathen, pagan and it can also mean race. Now there is a lot of teaching that when Yahshua couldn’t convert the Jews, He turned and offered salvation to the “Gentiles.” Yahshua never came to save Jews or heathen, but “Israel Only.” Let’s consider some of these teachings and then see what the Bible is really saying. Before we do, however, let’s use one of Dake’s notes from his Dake’s Annotated Reference Bible, New Testament, page 24, col. 1, note h, as an example:

Gr. ethnos, race or nation, meaning the Gentiles who took the place of the Jews in the gospel program...

I would like to start this with Revelation 5:9 which says:

And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.

Now it might appear, at first glance, that this is speaking of bringing a lot of non-Israelites under redemption, but it is not so. With a non-Israelite, What is there to redeem? Here is where we get into trouble; we take for granted what we think we are reading is a certain way but when we take the time to study it in depth, we find it is altogether different. This is one of those cases. Even Bertrand L. Comparet goofed on this Scripture and Comparet was correct about 98% of the time. This is what Comparet said:

“In other words, people not of the Israel group have salvation opened to them. All that Christianity promises in the way is opened to them, but it still does not make them members of Israel with the particular job, and the pay for it that is given Israel.

At this point, we are going to have to take exception to this statement by Comparet although we, at the same time, must respect his teachings very highly for the most part. Yes, it would appear that the terms “every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation” would seem to include all races of people upon the earth. Again, here, it is a matter of translation that is the problem. Now these “every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation” are the many nations of Israel, and “Israel Only.” Now we are going to have to do a little word study to prove that it is true.

The word “nation” here is the same word that is used for the wildly impractical misleading word “Gentile.” If there were ever a word to confuse the issue, this Latin translation for the Greek word “ethnos” is it. Actually “ethnos” can mean ⁽¹⁾ a multitude, ⁽²⁾ people, ⁽³⁾ race, belonging or living together. It can mean Israel or non-Israel or both. The meaning can sometimes just mean “nation” or “governments” and can mean a “multitude” of different kinds of peoples.

In Acts 8:9 it has reference to the inhabitants of Samaria which we know, at that time, included several groups of non-Israel people. It does appear that there may have been a smattering of true Israelites in Samaria at this time. You surely wouldn't think the Holy Spirit would enter a bunch of half-breeds, Do you? This is the story of one Simon, a sorcerer (witch) who was converted, baptized and supposedly received the Holy Spirit. We have sorcerers in America today, all of those charismatics, you know. Later this same Simon offered to purchase the power of laying on of hands and Peter pointed out that it wasn't for sale and that Simon was “in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity” (in other words, a Jew).

Actually, here in Revelation 5:9, it is referring to the White Israel “nations” that have descended from White Adam. You surely don't think that all of these blacks and

Mongolians are spoken of here, Do you? It would be a dangerous thing to have children if we would get blacks and Mongolians from a White union.

In John 11:48 “ethnos” is used to denote the Jewish nation at the time of Yahshua:

*If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and **nation**.*

In Acts 7:7 “ethnos” is used for the nation of Egypt:

*And the **nation** to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge, saith God: and after that shall they come forth, and serve me in this place.*

Again in Acts 10:22, “ethnos” is used for the nation of the Jews:

*And they said, Cornelius the centurion, a just man, and one that feareth God, and of good report among all the **nation** of the Jews, was warned from God by an holy angel to send for thee into his house, and to hear words of thee.*

There is a sense in which “ethnos” means non-Israelite or non-Israelite territory but this is not true in all cases. As a matter of fact, “ethnos” is used for “nation(s)” and “Gentile(s)” which are Israel about ten times more often than it is used for lands and people that are non-Israel.

In the *Complete Word Study Dictionary of the New Testament*, compiled and edited by Spiros Zodhiates, TH.D., there is an interesting comment on page 503:

*In 1 Pet. 2:9, Christians are called both an elect genos (1085), **race**, offspring, and a holy ethnos. In Mark 7:26 and Gal. 1:14, it is the word genos which is translated “nation”, but it should be **race**.*

Of these three Scriptures mentioned here, 1st Peter 2:9 and Mark 7:26 are good examples of where the translators really goofed. There is something like 27,000 mistakes in the King James translation. Many call the King James translation “inspired.” It may be, but the mistakes are not. Let us now read these two verses using the word “race” instead of the words “nation”, “generation” or “Gentile”:

1st Peter 2:9:

*But ye are a chosen **race**, a royal priesthood, an holy nation (ethnos), a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.*

Mark 7:26

*The woman was a Greek, A Syrophenician by **race**; and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter.*

From this we can see that we need to understand what it really means when it says “Gentile” or “nation” In the King James version, 1st Peter 2:9 says “generation” instead

of “race.” In Mark 7:26, it says “nation” instead of “race.” Here, again, 1st Peter 2:9 is speaking of White Israelites and “Israelites only.”

In one place the translators used the word “heathen” for the word “ethnos” (1484). It is found in Galatians 2:9. Let’s read it as it is in the King James version:

*And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the **heathen**, and they unto the circumcision.*

This verse is simply stating that Paul and Barnabas was going to the Lost Tribes of Israel and that James, Cephas and John were going to the Judean Israelites. The “heathen” spoken of here are the (ethnos) Israelites. When we can read it in this vein, the whole chapter comes to life.

Now let’s look at some Scriptures where the Greek word “ethnos” does mean people who are non-Israel. After we do so, we will look into the very many cases where “ethnos” does mean Israel in such words as “nation” and “Gentile.” First, let us consider Matthew 10:5-6:

*These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the **Gentiles**, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. 6 But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*

Just before the crucifixion of Yahshua the Messiah, His disciples came to Him and made mention of the temple in Jerusalem. Whereupon Yahshua foretold of its destruction which, as we know, came in 70 AD. Yahshua went on to tell of other things in the future of which Jerusalem was to be under non-Israel control until the end of the “times of the Gentiles.” We know (for the “times of the Gentiles” came to an end when General Allenby delivered Jerusalem from the Turks December 9, 1917 as predicted by the prophets on the very day and year it was foretold to happen). Yahshua also predicted the dispersion of the Jews from Jerusalem, that they would be led away captive into all nations. Now let’s read Luke 21:24:

*And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the **Gentiles** (ethnos), until the times of the **Gentiles** (ethnos) be fulfilled.*

You can see definitely that this verse is speaking of the “Gentiles” as Turks. In Acts 4:25, “ethnos” is translated heathen and it definitely is not speaking of Israelites. It reads:

*Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the **heathen** rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?*

We find in Acts 7:7 that “ethnos” is used for the “nation” of Egypt. This is the passage of Scripture where Stephen, in Acts, reviews the history from Abraham up until his time

for which he is stoned. Inasmuch as Egypt had become a mulatto nation, this would again be speaking of a non-Israel nation. This passage reads:

*And the **nation** to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge, saith God: and after that shall they come forth, and serve me in this place.*

Again in the 7th chapter of Acts we find another “ethnos” which is translated “Gentiles” and means peoples who are non-Israel. In this case it was the Canaanite people which Israel was to completely drive out and destroy. Let’s take a look at Acts 7:45:

*Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus (Joshua) into the possession of the **Gentiles**, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David.*

You will notice here that the translators used the name “Jesus” for Joshua. They did this because they knew that the Savior and Joshua had the same name. Now the name “Joshua” is a corruption of the name Yahshua as the English almost always added the “J” sound to any word starting with a “Y”, so “Joshua” should be pronounced “Yahshua.” Now “Jesus” is a corruption of the name Zeus, and of course, the English added the “J” sound to make it “Jesus.” Now the translators did the same thing in Hebrews 4:8 with the name “Jesus.” Unless you know this you can not make any sense out of these two verses. After clearing this up, you can see that these two verses are clearly speaking of “Joshua’s” time and the “Gentiles” spoken of here are the Canaanites.

Again the term “ethnos” is used as a non-Israel term in Acts 13:19, and here again it is referring to these same Canaanites. Here “ethnos” is translated “nations”:

*And when he had destroyed seven **nations** in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot.*

Now let’s take up a passage in Matthew 4:15-16. In this particular Scripture, “ethnos” is used as a sign marker to indicate a certain geographic area. This is the period of time after the Ten Northern Tribes had been removed from Palestine by Assyria and Assyria repopulated it with non-Israel people. Then, later, when the captives of Judah, which returned after the Babylonian captivity, which consisted of Judah and Benjamin, Judah settled around the area of Jerusalem and Benjamin settled in Galilee. This was necessary because of all of those non-Israelites who settled in old Samaria. This is why, during Yahshua’s time, they were called Samaritans although they were a multiracial people. Knowing the historic background, here, we can understand these two verses:

*15 The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the **Gentiles**: 16 The people which sat in darkness saw a great light: and to them which sat in the region of the shadow of death light is sprung up.*

This is interesting what we have here. It is the fulfillment of a prophecy in Isaiah 8:17. The “darkness” spoken of here is that of Yahweh hiding His face from Israel. The “great light” is the Gospel of the Good News being preached by Yahshua Himself. The place where this Gospel was to be preached first according to the prophet was where Israel began to be cut short as the enemy (Assyria) began to smite their coast. At this time the tribe of Benjamin occupied this area. Where is this area?- “beyond Jordan of the Gentiles.” In this case the “Gentiles” were the Samaritans. Yahshua didn’t go to the Samaritans, but He went “beyond” them. It wasn’t the Samaritans who sat in darkness, but the Benjaminites and the rest of Israel.

The last verse we are going to consider for the term “ethnos”, where it is used as meaning non-Israel people, is found in Romans 11:25. Here Paul had been explaining how the “Gentiles” (the wild olive tree) who were the Israelites were to be “grafted” back in to the main “root.” Then in verse 25, Paul explains that these same Israelites were to be blinded “until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.” Here, again, it is speaking of the time when General Allenby drove the Turks out of Jerusalem and the Turks were the “Gentiles.” This is a very important time marker that we should all understand. Paul is as much as saying: When you see the Turks driven from Jerusalem, the blindness will start to be removed from Israel and they will start to understand their Identity. Now you won’t find this in any commentaries, but this is about the time that the “Identity” message began in earnest. When we understand this verse in this vein, it comes alive to our understanding so let’s read it:

For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.

ISRAEL AS “GENTILES”

Now that we have considered examples of Scripture where “Gentiles” (ethnos) means non-Israel, let’s consider some of the many passages where “Gentiles” (ethnos) means Israel. About 90% of the time that you read “Gentile(s)” in the Bible, it means Israel. Romans 9:24&30 are verses that are very good examples of this. The “Gentiles” in these two verses can only mean Israel. Let’s take a look at them:

Romans 9:24:

Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?

Romans 9:30:

What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith.

It is necessary here to understand that the “Gentiles” spoken of in these two verses are Israelites! In order to do this we have to go to verse 25 to prove it. Let’s see what we have in verse 25:

As he saith also in Osee, (Hosea) I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved.

In order to understand this verse, we will have to understand what “Osee” means. The “Osee” of verse 25 means the book of “Hosea.” Then if you go to Hosea 2:23, you will find that this passage is speaking not of some so-called “heathen” but of Israel. Let’s now read Hosea 2:23 and see if it appears like Romans 9:25:

And I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say unto them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God.

Anyone who will read the first and second chapters of Hosea will have to admit that it is indeed speaking of Israel. It is hard to believe that in the last almost 400 years since 1611 when the first Bibles were printed in mass and the millions who have read them that someone wouldn’t have investigated the matter of “Osee” to see what it was talking about. You would also think that the translators would have done a better job of indicating that “Osee” meant “Hosea.” This whole 9th chapter of Romans is very badly translated and it is a wonder that we can make anything out of it. At this point, I will try to reconcile it to its true theme. Then maybe we can understand just what all this “Gentile” business is all about.

ROMANS CHAPTER 9

1 I tell you the truth as one united with Yahshua, and my conscience being enlightened by the Holy Spirit assures me it is no lie, 2 That I am greatly pained in my heart and have great sorrow. 3 Indeed, I could even wish that I myself might be sentenced to separation from Yahshua on behalf of my kinsmen, and those of my race, 4 Who are Israelites; and to them belong the rights of sonship, the Shechinah glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of Yahweh, and the promises. 5 For they are descended from the Patriarchs, and from their race came Yahshua who rules over all things, Bless Yahweh forever. 6 Now this does not mean that Yahweh’s word to Israel has failed, for not everyone who claims ancestry to Israel belong to Israel, 7 Nor does everyone who claims ancestry to Abraham belong to Abraham, but he was told, “The line of Isaac will be called your descendants.” 8 This means that not all the children born in the course of nature are the children of Yahweh, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. 9 For this is what the promise said, “At this time next year, Sarah shall have a son.” 10 Nor is this all. There is also the case of Rebecca, when she was about to bear children to our ancestor Isaac, 11 And though the children were still unborn and had done nothing either good or bad, Yahweh elected their destinies according to his choice. 12 And it

was said unto her, "the elder shall serve the younger." 13 Accordingly as scripture is written, "I have been a friend to Jacob, and an enemy to Esau." 14 Does this mean that Yahweh is unjust? Yahweh forbid. 15 For he said to Moses: "I will have mercy on whom I choose to have mercy and I will have compassion on whom I choose to have compassion." 16 It is not a question of human will, but a question of Yahweh's mercy. 17 For it is written in the scriptures of Pharaoh: "It was for this very purpose that I raised you to the throne that I might show my power by means of you that my name should be proclaimed throughout the earth." 18 Thus he not only shows mercy as he chooses, but also makes men stubborn as he chooses. 19 Perhaps you will say to me, "Why does Yahweh still blame us since there is no resisting his will." 20 On the contrary, Who are you, my friend, to answer back to Yahweh? Can a thing that is molded say to its maker, "Why did you make me thus?" 21 Has not the potter absolute power over the clay to make one vessel unto honour and another clay vessel to degradation. 22 What if Elohim, willing to show forth his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much patience the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction: 23 So as to make known his incomparable glory in dealing with the vessels which are objects of his mercy whom he prepared from the beginning to share his glory. 24 Even us, whom he called, not of the Judah only, but also of the Israel nations (**Gentiles**). 25 This, indeed, is what he says in the book of Hosea (**Osee**), "I will call them my people, which before became not my people, and her who became not beloved, I will call beloved." 26 And in the very place where they were told, "You are no people of mine," there they shall be called "Sons of the living Elohim." 27 And Isaiah cries aloud over Israel, "Though the Israelites be countless as the sands of the sea, only a remnant shall return to Yahweh and his laws" (and learn their Identity at the end of the age). 28 For Yahweh will execute his sentence upon the earth, fully and without delay. 29 It is as Isaiah predicted, "Had not Yahweh of Host spared some few of our race to us, we would have fared like Sodom and made like Gomorrha. 30 To what conclusion does this bring us? That the Israel nations (**Gentiles**) who did not follow righteousness, attained to righteousness that comes through faith. 31 But Israel (the Jewish nation) on the other hand sought justification by the law and failed to reach the goal of righteousness. 32 Why was this? Because they sought it not by faith, but thought to gain it by works. They stumbled against the stone of stumbling; 33 Even as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and a rock which shall prove a hindrance: and no man, that has faith in him, shall be disappointed.

Now that we have connected the "Gentiles" with Israel, let's look into some of the other cases where Gentiles means Israel. The next passage we are going to consider is Matthew 12:14-21 and the word "Gentiles" is used twice and in both instances is speaking of Israelites in their lost state. Let's read this passage now with the emphasis on the word "Gentile" knowing that its meaning is Israel:

14 Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him. 15 But when Jesus knew it, he withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; 16 And charged them that they should not make him known: 17 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, 18 Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the **Gentiles**. 19 He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. 20 A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. 21 And in his name shall the **Gentiles** trust.

Now to understand this portion of Scripture, we must take notice here how the enemies of Yahweh/Yahshua (the serpent Jews) are plotting to destroy Yahshua thereby killing His message. Have you ever noticed how the Jews are always trying to kill the influence of the Two "Seed-line message"? Oh how they like to use every opportunity on television to deride, ridicule, mock and mimic in derision at this sort of thing. They quip, jeer and scoff at the true message of Yahshua. They do it now and they were doing it when Yahshua was walking on the earth in His ministry. It goes on to say in verse 15 that when He was aware of it, "*he withdrew himself from them thence.*" Now when the hissing of the Jews can be heard, its always a good idea to "*withdraw*" from them so we really shouldn't be surprised that this is exactly what Yahshua did. In verse 16 you will notice that Yahshua was not out to grab a bunch of headlines and draw a lot of attention to Himself, but keep a low profile. This doesn't mean that He didn't want to get His message out, but He didn't want to waste it on the wrong people. That starts us in the right direction here as we will soon see the people for which the message is intended (the Israelite "Gentiles"). In verses 17 and 18, we should take notice that Yahshua fulfilled a prophecy which is found in Isaiah 42:1-4 which is as follows:

*1 Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the **Gentiles**. 2 He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. 3 A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment into truth. 4 He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law.*

You can see here that Matthew 12, verses 18 through 21 is almost an exact quote of Isaiah 42, verses 1 through 4, so as we continue to quote from Matthew 12 , my comments can apply to both passages.

When it says "*Behold my servant*" in verse 18, you can be sure it is speaking of Yahshua. Then also in verse 18, it says of Yahshua, "*he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles.*" What is meant by this statement is: He will publish the Gospel to paganized Israel. You didn't think He was going to publish it to some black or Mongolian, Did you? We can see clearly, here, again, when it is speaking of "Gentiles", it means Israel. Verse 19 indicates that He is not going to make a loud proclamation in the street (to all

people and races) about this Gospel. Then in verse 20, it indicates that the hope of the light of the Gospel message, at that time, was weak like a “*broken reed*” and almost ready to be extinguished like a candle wick of “*smoking flax*” where the flame is ready to go out. Yes, the hope of the light of the Gospel was ready to go out, but Matthew 4:16 says:

The people which sat in darkness saw a great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.

And, Who are these people who “*sat in darkness*”? — no other than Israel! And it says in verse 21, “*And in his name shall the **Gentiles** (Israel) trust.*” Verse 4 of Isaiah 42 says one more thing, “*and the isles shall wait for his law.*” Where was Israel at that time? — in the British Isles and many other places in Europe. Again, it is “Israel Only.”

The next verse that we are going to use that uses this same word, “ethnos”, is Matthew 21:43. In this case the translators choose the word “nation” instead of the word “Gentiles.” Let’s take a look at this verse and see what it says:

*Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a **nation** bringing forth the fruits thereof.*

If they would have chosen the word “Gentiles”, this verse would have read like this:

*Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a **Gentile** bringing forth the fruits thereof.*

To understand this verse, we have to understand the parable of the householder which starts with Matthew verse 33 and ends with verse 46 and reads thusly:

*33 Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: 34 And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen that they might receive the fruits of it. 35 And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. 36 And, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. 37 But last of all he sent them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. 38 But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. 39 And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. 40 And when the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? 41 They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. 42 Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? 43 Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a **ethnos** bringing forth the fruits thereof.*

44 And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder. 45 And when the chief priest and the Pharisees had heard his parable, they perceived that he spoke of them. 46 But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet.

To understand this verse and this passage, it is necessary to understand the histories of Israel and Judah. We cannot go into any great detail here but will give a short summary of it. From 741 BC to 676 BC, Assyria, under successive kings Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser and Esar-Haddon invaded the Northern Kingdom of Israel removing all of the population to Assyria. After all of the Northern Kingdom of Israel was removed, Assyria continued to invade and deport to Assyria most all of the Southern Kingdom of Judah. Assyria failed in its last campaign against Jerusalem leaving it all by its self alone. After Assyria was finished, all that remained was the city of Jerusalem only. About 123 years later, Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon came against Jerusalem deporting much of the population to Babylon. Then after the Babylonian government was replaced by Cyrus, king of Persia, he made a decree concerning the house of Yahweh at Jerusalem and the return of the Judah captives to their home in 537 BC. There was a problem with this return to Jerusalem because not all of those returning with them were pure Israel stock. This plus the intermarriage with the non-Israelites of the land recorded by Ezra and Nehemiah started this corrupt branch of Judah on a decline from which it would never recover. While most of the true Israelites of the nation of Judah were well on their way into Europe, this corrupt remnant from the return from Babylon were only to exist as a nation for another 490 years (a period of 70 weeks of years). This is the “seventy weeks” prophesied by Daniel, Daniel 9:24. It was this 70 week “nation” that Yahshua was addressing when he said (Matthew 21:43), *“Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a **nation** bringing forth the fruits thereof.”* In other words, Yahshua was as much as saying to these Jews: I am taking the Kingdom away from you crossbreed Jews who “kill the prophets” and give it to the true “ethnos” of Israel (Dake says “race or nation”.) Here the translators had to use the word “nation” for “ethnos.” If you don’t think that this 70 week “nation” didn’t kill the prophets, read Nehemiah 9:26.

Acts 9:15

The next Scripture we are going to consider along the line of “ethnos” is Acts 9:15. Here the translators used the word “Gentiles”, but it would have made things more understandable if they would have used the word “nations.” Oh how the translators have messed things up with this damnable term! The story that surrounds this verse is the apostle Paul’s conversion “near Damascus” and how “suddenly there shined a light round about him a light from heaven.” One must have to imagine, in our mind, how the news affected the followers of the Nazarene in Damascus. They weren’t called “Christians” until Acts 11:26, so they were still, at this time, called Nazarenes. They were aware that this same Saul was on his way to assault and arrest them at the behest of the Jews. Now they hear that this archenemy of their faith has become one of

them. They are astounded and are cautious and really don't know what to think of it. Then one of the Damascus believers, Ananias, is instructed of Yahshua to visit this Saul, but he had much misgivings about this thing. After being assured that Saul had a change of attitude, he made his way to the house of one Judas where Saul was staying whereupon Ananias putting his hand on him and Saul, now called Paul, received his sight after he was blinded. Then in verse 15, the following is stated of Paul:

*But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the **Gentiles** (ethnos), and kings and the children of Israel.*

This should read:

*But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the **nations**, and kings and the children of Israel.*

I believe that it should even more correctly read “before the nations and kings of the children of Israel.” This slight change from the word “and” to the word “of” can make all the difference in the world. In the original Greek the “ands” and “ofs” were not there, therefore they were added by translators later. We really don't know which would be correct, but in keeping with the theme of the Bible, I believe that it should have been “of.” Now to the next usage of the word “Gentile.”

Acts 13:42, 46, 47, 48

To do these four verses justice, we are going to have to understand the whole 13th chapter of Acts. Acts chapter 13 starts out at an assembly of the followers of the Nazarene at Antioch. Before this chapter is completed it will be speaking about the spreading of the Gospel to the so-called “**Gentiles**” which, if you will remember, was Paul's commission — to “go and disciple the nations.” At this time the “prophets” and “teachers” of the Ekklesia, after a period of “ministering” and “fasting”, were directed by the Holy Spirit that Barnabas and Saul (Paul) were to start doing what they were called to do, presenting the Gospel to the “ethnos” (translated Gentiles). So Paul and Barnabus departed Antioch to Seleucia and then to Cyprus. When they arrived at a place called Salamis, they preached the Word of Yahweh among the Judeans there. Then they continued on to a place called Paphos where they ran into a very interesting situation. They found there a “deputy of the country”, a person by the name of Sergis Paulus who was quite an educated man. It seems that this Sergis Paulus had evidently heard about the Gospel message that Paul and Barnabas had been proclaiming and invited them to come and inform him more about it. As we know the Gospel is the “good news” that Yahshua had come in the flesh to redeem His kinsmen Israel. Yahweh didn't come for the blacks nor did He come for the Mongolians, but “Israel Only.”! Now we are on the subject of redemption and we will have to take some time here to talk about that before we continue with the rest of this 13th chapter of Acts.

Now let's go back to Romans 7:1-4 again:

1 Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? 2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; **but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.** 3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

When I tried to find information on Romans 7:1-4 in different commentaries concerning the divorce and remarrying of Israel to Yahweh, I was not able to find anything worthwhile. *Matthew Henry's Commentary* tries to promote the idea that we somehow are no longer under the Law. He says, "The sentence of the law against us is vacated and reversed, by the death of Christ, to all true believers." This is not at all what this passage is saying! What it is saying is: By the death of Yahshua we are free from the letter of the divorce law insofar as Israel being able to remarry. By Yahweh coming in the flesh and dying as prescribed by the letter of the Law, this freed Israel to marry Him again. Another thing that is taught here by Paul is: The Law has power over a man as long as he lives and secondly, a wife is bound under the authority or law of her husband as long as she lives and no longer. In other words, the wife is bound to the Law of Yahweh through her husband. *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 1052, indicates that Paul was preaching to some Jews and therefore Paul had to refer to the law of Moses or maybe the Jews wouldn't "embrace the gospel." Clarke says of the 4th verse, "You were once under the law of Moses and were bound by its injunctions, but now you are dead to that law God has determined that it shall be no longer in force. So that now, as a woman whose husband is dead is free from the law of that husband..... the law has consequently ceased." Can you imagine Yahweh being married to serpent Jews? — what garbage! Here Clarke is teaching the Law was abolished with the death of Yahshua when, in fact, Yahshua obeyed His Own Law to the minutest detail. Yahshua didn't die to abolish the Law, but by the Law might be able to remarry Israel and redeem her, and her only unto Himself. The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary on the Whole Bible says, "that believers are 'not under the law but under grace' the apostle here shows how this change is brought about." OH REALLY? *The Concise Bible Commentary* by The Reverend W. K. Lowther Clarke has this to say, "The man dominated by law turns into a woman, the law unto her husband. The husband (=law) dies, in the application the Christian (= the wife) die. **No attempt to make sense of the parable is possible.** The application in ⁴ is forcible Pauline doctrine, **but the parable itself is best disregarded as one of the Apostles failures.**" OH, REALLY, **I BELIEVE THAT THIS PASSAGE IS ONE OF PAUL'S GREATEST SUCCESSES!!!** (If you are wondering what the "⁴" means, it points to some more spurious remarks by this commentator.) *The Believers Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald has this to say, "The point of the illustration is just as death breaks the marriage relationship, so the death of the believer with Christ breaks the jurisdiction of the law over him." OH, AGAIN, I SAY, REALLY? I didn't know that we "the believers" died with Yahshua. I was under the impression that Yahshua

died alone to ransom us. The Interpreter's Bible by Abingdon Press, a 12 volume work with 36 consulting editors and 124 contributors has this to say of this passage, "Paul feels the need of giving his idea of the believer's necessary separation from sin further emphasis and clarification and decides to try one more analogy. By means of it, he succeeds perhaps in emphasizing his idea, but hardly in clarifying it. Indeed, the new illustration from marriage becomes even more awkward than the proceeding one from slavery. Again the general intention of the apostle is clear enough: we were formerly married, as it were, to sin; but sin has now died, and we are free to belong to another husband, even Christ, and in fact we do belong to him. We formerly bore 'fruit for death'; now we bear 'fruit for God.' **Some such idea as this is apparently in Paul's mind but his statement in detail is confused.**" Poor Paul, just doesn't understand, he is "confused", or is it the "editors" of the Interpreter's Bible that are "confused"? The Interpreter's Bible goes on: "Paul we must remember, was a speaker, with the added difficulties inseparable from being tied to the slow capacities of an ancient amanuensis (secretary). **Anyone who has read with shame the confused dictation which his secretary has brought back for correction will feel himself quite at home in the opening verses of ch. 7. The confusion may also be attributed to the fact that two thoughts are present in Paul's mind** — there is the old nature, married to sin, which has been put to death, so that our true self can be united to Christ; and there is law which also belonged to the old order, and whose power has ended by the death we share with Christ (more hocus-pocus). The ideas are related: they are both intimately connected with death as the decisive breach between the old order and the new; and both are inseparable from any full consideration of what Christ has accomplished for us. **So Paul launches out on his analogy, and as the scribe painfully scratches down his words, his active mind, so quick to grasp interrelated thoughts, races ahead, and when the dictation is completed, the result is the confusion before us. Owing to the method he has chosen and the difficulties inherent in the analogy he uses, this passage does not constitute one of Paul's great statements of his gospel.**" From all of this, you can see that The Interpreter's Bible and the other reference commentaries here have missed the entire point of this passage. All of these reference books should have referred to Deuteronomy 24:1-4, but they did not. The reason they didn't is because they were so intent on the abolishment of Yahweh's Laws which they call "the law of Moses" that they were entirely blind to the true meaning of "redemptive law." Let's now take a look at Deuteronomy 24:1-4:

1 When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. 2 And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. 3 And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; 4 Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for

that is abomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy GOD giveth thee for an inheritance.

We know that Yahweh married Israel, and “Israel Only”, and took her to wife. We also know that Israel committed religious adultery with heathen paganism. As a matter of fact, she is still doing that very thing today. So you can say that Yahweh did indeed find something “unclean” in Israel and He had no other alternative than to send her out of His House. It is clear, with this passage, that Israel could not return back to Yahweh after He divorced her. There was one exception to this: If Yahweh Himself were to die, then the Law was satisfied and Israel could return again to Him. We will see, as we get further into this thing, it is really more than a simple divorce as we would think of it. In considering Isaiah 50:1, above, *The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge*, Edited by Jerome Smith remarks on page 801:

“Husbands often send bills of divorcement to their wives on slight occasions; and fathers, oppressed with debt, sold their children till the year of release. But this, said God, cannot be my case: I am not governed by any such motives, nor am I urged by any such necessity. Your captivity and afflictions are the fruits of your own folly and wickedness.

To give you an idea of just what was going on in Israel and the extent of their depravity, let’s consider 1st Kings 21:25:

*But there was none like unto Ahab, which did **sell himself** to work wickedness in the sight of the LORD whom Jezebel his wife stirred up.*

Its disdainful, but we have an Ahab and a Jezebel living in the White House of the United States today and indeed they are “selling themselves.” 2nd Kings 17:17 gives more detail of the things Israel did:

*And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, **and sold themselves** to do evil in the sight of the LORD, to provoke him to anger.*

I believe Hillary (today’s Jezebel) is right in there helping to murder the babies of today with her position on abortion. I think also she is using “divination”— talking to Eleanor, you know.

Now that we understand the divorce phase of this relationship, let’s go on to the remarriage part of it. It is very important, at this stage, that we understand it is only a **near kinsman** to Israel **which can lawfully redeem her**. This is clearly set forth throughout the entire Bible especially the New Testament, but let’s consider the law of “**kinsman redemption**” as found in Leviticus 25:47-49:

*47 And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor, **and sell himself** unto the stranger or sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger’s family: 48 After that he is sold **he may be redeemed again**; one of his **brethren** may **redeem** him: 48 Either his uncle, or his uncle’s*

son, may redeem him, or any that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be able, he may redeem himself.

Now in my article, "Israel Only", I go into the subject of "Redemption" more in detail. I have not finished this article as yet, but will sometime in the future. What is being taught as "Redemption" today is not at all what the Scripture teaches. Redemption is #1350 in the Hebrew and is used 96 times in the Old Testament and in every case means "kinsman redeemer." In other words, if you are not a "kinsman" to the "Redeemer", you don't get "redeemed", its that plain and simple. It is only the White Israelites who Yahweh married and White Israelites He came to redeem! Repeating now, **race is everything!** As Job 19:25 says:

For I know that my [kinsman] redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth.

The blacks are not "kinsmen" — the Mongolians are not "kinsmen." All this (as the Scripture puts it "dung") that these "one seed-liners" are foisting on us like Stephen Jones, Ted R. Weiland, Charles Wiseman, Pete Peters and James Bruggeman who are just parroting Jones. Anyway, we must go on to scrutinize the rest of Jones' book.

JONES CONTINUES ON A SUBJECT CALLED "GENETICS AND TELEGENY"

Jones says this on page 77:

"We believe that there is scientific proof that if Eve had been impregnated by any being having the capability to reproduce sexually, then the rest of Eve's offspring could have been contaminated as well.

We will soon see just what Jones means by this statement. On page 77, Jones starts his maneuver to set you up again. He points to some "genetic" studies that were done by the International Congress of Genetics. In order for you to understand his thrust, we must quote him word for word to get started here:

"Studies in Genetics were progressing rapidly in the world until the anti-Nazi scare caused people to view any study in heredity with suspicion. The first country to openly declare war on this science was the Soviet government in 1936, when it canceled its participation in the 1937 International Congress of Genetics. By the early 1940's Genetics was being suppressed in Russia on grounds that it was 'anti-revolutionary.' In its place the Soviets officially blessed the environmentalist theory of the botanist, Trofim D. Lysenko, who despised the view that heredity has anything to do with the development of physical or social attributes, said: 'Genetics is merely an instrument, like chess or football' (Death of a Science, Conway Zirkle, p. 3).

"The key to nature, argued Lysenko, was evolutionary development, and any change in environment will cause the organism to evolve in order to adapt to that change in environment. If we plant crops in a northern area that has a short growing season, we will soon develop new strains of crops that will grow in short

growing seasons. Breeding cattle and horses was unimportant, he claimed. What we need is to place them in an environment that will promote the evolution of better livestock. Men of every race are equal under the skin, and we only need put a black man in a white man's environment to make him equal to the white man in skills, intelligence, and behavior, he claimed.

"After a few disastrous years, however, Russia quickly abandoned this false theory, except in its application to society and integration. America and most of the other western nations soon adopted Lysenko's theories, and thus began the government's big push for integration and 'equality.'

"Thus the science of Genetics has been suppressed and ridiculed in favor of 'social sciences.' Physical anthropology has been replaced almost entirely by social anthropology. RACE has become a 'four-letter-word', and anything that now tends to emphasize racial differences or promote racial segregation is illegal.

"With the decline of Genetics has also come the burial of a phenomenon known as TELEGONY. When it is mentioned at all, it is usually placed in the category of mythology or superstition. Telegony was defined in 1965 in a chapter entitled 'Myths of Mating.'

Now that Jones has set you up, he is going to tell you what "telegony" is:

"Telegony is the theory that if a female is mated with two or more successive males, the influence of an earlier sire may carry over to offspring of a later father (Heredity and Environment, by Amram Scheinfeld and Herbert L. Cooper, M.D., p. 23).

At this point, it should be pointed out that Jones is going to try to use the above statement to prove that if Cain was fathered by Satan and Abel was fathered by Adam, that Satan through the process of telegony would have corrupted the entire white race including "Jesus Christ" who we call Yahshua. He is going to use "telegony" as a basis to argue against the "Two Seed-line" seduction of Eve. He is going to say if you accept the idea of "Two Seed-line", then Yahshua was not of pure blood. If you buy his line of reasoning, you will have to settle for either "one seed-line" or an impure "kinsmen Redeemer." Jones' next move is to prove Scheinfeld and Cooper wrong who argued that the theory of telegony was false.

On page 79, Jones cites several cases of animal breeding to try to prove telegony. Here is an example of one of his arguments recorded on page 80:

"This phenomena known as 'telegony' was first noted by an English horse breeder who had a mare that had mated with a zebra and was observed to give birth to colts that all had signs of zebra stripes, even when later mated to pure-bred stallions. Genetics have denied this possibility only because they were

unacquainted with the possible theory of how it could happen (Vol. 3, No. 8 Standard Process Laboratories. Milwaukee, Wis.).

Jones goes on to describe other cases in rabbit breeding. On page 82, Jones goes on to quote an article given in “Applied Trophology” which is supposed to explain this phenomenon known as “telegony”, but before I quote it, I will go back to page 79 and quote paragraph 2, and if you will read it very carefully, you will see that Jones is skating on pretty damn thin ice with this “theory” of “telegony.”

*“Very little is written on the subject of telegony, and most of what is written merely states the **opinions** of the authors. Some denounce it, while others treat it as a **probable theory** or even as fact. Most conclude that it is **too bizarre** even to admit the possibility.*

Now we will go back and quote the process by which this “telegony” is supposed to happen on pages 82 and 83:

“In pregnancy the rapid cell division promotes the release of greater than normal quantities of protomorphogens into the blood from the embryo, and the maternal gonad becomes loaded up with embryo blueprints, as it were, which causes subsequent germ cells of that female to be contaminated with the blueprints of the father, for all embryo protomorphogens are one-half duplicates of the genes of each parent.

“It is obvious, that these protomorphogens circulating in the maternal blood influence tissue repair and reconstruction to a tremendous extent.

“It will be obvious that this presence of paternal ‘blueprints’ in the blood of a female who has had a child by one husband and subsequently remarries, the children of the later marriage will be carrying characteristics of both male mates.

After quoting this from “Applied Trophology”, Jones continues to comment on page 83:

“The word PROTOMORPHOGENS simply means ‘the earliest beginnings of form or shape.’ Here it refers to the cells that begin to divide, forming the embryo in the earliest stages of pregnancy. The embryo begins with a single material cell that has been fertilized by the seed of the male. It thus contains characteristics of both the father and the mother.

“When this newly-fertilized cell begin to divide itself and grow, they say, there is a subsequent release of some protomorphogens into the blood of the mother. (For those who understand medical terminology, these are carried by the platelets and polymorphonuclear leukocytes). These cells in the mother’s blood influence tissue repair and reconstruction, and thus the paternal genes could have a definite effect upon the mother herself and all subsequent offspring.

“In support of their position, the authors of ‘Applied Trophology’ quote Dr. Austin Flint’s TEXTBOOK OF HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY, which says:

“A white woman who has had children by a negro may subsequently bear children to a white man, these children presenting some of the unmistakable peculiarities of the negro race.

Here, again, I want to point out that Stephen Jones, with the quotes and comments above is trying to make a case that if Satan seduced Eve sexually, that the white race would forever be polluted. He is doing this to support his “one seed-line” doctrine. From what I know, and I heard it on one of Bertrand L. Comparet’s audio cassette tapes that the embryo is completely separated from the mother — that the child is not effected by the mother’s blood or is the mother effected by the child’s blood. I will now quote from *The World Book Encyclopedia* to support Comparet, volume E, #6, page 207, under the subtitle “Human Development”:

During the first week after fertilization, the conceptus first becomes a solid ball of cells called the MORULA. It later changes into a hollow BLASTULA or BLASTOCYST. The blastula has an outer layer of cells called the TROPHOBLAST and an INNER CELL MASS called the EMBRYOBLAST. During the second week, the trophoblast attaches itself to the lining of the uterus and becomes the CHORION. The chorion, and the PLACENTA it forms, are membranes through which the embryo gains nourishment, water, and oxygen and discharge waste products. The nourishment is taken from the mother’s blood, and wastes are passed off through her blood.

“The placenta, which is well formed two months after fertilization, is connected to the embryo by an UMBILICAL CORD. This cord serves as a ‘life line’ between the embryo or fetus and the mother. Food, water, and oxygen from the mother are absorbed by the placenta and flow through blood vessels in the umbilical cord to enter the embryo’s blood. The embryo’s waste material is carried through the cord to the placenta, absorbed by the mother’s blood, and then eliminated by the mother.

You can see plainly here, then, there is absolutely no direct connection between the embryo and the mother to cause any genetic change in the mother and her offspring as Jones comments, *“there is a subsequent release of some protomorphogens into the blood of the mother.”* The only thing connecting the mother and child is the umbilical cord and all the umbilical cord is used for is to feed the child and carry away its waste. The Scriptures verify this in Genesis 1:11 as follows:

*And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, **whose seed is in itself**, upon the earth: and it was so.*

The word “itself” here in the Hebrew is a personal pronoun and when applied to a person like Eve, means her “seed” is within herself and cannot be genetically changed. The only thing that can adversely affect her seed is a fertilization from a foreign race. The woman usually only produces one egg at a time for fertilization in the “premenstrual phase.” Occasionally more than one egg can be ready for fertilization at

the same time. Let's read about this in *The World Book Encyclopedia*, under M, volume 13, page 327 under "Menstruation":

***"Premenstrual Phase.** The egg released by the ovary makes its way slowly down the Fallopian tube to the uterus. The journey takes about five days. If sperm are present, fertilization takes place in the Fallopian tube. This egg-sperm combination then settles into the lining of the uterus, which has become thick and spongy with many blood vessels and watery fluids. ... When this happens the menstrual cycle usually stops until after the baby is born.*

What Jones is trying to prove is: the sperm of the male can somehow go on to follicle in the ovary and alter all of the future eggs produced by the woman, and that somehow through the blood of the woman. Well let's take another look at what happens at the time of pregnancy in *The World Book Encyclopedia* under the term "Germ Cell" on page 137 of volume 8:

***"Germ Cell** is a special cell that produces eggs or sperm. These cells divide to produce eggs in the ovaries, or sperm in the testes.*

***"The germ cells are always set aside in each new individual to become reproductive tissue.** These groups of cells make up the GERM PLASM. All other cells become SOMATIC CELLS. They make up the SOMA, or protoplasm of the body cells. **The germ plasm holds substances necessary to produce new individuals and has no other function.** The theory of distinguishing between germ plasm and the soma was introduced in the 1880's by August Wiseman.*

Well, this is quite interesting! It seems that the woman has "germ cells" as well as the man and that both of the male and female germ cells contribute to the genetics of the child. Charles Wiseman (another Wiseman) and Ted R. Weiland went to long lengths to try to prove the woman didn't have seed in order to prove "one seed-line." They cried long and loud that the man only had seed. With this last quote, you can plainly see that Eve did have seed with her "germ cells." When a baby is newly born bystanders are usually making comments like, he/she has the eyes of the father, the nose of the mother or the ears of uncle or aunt so-and-so. I think the women have always known that they shared equally with the male in the genetic makeup of their children. Its only idiots like Wiseman and Weiland that don't seem to know it..

Did you also notice how the "germ cells" are set aside for reproductive purposes? It only confirms what Scripture says, Genesis 1:11: **whose seed is in itself!!!** Because Cain and Abel were twins, let's quote from *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 18, page 435 on the subject of "twins".

***"Twins** are two children born at the same time of the same mother. Twins occur once in every 96 births. The tendency to have twins is hereditary. There are two general types of twins, FRATERNAL and IDENTICAL.*

“Fraternal Twins may be one boy and one girl. If they are of the same sex, they still may be easy to tell apart, because they grow from two different egg cells which happen to have been fertilized at the same time.

“Identical Twins are of the same sex. Such twins are born from a single egg cell which separated into two parts early in its development. Each of the parts became one of the twins. They are usually much more difficult to tell apart than fraternal twins. But some identical twins have almost exactly the same characteristics in reverse. The hair of one twin may part naturally on the right, for example, while the other’s hair parts on the left. These twins come from a common egg cell which did not separate until it began to develop right- and left-sided characteristics.

Cain and Abel would have been fraternal twins as they developed from two separate eggs. Further, Cain and Abel had two different fathers so they were only half brothers.

Stephen Jones sums up his position on telegony on page 85 with the following statement, and here is where he drops his bomb again:

“The reason for including telegony in this discussion has been to relate it to the sexual interpretation of Genesis 3. Those who teach that Eve’s act was to have had sexual relations with, and to have been impregnated by, a negro, Satan, or anyone other than Adam, cast doubt on the purity of Abel, or Seth, and indeed upon Eve herself. And thus we may even doubt the racial purity of the entire white race, including Jesus Christ Himself.

For the record, Mr. Stephen Jones, Seth raised up seed to Abel, and Seth was racially pure as was Eve. And Eve did have sexual relations with Satan to produce Cain, a mamzer, and Eve’s seed did continue to be pure in spite of this episode. Mr. Stephen Jones, your theory on telegony is pure hogwash for the seed is in itself (personal pronoun) and cannot be contaminated except when the egg is ripe. An egg from the ovary cannot be corrupted by one of another race until it gets into the Fallopian tube. There are two ovaries and each contain as many as 400,000 potential egg cells which are pure.

JONES EMPLOYS DOCUMENTATION TRICKERY

The next passage we are going to look at in Jones’ book, *The Babylonian Connection*, is found on page 87. This passage in Jones’ book is truly a good document, but his using it will prove that he only picks and chooses items he particularly wants. I looked up this reference we are about to read in my copy of *The Secret Teachings Of All Ages* by Manly P Hall, and it is truly there on page 33. But why did Jones skip a very important document about Cain on page 35 of Hall’s book? First we will read what Jones quoted from Hall’s book and then we I will quote what Jones overlooked in Hall’s book:

“The ancient Scandinavian religion also had its origins in Babylon and Assyria. This is shown in the worship of the god Woden, or Oden. Godfrey Higgins tells us:

“In the Syriac tongue Oden is Adonis; but the O, in Syriac or Pushto ... was the emphatic article THE. Then Oden would be THE Dn, Dun, or Don; but Don, we have found meant wisdom or knowledge. Thus we come again to the tree of knowledge or of the garden of Knowledge, or Garden of Adonis.

“Commenting on this, Manly P. Hall says:

*“As Woden therefore means both wood and wisdom, **it does not require a great stretch of the imagination** to see in this symbolic name an allusion to the tree of knowledge growing in O-Don (The Don, or Eden), the garden of Wisdom (The Secret Teachings of All Ages, p. 33).*

“Thus we can see that the story of creation was used and interpreted in such a way as to be the basis of the Babylonian religion of sex and fertility.

THIS IS WHERE JONES EVIDENTLY GOT HIS IDEA FOR THIS BOOK FROM THIS LAST QUOTE, AND HE DID “STRETCH HIS IMAGINATION.”! If Jones would have simply taken the time to turn two pages further in Hall’s book, *The Secret Teachings of All Ages* to page 35 he would have found a very interesting paragraph on Cain. As a matter of fact, this paragraph is simply outstanding — it blows a hole through Jones’ thesis so big it will never float again! Let’s see what it says:

*“H. P. Blavatsky thus sums up the causes which precipitated the Atlantean disaster: ‘Under the evil insinuations of their demon, Thevetat, the Atlantis-race became a nation of wicked magicians. In consequence of this, war was declared, the story of which would be too long to narrate; its substance may be found in the disfigured allegories **of the race of Cain, the giants**, and that of Noah and his righteous family. The conflict came to an end by the submersion of the Atlantis; which finds its imitation in the stories of the Babylonian and Mosaic flood: The giants and magicians*

Now if Stephen Jones is going to quote from Manly P. Hall’s book, *The Secret Teachings Of All Ages*, Why doesn’t he quote all pertinent references to the subject? Now this quote above by H. P. Blavatsky on the “Atlantean disaster” in Hall’s book is outstanding as it has most all the elements in it that you find in the account of the episode in the Garden of Eden. Let’s analyze it for a moment:

It seems that these people that lived on the continent of Atlantis which sunk beneath the waters of the Atlantic Ocean were a “wicked” “nation” of “magicians.” Isn’t it just simply amazing that the term “magician” is the very word that is used for the “serpent” in Genesis 3:14 (#5175 which is from #5172 in the Strong’s Concordance)? Is this the family “tree” which Adam and Eve were warned to not have sexual intercourse with? It

seems that these Atlanteans had a “evil” “demon” leader by the name of “Thevetat” — Could this be the one that seduced Eve? And, What about this “war” spoken of here between “**the race of Cain**” and “giants” with “Noah and his righteous (perfect in their genealogy) family? Please notice this is in its proper context, “**the race of Cain**” ,for indeed the Jews are a “race” inasmuch as they all have some portion of the Cain Satanic blood! Could this be part of the war of Revelation 12:7? Of course, if you don’t understand that there were pre-Adamites, like Jones evidently does not, then you have a problem with “Atlantis” and its people. Actually Atlantis and its people sank beneath the waters of the Atlantic Ocean some 7,000 years before Adam. Obviously a few of that “serpent race” survived and one of them seduced Eve in the Garden of Eden. The “war” that started with them back then is the same war that is going on today in “the great One World Conspiracy” with the main thrust of Satanic integration of the races and Jones and company with their “one seed-line” doctrine are totally blind to it. If you want to know more about Atlantis, Get the book, *The Children Mu* by: Co. James Churchward.

TRACING CAIN THROUGH THE BIBLE

This is an area that Jones failed to do as he didn’t take time to trace the numbers 7014 and 7017 through the Bible. If he would have done this, he would have found there is more on Cain than there appears on the surface. He would also have found that Noah’s flood was not a universal flood for the descendants of Cain made it through Noah’s flood without any trouble. Before we trace Cain through the Bible, we are going to Genesis chapter 4 to find out the fingerprints of Cain. Certain characteristics and behavior patterns are mentioned in this chapter so we can recognize Cain’s descendants today. We will also find that these characteristics show up and identify him in the Bible. I will not read this passage, but only point out Cain’s fingerprints:

- ❖v12 non-farmer.
- ❖v12, fugitive.
- ❖v12, vagabond.
- ❖v14, a hated person (men wanting to kill him).
- ❖v15, a marked man.
- ❖v17, a city dweller.
- ❖v20, tent dweller.
- ❖v21, handlers of musical instruments.
- ❖v22, artful metal workers.
- ❖v24, avengers.

The next place we find Cain is in Genesis 15:19 and we will have to read verses 18 through 21:

*18 In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: 19 **The Kenites**, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, 20 And the*

Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, 21 And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.

It is important to understand that Yahweh was going to keep Israel in Egypt for four hundred years until the “iniquity” of these people came to the “full”, verse 16. These people are generally termed as Amorites probably because they were the dominate group. But, anyway, here we have the Kenites #7017, or the descendants of Cain. We are going to have to look into this thing further here to see the significance of what this passage is all about and how Cain fits into it. We are simply told in Genesis 15:16 that Yahweh was going to leave these nations generally called Canaanites, which included the Amorites, until their iniquity (#5771) came to the “full.” This process was to continue for four hundred years to complete. The term “iniquity” here means perversity (*willfully deviating from acceptable or conventional behavior*). We are going to see soon what kind of behavior this might have been.

Well one of these nations among the Canaanites was the Kenites (#7017) which were descendants of Cain. Now being that Cain was of the Satanic seed-line, he would infect his Satanic blood among all these nations. This is what it would take four hundred years to accomplish.

There are two other nations among these ten nations worth mentioning, the Kenizzites and Rephaim. Here is what *Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 1, page 38 has to say about the Kenizzites:

The Kenizzites, thought to be the Idumeans, who sprung from Kenaz of Esau’s race. But it seems not to agree with Deut. ii. 5, where God expressly said to the Israelites concerning the Idumeans, I will give you none of their lands, &c.

As Kenaz was only one of the fourteen dukes of Edom, this statement about agreeing with Deuteronomy 2:5 is superfluous. The Kenizzites are indeed of Esau. *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 3, page 782, has this to say of Kenaz and the Kenizzites:

KENAZ Singular form of the clan name Kenizzite, son of Eliphaz and grandson of Esau (Gen. 36:11; 1 Chron. 1:36), one of the chieftains of Edom (KJV Dukes) (Gen. 36:15,42; 1 Chron. 1:53).

Well, this is interesting as it seems that Esau has mixed his blood with this group of nations too!!! Now it sure gets exciting when we find out what these names mean, Doesn't it? Now let's talk about these “Rephaim.” *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 5, page 64, says this in part:

REPHAIM. ... *The inhabitants of Trans-Jordan in pre-Israelite times whom the Moabites and Ammonites called respectively “Emim” and “Zamzummim” ... “giants” ... Their land is one of ten ethnic groups promised to Abraham (Gen. 15:20). ... Deuteronomy 2:10, 11 says that they were great, many and tall like the Anakim. Og, king of Bashan, for example possessed a king size iron bed, nine*

cubits long and four cubits broad. ... Giants among the Philistines who fought against David and his mighty men along their disputed border both a Gezer ... and at Gath ... These giants were the descendants of Rapha, the eponymous ancestor of these Rephaim.

Now that we know this, let's analyze what we have here:

**Emim-Zanzummim Giants Mixed With Edomite And Cain Satanic Seed.
NOW THAT'S THE DAMNEDEST JEW MIXTURE I EVER HEARD OF !!!**

TEN NATIONS BECOME SEVEN

Now in Genesis 15:19-21 are listed ten nations and they race-mixed so much that in Deuteronomy 7:1-2 there are only seven. The Kenites, Kenizzites and Rephaims were completely absorbed by the other nations of this group from which the Jews are extracted. *The Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 38, has this to say:

*The Kenites. Here are ten nations mentioned, though afterwards reckoned but seven; see Deut. vii. 1; Acts xiii. 19. Probably some of them which existed in Abram's time had been **blended** with others before the time of Moses, so that seven only out of the ten then remained.*

In the *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, page 116 we find this about this mixed group of nations spoken of in Genesis 15:19-21:

*When the Israelites entered Canaan they found there a **very mixed** population generally designated by the term Amorite or Canaanite.*

How, then, do we know that this is what happened? Well, we can know this because we know the lifestyles of what kind of people they were. It is recorded in the 18TH chapter of Leviticus and we will read verses 24 and 25:

Leviticus 18:24-25:

24 Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: 25 And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.

We are not going to read the whole chapter here but just point out what kind of people they were according to this chapter:

- ❖ The sons were having incest with their mothers.
- ❖ The fathers were having incest with their daughters.
- ❖ The brothers were having incest with their sisters.
- ❖ The fathers-in-law were having incest with their daughters-in-law.
- ❖ The nephews were having incest with their aunts.
- ❖ The uncles were having incest with their nieces.
- ❖ The brothers-in-law were having incest with their sisters-in-law.

- ❖ The sons-in-law were having incest with their mothers-in-law.
- ❖ The grandfathers were having incest with their granddaughters.
- ❖ The grandsons were having incest with their grandmothers.
- ❖ They were laying every man carnally with their neighbor's wife.
- ❖ They were also committing homosexuality.

Now if they were doing all of this, you know damn well (and I really don't like to use this kind of language) they were breeding interracially. Now in this four hundred years, this Satanic seed spread throughout Canaan. Not only was the Satanic seed of Cain involved here, but there was also the Satanic seed of the Rephaims and the Edomites. The Rephaims were the children of the mixture of fallen angels (who left their first estate) and the daughters of men, and it is recorded that there were giants among them (mutants with six toes on each foot and six fingers on each hand). This is why Yahweh gave Israel the commission to kill every damn man, woman and child among them and He has never rescinded that commission — He has just put it on hold.

The next mention of the descendants of Cain is found in 1st Chronicles 2:55:

*And the **families of the scribes** which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab.*

Now the whole 2nd chapter of 1st Chronicles, from verse 3 on, is the lineage of Judah. Then tacked on at the end of the chapter (verse 55) is this group of people who are actually descendants of Cain known as Kenites and have no blood connection at all with Judah. A footnote in The Complete Word Study King James Bible, by Spiros Zodhiates, page 1055 says, "*They became incorporated into the tribe of Judah.*" The word Kenite here is 7017 in the Strong's Concordance. Actually the numbers for Cain are both 7014 and 7017. You will notice here in 1st Chronicles 2:55, they are called, "*the families of the scribes.*" They were scribes at this time and they were scribes in Yahshua's time — they are the same people.

At this time I am going to quote from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 3, page 782:

*KENITES ... meaning (metalworkers, smiths). Clan or tribal name of semi-nomadic peoples of South Palestine and Sinai. The Aramaic and Arabic etymologies of the root gyn show that it has to do with metal and metal work (thus the Hebrew word from this root, "lance"). This probably indicates that the Kenites were metal workers, especially since Sinai and Wadi 'Arabah were rich in highgrade copper ore. W. F. Albright has pointed to the Beni Hassan mural in Egypt (19th century B.C.) as an illustration of such a **wandering group of smiths**. This mural depicts thirty-six men, women and children in characteristic Semitic dress leading along with other **animals**, donkeys laden with **musical instruments**, weapons and an item which Albright has identified as a **bellows**. He has further noted that Lemech's three children (Genesis 4:19-22) were*

responsible for **herds** (Jabal), **musical instruments** (Jubal), and **metal work** (Tubal-Cain, or Tubal, **the smith**), the three occupations which seem most evident in the mural.

2nd quote from the same article:

The early monarchy. During this period a significant concentration of Kenites was located in the southern Judean territory. This is clear from 1 Samuel 15:6 cited above and also from David's relations with them.

3rd quote from the same article:

Postexilic references. In 1 Chronicles 2:55 the **families of the scribes** living at Jabaz are said to be Kenites. Apparently, during the kingdom and exile periods, certain Kenites had given up **nomadic smithing** and had taken on a more sedentary, but equally honorable **profession of scribe**.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, page 114, has this to say about the name of the Kenites:

The etymology of the name suggest **that they were smiths or artificers**, a theory which is supported by their association with the Wadi 'Arabah, where there were copper deposits which had been worked by the Egyptians since the middle of the 3rd millennium.

Again in the Peake's Commentary on the Bible, page 181, we have more on the name of the Kenites:

The name **Cain** is generally taken by Semitic philologist to mean 'smith', and regarded as the patronymic of the **Kenite clan of smiths**.

The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible has this to say on Kenite, page 293:

The families of the scribes — either civil or ecclesiastical officers of the Kenite origin, who are here classified with the tribe of Judah, not as being descended from it, but as dwellers within its territory, and in a measure incorporated with its people.

The Matthew Pool's Commentary On The Holy Bible has this to say on the Kenites, volume 1, page 778:

The Scribes; either civil, who were public notaries, who wrote and signed legal instruments; or ecclesiastical ... and are here mentioned not as if they were of the tribe of Judah, but because they dwelt among them, and probably were allied to them by marriages, and so in a manner incorporated with them. Which dwelt, or rather, dwelt; Hebrew, were dwellers. For the other translation, which dwelt, may seem to insinuate that these were descendants of Judah,

which they were not; but this translation only signifies cohabitation with them, for which cause they are here named with them.

Here is where these Pharisees, Sadducees and **SCRIBES** which Yahshua pointed out as being of their father the devil came from. When He said to them Matthew 23:35:

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zechariah son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

Yahshua was stating a scientific fact. Not only was all of the blood from Abel up to this point on their head, but the blood of Yahshua Himself would fall upon them. Matthew 27:25 says:

Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children.

Not only is the blood of Yahshua upon their head, but all of the blood shed since that time in all their murders. That means every Adamic man woman and child that has died in their planned wars and whatever other murder they have committed. Here is where this one seed-line (or maybe no seed-line) doctrine gets serious: When you deny the Cain Satanic seed-line you put the Jew on the same level as anyone else. What you are actually doing, in essence, is forgiving the Jews for the murder of Yahshua. What the one seed-liners are saying, in essence, is that the enmity is in the flesh and therefore we are the murderers of Yahweh. You can see here, once you take a false position, all kinds of problems start to arise. I know that Yahshua died for my sins, but I didn't murder Him! Now if the one seed-liners want to continue the position of one seed-line or no seed-line, and be responsible for the death of our Savior, then go right ahead.

From 1st Chronicles 2:55, we pick up another name for Cain. Let's review it again to see what it is:

1st Chronicles 2:55

*And the families of the scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the house of **Rechab**.*

Here we pick up the word "Rechab" or "Rechabite." In *The Complete Word Study, Old Testament*, King James Version by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates, page 1055, there is a note to go to Jeremiah 35:1-19. If you have a King James Bible with the center reference it will take you from Jeremiah 35:2 back to 1st Chronicles 2:55. Now let's go to the 35th chapter of Jeremiah, verse 2:

*Go unto the house of the **Rechabites**. and speak unto them, and bring them into the house of the LORD, into one of the chambers, and give them wine to drink.*

Now I am not going to go into detail on this passage, but point out the fingerprints of Cain. In verse 7 it says the Rechabites would not plant seeds nor plant vineyards. If the

ground is cursed for their sake, the seed wouldn't grow anyway. In this same 7th verse it says they shall dwell in tents. Well vagabonds do live in tents. You will also notice in several verses here that they won't drink wine. Could it be that they didn't want to take the wine of Communion? We can see here that the fingerprints of Cain are consistent. Yes, Yahshua, when he pointed out that they were serpents, devils and vipers, knew who he was talking to.

JONES KEEPS UP HIS BARRAGE THAT "TWO SEED-LINE" IS THE "BABYLONIAN RELIGION."

We will now quote several passages of Jones' book, *The Babylonian Connection* to give you an idea of what he considers "Two Seed-line" doctrine to be. The next passage is found on pages 89 and 90 of his book. In this passage he tries to make the Two Seed-liners appear something dirty and morally filthy in making this comparison:

"It takes little imagination to suspect who the "god" was that slept with the priestess. The priest of Egypt taught Alexander the Great one of their most guarded secrets: that the 'Gods' were only human beings. It follows then that the 'god' who slept with the priestess of his choice could only have been the high priest.

"Before leaving Herodotus and his description of Babylonian life and religion, let us quote him one more time to show the extent of the perversion in that land.

"The Babylonians have one most shameful custom. Every woman born in the country must once in her life go and sit down in the precinct of Venus, and there consort with a stranger ... Here there is always a great crowd, some coming and others going; lines of cord mark out paths in all directions among the women, and the strangers pass along them to make their choice. A woman who has once taken her seat is not allowed to return home till one of the strangers throws a silver coin into her lap, and takes her with him beyond the holy ground. When he throws the coin he says these words — 'The goddess Mylitta prosper thee.' (Venus is called Mylitta by the Assyrians).

"... Therefore, we can conclude that this sex religion forced not only integration, but also interracial sexual relations.

You can really see here that Jones is trying to cause a stigma for anyone who believes that Eve was seduced by Satan as cheap and dirty and influential in causing interracial miscegenation to boot. It is not Two Seed-line that is encouraging this, but the one seed-liners like Jones. But Jones continues his diatribe on pages 90 and 91: (*quoting Races of the Old Testament, pp 60,61*):

"The Babylonian people continued to the last to exhibit signs of their mixed descent; now it was the Semitic element which predominated, at other times the non-Semitic (p. 61).

“The ancient population of Babylon was a mixed one, and it is probable that the predominate element in it remained non-Semitic to the end, although it had learned to speak a Semitic idiom (p. 70).

“With this mixture of racial stocks integrated in Babylonian society, it was not long before the Semitic population was mongrelized into an off-white racial strain. It was illegal for a woman who had gone to the precinct of Venus to refuse to have sexual relations with anyone, regardless of race. ...

“It was the religion of Baal, which the prophets without exception denounced. It was a religion of sex, phallic worship, a fertility cult which the Bible utterly condemns, along with all who associate themselves with it or teach its doctrines.

So there you have it, if you are like me, a militant “Two Seed-liner”, you are not good enough to “associate” with Stephen Jones and you are condemned by his interpretation of the Bible! Let’s read that last line over again: *“along with all who associate themselves with it or teach its doctrines.”* According to Jones, the Two Seed-liners are teaching “its doctrines.” Now don’t you feel real dirty because of that? Well Jones wants those teaching “Two Seed-line” to look very low and degrading so he continues with more of his diatribe on page 93:

“The groves (temples) which the Scriptures denounce so frequently, were actually Babylonian and Canaanite representations of the Garden of Eden. This was where initiates of the mystery religions in Canaan reached the first step of ‘perfection’ (the stage of the Moon). The initiates went to the grove and had sex with the temple sodomite.

“Pillars were often substituted for trees in the groves and were used extensively as phallic symbols to teach the sexual interpretation of the ‘trees’ in the Garden of Eden. Nowadays, unknown sex-worshippers dance around May Poles, which had their origin in the groves of Canaan. The only difference is that when the prophets in Israel denounced them, the poles were called ‘Pillars.’ It is also interesting and far more than coincidental that May Day is the day the Reds in Russia have chosen to show off the military might of their god in holiday parades. It is a part of their religion.

“The Baal worship of Canaan was derived from the Babylonian interpretation of the trees in the Garden of Eden. The trees, they claimed, were people (sex symbols), and eating their fruit was sexual intercourse.

Now Jones is insinuating, in an underhanded way, that proponents of Two Seed-line by association of religion condones homosexuality. When did you last have sex with the temple sodomite? — that is what Jones is implying! Yes the Scriptures confirm that there were pillars and denuded trees in the Canaanite groves, But where does Jones get his documentation that they represent the sexual interpretation of the trees in the Garden of Eden? In my reference books, and I have a lot of them, Baal is a lot of bad things, but NOWHERE can I find a connection with the “trees of the Garden of Eden”!

He is pulling that one right out of the air. Jones talks about the “Red” of Russia, but fails to mention they are “red” because of Esau. Jones further condemns the Canaanite religion, but fails to identify the Canaanite. If Jones denies the seduction of Eve, then the Jews and Canaanites are nice people because they cannot be devils in flesh bodies. Again on page 95, Jones takes a crack at Two Seed-line and the “religion of Babylon” with that of sodomy, and let’s read it:

Most people in America today do not realize that the current trend to legalize sexual deviation and relations outside of marriage is a religion. It is a religion of sodomy and is the religion that flourished in Sodom during the time of Abraham. Sodomy is an all-inclusive word encompassing the whole religious structure of the Babylonian sex-religion. In the days of Abraham, it was clearly characterized by the legalization and predominance of homosexuality.

On page 98, Jones makes it appear that Two Seed-line, inasmuch as it is a supposed “Babylonian religion”, as such promotes “feminism.” Let’s see how he twist this one around:

“The so-called ‘feminist’ today are some of the most blatant advocates of Canaanitism in America today. Betty Friedan, the Jewish founder of the National Organization for Women (NOW), essentially began the modern ‘woman’s lib’ movement with the publication of her book: ‘The Feminine Mystique.’ She and her fellow Jewess Gloria Steinem, are faithful Canaanitish missionaries to America, attempting to destroy God’s Law in the nation.

“‘The humanist Manifesto’ outlines the doctrine of this sex religion of Canaan and Babylon. One of its statements declares:

“In the area of sexuality we believe that intolerant attitudes often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical culture, unduly repress sexual contact.

“...Were these Canaanite missionaries to succeed in their proselytizing any great number of people, America would find itself not with a class of liberated women, but with an entire society where the children would have just one parent — the state.

What Jones is doing here is: he is pointing out the “enemy” in Friedan and Steinem (Jews) and at the same time writing a book that they are not the “enemy.” Yes, a double minded man like Jones is unstable in all his ways, James 1:8. Now we shall go to page 102, but before we do, let’s take notice that Jones will try to establish a topic motive and try to prove it with a quote from “The Two Babylons”, but the passage he uses from that reference does not prove what he is trying to establish. It will be amusing watching him try to do this:

“The reader will recall the Mystery religion’s doctrine that the serpent sexually seduced Eve in the Garden, causing her to ‘fall.’ The purpose of sexuality in the groves was to ‘purify’ the woman by re-enacting the Genesis scene. Eve fell

through a sexual act, they thought, and thus the only way women could justify (or reverse the effect of her sin) was through the same act.

“The Canaanites taught that the serpent in the Garden was God (whom they called ‘Baal’). The woman who came to be purified in the groves could not literally have sexual relations with Baal, so this was done through Baal’s representative, or minister, called the temple sodomite.

“The Canaanites were also aware of the ancient prophecy that God would send His Son to earth to be the sacrifice for sin. Thus, the ‘purified’ woman who had children by Baal’s representatives were required to bring these first-born children back to the grove, for they were the ‘sons’ of ‘god.’ The children were then given to Baal, that is, sacrificed on his alter, This was the Canaanite method of justifying sin and reversing the effect of Adam and Eve’s transgression.

Now for his so-called documentation from Alexander Hislop’s, *The Two Babylons*:

“When ‘the fruit of the body’ was thus offered, it was ‘for the sin of the soul.’ And it was a principal of the Mosaic law, a principal no doubt derived from patriarchal faith, that the priest must partake of whatever was offered as a sin-offering (Numbers 28:9, 10). Hence the priest of Nimrod or Baal were necessarily required to eat of the human sacrifices; and thus it has come to pass that ‘Cahna-Bal’, the ‘Priest of Baal’, is the established word in our own tongue for a devourer of human flesh.

Please note here that Jones’ documentation from The Two Babylons does not prove a “Mystery” religion’s doctrine that the serpent sexually seduced Eve.

His documentation is interesting but not pertinent to the subject. If you will look in any Bible reference book under the term “Baal”, you will find a completely different description of Baal than the one Jones is giving here. Baal had to do with agriculture (tilling of the soil), vegetation, grain, beast, rainfall, the cycle of the year’s growing seasons and today is celebrated as Christmas, New Years, Easter, May Day etc. and came from the Moabites, Midianites, Phoenicians and Canaanite nations rather than Babylon. Most of what Jones is saying, he is pulling right off the top of his head. All you have to do is check it out for yourself.

Now we will scrutinize a quote by Stephen Jones on page 119 of his book, *The Babylonian Connection*:

*“Jesus is the Greater David, in the same sense that He has a similar ministry to that of David, but on a greater scale. This anointing, or calling, is specifically that His throne is to be established forever (2 Samuel 7:16), and that He will rule the world in righteousness. David was a great warrior-king and Christ too will **come soon to destroy His enemies** before setting up His Kingdom.*

Well, Who are these “enemies” Jones is talking about here? If Jones doesn’t understand the “Two Seed-line seduction of Eve” (and he doesn’t), he cannot

understand who the “enemy” is! Not only this, but Scripture says that He (Yahshua) will destroy the “enemy” by the hand of His people, Israel. Now if we don’t know who the enemy is, How in the world are we going to destroy them? Israel is getting mixed signals today. The fundamentalist cry long and loud that the enemy is the friend — that the “Jews are God’s chosen people.” Then we have people like Stephen Jones and company that say, in essence, **“there is no enemy.” It is only the teachers of the “Two Seed-line” message who are truthfully pointing out who the “enemy” is** and that is our job.

On page 120 and 123, Stephen Jones continues his diatribe:

“It now becomes clear why the Babylonian priest honored and worshipped the serpent as being their god, and why they also taught that the serpent’s seduction of Eve was a good thing , rather than a sin. According to their doctrinal scheme, Adam and Eve would never have attained ‘immortality’ (the ability to reproduce) had not the serpent taught them the ‘secret’ of sex. These ancient priest interpreted the serpent’s deception sexually, because they did not believe in immortality at all. The only immortality they recognized was that of passing their genetic heritage down to the next generation.

“Thus, the pursuit of heaven and immortality inevitably involved worship of sex and fertility. All the temple prostitution had as its basis the doctrine of the soul’s ‘immortality.’ No one could join their denomination unless he ‘believed in immortality’ (i.e., had sex with the sodomite).

“... The high priest ruled by revelation, rather than by the pre-written Law of the God of the Bible. No man could question his absolute authority. His will was the will of God, and decisions were the decisions of God. He ruled as absolute dictator. This shows the political side of Mystery Babylon. We see it in the world today under the guise of Communism. Communism is a religion in which Karl Marks (their god) gave them his laws, and Lenin (their christ) interpreted them and put them into practice.

Here, again, Jones is beating at the enemy while denying there is one. He doesn’t understand that Karl Marks and Lenin were of a Satanic seed-line — that it is more than just religion. The next thing Stephen Jones tackles to do is to set you up again from pages 129 to 141 telling all the bad things about the Jewish Talmud. Because the sexual seduction of Eve is mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud, he points to it and indicates that because it is in the Talmud, Eve’s seduction has to be untrue. In order to get the flow of his thought and the manner in which he is trying to get his point across, I will have to quote several pages here. And, by the way, most all of what he says about the Babylonian Talmud is true and it is hard to understand why he doesn’t understand that the Jews are a Satanic seed-line. Again he is pointing out and debasing the “enemy” while, at the same time, declaring the enemies’ origin to be false. Now the Jews did get their religion from Babylon. Let’s see what Jones has to say, (And while we read this, let’s take notice of the “enmity” of the Jews predicted in Genesis 3:15):

"MYSTERY BABYLON AND JUDAISM

"ORIGIN OF THE TALMUD

"Seventy years after the Judean remnant was carried captive into Babylon, a small minority of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi returned to the old land to rebuild the city and the temple. The majority, however, remained in Babylon, having been well-integrated into that society and having incorporated Babylonian religion into their own. It was at this time that the Talmud and other secret writings began to be written.

"The Jews who wrote the Babylonian Talmud had been indoctrinated in the religious principles of Babylon. Because the Jewish exile served to emphasize their nationalism, they viewed these Babylonian 'truths' as rightfully belonging to them. Thus they incorporated the doctrines of Mystery Babylon into their Talmudic writings.

"The Jew who led this descent into Babylonian influence, the real founder of Judaism as we know it today, was a man called Zoroaster. There seems to have been two Zoroasters in history, which makes this point somewhat confusing. There was (1) the Jew from Bactria who lived around the time of the Judean captivity. who was either named Zoroaster or took that name upon himself, and (2) there was the original Zoroaster from Chaldea, who according to Epiphanius, was ...

"...Nimrod, that established the sciences of magic and astronomy, the invention of which was subsequently attributed to the (Bactrian) Zoroaster (Two Babylons, p. 67).

"Bernier tells us just how important the Bactrian Zoroaster is to modern Judaism:

"Certain traditions give to Zoroaster, a Jewish Prophet, as Master ... But on the other hand, Chaldean thought acted powerfully upon orthodox Judaism and determined the growth of a sect in its midst which was to transform Israel ... This sect was that of the 'Pharisees' ... What they borrowed (from the Chaldeans) in fact ... was the essence of the pantheistic doctrine ... From these borrowings ... the KABALAH of the Pharisees ... was 800 years later, to inspire the compilation of the TALMUD, and found its completest expression in the SEPHER HA ZOHAR ... This religion of the 'Deified Man', with which they were impregnated in Babylon, was only conceived as benefiting the Jew, superior and predestined being (Inquire Within, Light-Bearers of Darkness, p 12).

"It was in Babylon that this corrupted segment of Judah began to think of themselves as the God-people, rather than the People of God, Professor H. Graetz, in his History of the Jews, says:

“...The Babylonian Talmud rather than the Jerusalem Talmud became the fundamental possession of the Jewish race, its life breath, its very soul ... (Vol. 2, p. 631).

“Harmsworth’s History of the World says: ‘Judaism was not evolved in Judah; it was in Babylon that Judaism first became that which it was and still is’ (Vol. 3, p. 1781-4).

“Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, the official spokesman for the American Jewish Committee wrote: ‘The Talmud consist of 63 books of legal, ethical, and historical writings of the ancient rabbis. It was edited five centuries after the birth of Jesus. It is a compendium of law and lore. It is the legal code which forms the basis of Jewish religious law and it is the textbook used in the training of rabbis’ (Look Magazine, ‘What Is A Jew?’, June 17, 1952).

“MYSTERY BABYLON IN THE TALMUD

“Having written the Talmudic writings over a period of 1,100 years, the Rabbis finally edited and canonized them in Babylon around 500 A.D. These writings had already supplanted the true religion of the Bible by the time of Christ. Michael Rodkinson, a Jew wrote:

“What is the Talmud? The Talmud, then, is the written form of that which, in the time of Jesus was called ‘the traditions of the elders’ and to which he makes frequent allusions (History of the Talmud, p. 70).

“Jesus must have had a very low opinion of these traditions, for He said: Full well ye reject the commandments of God, that ye may keep your own tradition (Mark 7:9). — But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men (Matt. 15:9).

“In other words Jesus accused the Pharisees of considering their own writings to be more important than Scripture. The Talmud itself bears witness to this ungodly teaching, for it reads: ‘The teachings of the Talmud stand above all other laws. They are more important than the laws of Moses’ (Rabbi Ismael).

“The decisions of the Talmud are words of the living God. Jehovah Himself asks the opinion of the early rabbis when there are difficult affairs in heaven (Rabbi Menachem Commentary on Fifth Book).

“This religion of the Talmud was first called ‘Judaism’ by Josephus in the first century, in order to distinguish it from ‘Hellenism.’ However, the Jews considered Josephus a traitor and refused even to read his writings. Thus they continued to call their religion ‘Phariseeism’ until many centuries later. Rabbi Louis Finkelstein of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America wrote: ‘Phariseeism became Talmudism, Talmudism became Medieval Rabbinism, and Medieval Rabbinism became Modern Rabbinism. Both throughout these changes in name ... the spirit

of the ancient Pharisees survives, unaltered ...' (The Pharisees, the Sociological Background of Their Faith, p. 21).

"The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, under 'Pharisees', says: 'The Jewish religion as it is today traces its descent, without a break, through all the centuries, from the Pharisees ... The Talmud is the largest and most important single member of that literature ... and the study of it is essential for any real understanding of Phariseeism.'

"Let us study the Talmud briefly, then, since we must do so to understand Phariseeism.

"We have shown previously that the doctrines of Babylon lead to dictatorship in government. In Judaism this takes the form of an oligarchy (rule by the few — the Jews). They consider themselves to be above the Law of God and do not believe that any non-Jew has any rights at all, not even the right to belong to the human race. The Talmud says: 'Jehovah created the non-Jew in human form so that the Jew would not have to be served by beast. The non-Jew is consequently an animal in human form, and condemned to serve the Jew day and night' (Midrasch Talpioth).

"A Jew may do to a non-Jewess what he can do. He may treat her as he treats a piece of meat (Nadarine, 20, B; Schudshan Aruch, Chozen Hamiszpat 384).

"On the house of the goy (non-Jew) one looks as on the fold of cattle (Tosefta, Erubin VII,1).

"When the Messiah comes every Jew will have 2800 slaves (Simeon Haddarsen).

"When the modern churches support Zionism and teach that this is something God Himself supports, they commit blasphemy by attributing to God things which never came into His mind. Thievery is commanded in the Talmud, and when churches support Zionism, they say that God condones thievery doctrines such as: 'All property of other nations belongs to the Jewish nation, which consequently is entitled to seize upon it without any scruples. An orthodox Jew is not bound to observe principles of morality towards people of other tribes. He may act contrary, if profitable to himself or to Jews in general' (Schulchan Aruch).

"Five things has Canaan recommended to his sons: 'Love each other, love the robbery, hate your masters and never tell the truth' (Pesachim F. 113B).

"The very fact that so few people are aware of the malicious intent of the Talmud and its adherents show that Judaism is a Mystery Religion. The Talmud commands absolute secrecy in order to hide its true objectives:

“To communicate anything to a goy (non-Jew) about our religious relations would be equal to the killing of all Jews, for if the goyim knew what we teach about them, they would kill us openly (Libbre David 37).

“Every goy who studies the Talmud and every Jew who helps him in it, ought to die (Sanhedrin 59a).

“If a Jew be called upon to explain any part of the Rabbinic books, he ought to give only a false explanation. Whoever will violate this order shall be put to death (Libbre David 37).

“The Talmud obviously not only condones but commands the murder of those who reveal the contents of the Talmud and expose its religious doctrines. The Jews feel no guilt in murdering and then lying, because they all recite the ‘Kol Nidre’ (All Vows) prayer each year on the ‘Day of Atonement.’ This absolves them of any guilt. It is recited three times by the standing congregation along with the rabbi:

“All vows, obligations, oaths, anathemas, whether called ‘konam’, ‘konas’, or by any other name, which we may vow, or swear, or pledge, or whereby we may be bound, from this day of atonement unto the next, (whose happy coming we await), we do repent. May they be deemed absolved, forgiven, annulled, and void and made of no effect; they shall not bind us nor have power over us. The vows shall not be reckoned vows; the obligations shall not be obligatory; nor the oaths be oaths.

“The irony of it is that churches in their concurrence with this doctrine of devils, heartily ring their bells as a gesture of good will at the start of this day (sundown, Yon Kipper). Is it out of ignorance? Or are there secret Jews in those pulpits?

“The Bible contains a long record of godly prophets who attempted to expose Mystery Babylon in Israel and who died for their stand: ‘And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment’ ... ‘They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented’ ... ‘(of whom the world was not worthy); they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth’ (Heb. 11:36-38).

“The Apostle Paul says of the Jews that they ... ‘both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men’ (1 Thess. 2:15).

*“Jewish hatred of Christianity will never die, because Jesus and His disciples exposed the Mystery Babylon in Phariseism. St. Justin said in the mid-second century: ‘...but they (the Jews) though they read (the Scriptures) do not understand what is said, but count us foes and enemies; and like yourselves (the Romans), **they kill and punish us whenever they have the power**, as you can*

well believe. For in the Jewish war which lately raged, Barchochebas, the leader of the revolt of the Jews, gave orders that Christians alone should be led to cruel punishment, unless they would deny Jesus Christ and utter blasphemy (First Apology, ch. 31).

“In Justin’s Dialogue With Trypho, which is a book written specially to prove to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ, we read, concerning the Jewish exile from Palestine: ‘Accordingly, these things have happened to you in fairness and justice, for you have slain the Just One, and His prophets before Him; and now you reject those who hope in Him, and in Him who sent Him — God the Almighty and Master of all things — cursing in your synagogues those that believe on Christ. For you have not the power to lay hands on us, on account of those who now have the mastery. But as often as you could, you did so’ (ch 16).

“For other nations have not inflicted on us and on Christ this wrong to such an extent as you have, who in very deed are the authors of the wicked prejudice against the Just One, and us who hold by Him. For after that you had crucified Him ... when you knew that He had risen from the dead and ascended to heaven ... you selected and sent out from Jerusalem chosen men through all the land to tell that the godless heresy of the Christians had sprung up, and to publish those things which all they who knew us not speak against us. So that you are the cause not only of your own unrighteousness, but in fact of that of all other men ... Accordingly, you display great zeal in publishing throughout all the land bitter and dark and unjust things against the only blameless and righteous Light sent by God (ch. 17).

“About the Jewish proselytes, Justin wrote: ‘But the proselytes not only do not believe, but twofold more than yourselves blaspheme His name, and wish to torture and put to death us who believe in Him; for in all points they strive to be like you’ (ch. 122)

“Jesus said of the Pharisees: ‘Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves’ (Matt. 23:15).

“The Talmud (Makkoth 7b) proclaims Jews innocent if they murder Christians, and also says (Zohar II, 43a) that their extermination is a necessary sacrifice. Like communism, the Talmudic religion calls for the murder of all Christians. It is the modern form of human sacrifice offered to Baal. It is their religion. For further study into Biblical statements condemning Talmudic Jewry, see Pastor Emry’s ‘Who Killed Christ.’ (buddy, buddy)

“Today’s propagandist would have us believe that the Jews are an oppressed people in communist countries, although Jews are the only people allowed to leave at all. Among Jewish circles, however, the real facts are openly bared. George Marlen, a Jewish author, stated in 1937: ‘If the tide of history does not

turn toward Communist internationalism ... then the Jewish race is doomed' (Stalin, Trotsky, or Lenin, p. 414).

"Harry Waton, another Jewish writer wrote: 'The Jews have a right to subordinate to themselves the rest of mankind and to be masters over the earth ... This is the historic destiny of the Jews' (A Program for the Jews and an Answer to All Anti-Semites, pp, 99, 100).

"It is not an accident that Judaism gave birth to Marxism, and it is not an accident that the Jews readily took up Marxism; all this is in perfect accord with the progress of Judaism and the Jews (Ibid., p. 148). — The communist soul is the soul of Judaism (Ibid., p.143).

"According to I. Rennap (Jewish writer), Karl Marx, the founder of modern Communism ... 'came from an old ... family of rabbis and brilliant Talmudic scholars' (Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question, p. 31).

"Dennis Prager, another Jew said: 'In many ways Marxism is a secular Messianic offshoot of Judaism ...' ('The Times of Israel', Oct., 1973). — After giving examples of the objectives common to both Judaism and Marxism, Prager continues: 'These similarities reveal Judaism's contribution to Marx's thought.'

"So it should come as no surprise that communism is simply Talmudic Judaism in disguise. They have a single common goal — to destroy the Kingdom of God and to set up the Kingdom of Antichrist. Whereas the communist governments have always taken steps to eradicate Christianity, they have been the saviors of Judaism.

"Rabbi Moses Miller, President of the Communist Jewish People's Committee for United Action Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism, wrote a booklet called Soviet 'Anti-Semitism' The Big Lie! On Page 23 under the heading, 'Soviet Fight Against Racism', he says: 'From the very first day of its existence, the Soviet Union took steps to eradicate anti-Semitism. On July 27, 1919, a special decree was issued (by the Communist Government) against anti-Semitism.'

"Article 123 of the Soviet Constitution guarantees Jewish 'equality' and any violation of this is punishable by death. The Constitution of the Communist Party of the U.S. in Article VI, Section 7 reads: 'It shall be the obligation of all the Party members to struggle against all forms of national oppression, national chauvinism, discrimination and segregation, against all ideological influences and practices of 'racial' theories, such as white chauvinism and anti-Semitism.'

"It is well-known to those who have taken the time to study its origins that communism was founded, financed, and propagated by the Talmudists. According to a leading Jewish magazine: 'The Bolshevist Revolution in Russia was the work of Jewish brains, of Jewish dissatisfaction, of Jewish planning, whose goal is to create a new order in the world. What was performed in so

excellent a way in Russia, thanks to Jewish brains ... shall also, through the same Jewish mental and physical forces, become a reality over all the world' ('American Hebrew', Sept. 10, 1920).

"The Jewish-controlled New York Times lauded the head of the Jewish banking house of Kuhn-Loeb: 'The Kerensky Revolution was financed by a banker you all know and loved — Jacob Schiff (March 24, 1917).

"The Jews are not only the fathers of modern communism but were the ones who brought Babylonian witchcraft into the western world as well. In fact, communism was founded in the late 18th century by Jews actively practicing witchcraft. ...

LOOK OUT!, LOOK OUT!, BOMBS AWAY!, HERE HE GOES AGAIN

Jones has just set you up again!!! He has set up by telling you the truth!!! He has just given a very good scenario of what communism is. He has shown you, beyond all doubt, that communism is Jewish! There is absolutely no question about it! For the most part everything in his book *The Babylonian Connection*, from pages 129 to 141 is true. There are a couple of points that I don't agree, but for the most part it is true — he did an excellent job on this part of his book (and this part only). But Jones has an ulterior motive for telling the truth in this situation. As a matter of fact, he is going to present some more facts out of the Talmud truthfully. But he is going to present it in such a way as to make you take it wrong and cause you to establish a false premise and I am sure he deliberately planed it this way. Yes, I am saying that Stephen Jones is knowingly dishonest on this matter. Shortly I will be giving you an example of his dishonesty.

This is not the example I had in mind, but we need to back up to one of his quotes. Jones made a mistake in quoting what he quotes here and I will show you why. Let's go back and pick it up:

"Five things has Canaan recommended to his sons: 'Love each other, love the robbery, hate your masters and never tell the truth' (Pesachim F. 113B).

Notice Jones quotes the Jews using the name "**Canaan**" here. The Jews themselves are thus pointing out that they are "Canaanites." From this, all you have to do is go back to my documentation earlier in this article and see who made up the ten Canaanite nations! The "Kenites" of Genesis 15:19 takes you back to Cain, #7017 in Strong's Concordance. You can see that Jones didn't do his homework. **His premises are wrong; so, too, are his conclusions wrong.**

The Jews know they are "Canaanites" and descendants of Cain for they tell about it in their writings. Let's us see who the Jew admits himself to be. In the publication *Liberal Judaism*, January, 1949, there is an article entitled, "Liberal Judaism and Israel" written

by one of their greatest and most renowned Rabbis, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. Dr. Silver, writing about the then new State of Israel says:

“ ... the third commonwealth of the Jewish Nation is thus an accomplished fact. The State of Israel exists.

*“As a result the concept of **the wandering Jew** is bound eventually to disappear along with the term (galut) exile. All nations send forth immigrants to all parts of the world. People are continually moving from one country to another, and change their citizenship, but they are not regarded as exiles.*

*“This fact alone — the end of national exile for the Jewish people, as such — is destined to affect favorably the psyche of the Jew throughout the world. It will endow the Jew, wherever he lives, with a self respect and a sense of security, a normal tone, long-wanted in Jewish experience. **For the curse of Cain, the curse of being an outcast and a “wanderer” over the face of the earth has been removed ...***

You can see here the Jews themselves know they are from Cain. It is only people like Stephen Jones, Charles Wiseman, Ted R. Weiland, Pete Peters and company that doesn't know!!!!!! Where Jones goes wrong, when the Jews speak in the Talmud as being descended from Cain, it is an historical fact and not a “Babylonian religious” fact! Now that Jones has set us up to pull a wool cover over our eyes, let's see how he proceeds with it on pages 141-143. Some of it is true and some of it he pulls right out of the air:

“MYSTERY BABYLON IN THE 'ZOHAR HA SEPHER'

“The secret Jewish religion is based upon the Talmud, which finds its highest glories in the Zohar ha Sepher ('Book of Splendor'). The doctrinal structure is based upon the Babylonian sexual interpretation of the tree of life and of knowledge. The book claims that the story of creation is a veil of the sex mystery, known as the 'Mystery of Faith' and the 'Supreme Mystery.'

“Through this 'mystery' we are all incarnated in bondage to physical bodies here on earth, and only through this mystery — sexual union — may be liberated from mortality and the physical body. Sex is the Law of Liberation. The Talmud says:

“When the serpent copulated with Eve he infused her with lust. The lust of the Israelites who stood at Mount Sinai came to an end, the lust of idolaters who did not stand at Mount Sinai did not come to an end (Yebamoth, 103a-103b).

“R. Eleasar further stated: What is meant by the Scriptural text, 'This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh?' (footnote: emphasis on 'This is now'). This teaches that Adam had intercourse with every beast and animal but found no satisfaction until he cohabited with Eve' (Yebamoth, 63a).

“This doctrine that Adam was promiscuous and practiced bestiality is the Jewish interpretation of Genesis 2:16, which says: ‘And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat.’

*“Not only was Adam said to have had sexual relations with the beast of the Garden, but also it was taught that Adam had a Negro wife named Lilith before the creation of Eve. Since the Jews learned these doctrines from Babylon, we can **assume** that bestiality and intermarriage were also a part of the Babylonian religious worship. This particular passage of the Talmud quoted above spends much time dealing with bestiality — when it is permitted by their law, and when it is not. In Yebamoth 59b, Rabbi Shimi ben Hiyya said: ‘A woman who had intercourse with a beast is eligible to marry a priest (footnote: Even a High Priest. The result of such intercourse being regarded as a mere wound, and the opinion that does not regard an accidentally injured hymen as a disqualification does not so regard such an intercourse either.)’*

*“Because such words are offensive to true Christians, we will refrain from quoting further in this distasteful subject and continue our discussion of the Zohar. It teaches that the Serpent, called Samael, had sexual relations with Eve, thus defiling her. Then Eve in turn defiled Adam in the same way. The Zohar goes on to teach that the Serpent (who is said to be God, or at least their god) **was the father of Cain.**”*

Now this nearly completes our book review, *The Babylonian Connection*: by Stephen Jones except a couple of things. Before we go to these items, let’s look at a statement Jones makes on page 155, and it is pretty good advice:

“As a beginning, that certainly is a call for God’s people to separate themselves from churches and religions that teach the doctrines which we have shown to be those of Mystery Babylon.

Here Jones is calling everybody to be “separated” away from those who teach “Two Seed-line” doctrine, which he terms “Babylonian” in nature, from “God’s people.” I heartily agree with this statement. It is time for “Two Seed-line” believers to separate from one seed-line believers as there can be compromise on this subject — they are light-years apart ! Notice, here, **it is Jones who is calling for division!**

Well, we have one more thing about Jones. This item will really show Jones up for what he is. If a man is a liar, he should be exposed as a liar! It is my own personal opinion that Jones is a liar and as such he cannot be trusted with “Identity” teaching. If a man lies once, he will lie again. I am going to show you where Jones told a downright lie and he used subliminal suggestion in doing it. We will find it in his book on page 154 and it reads as follows:

“Liberty under God’s Law is our God-given inheritance. When Protestant reformers of 400 years ago discovered this liberty, they forsook the Papal

dictatorship. God opened their eyes to the truth of His Word, and they rejected the serpent's lies taught by the Catholic church. Martin Luther wrote:

*“My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus’ blood and righteousness;
I dare not trust the serpent’s lie,
Concerning immortality.
On Christ the solid Rock I stand,
All other ground is sinking sand.*

When I read this over, the words seemed familiar — they just kept going through my mind. I kept asking myself, Where Have I heard them before? Well, I kept going over and over them and then some familiar music began to come to me. It took me about 10 minutes to begin to recognize the melody that went with the words, but I couldn't think of the name of the song. I proceeded to go and find some old hymn books and started to see if I could find the song that matched the words. I probably was the better part of an hour doing this after I found my song books, and I was probably at least an hour in just finding the books. I didn't seem to have much luck in the indexes of the hymnals, so I just leafed through the pages one at a time. While I was searching, the words that seems to come to me were: “I dare not trust the sweetest (something), but (something something) Jesus’ name.” Finally I found it; the name of the song was “The Solid Rock.” and in some song books it is just “Solid Rock.” But the words “*the serpent’s lie, Concerning immortality*” were not there! Apparently Jones changed these words in order to prove his thesis.

Not only that, but I found that **“Martin Luther” never wrote these words!** I have an old hymnal entitled *The Evangelical Hymnal*, published by “Board Of Publication of the Evangelical Church, Cleveland, Oh. & Harrisburg, Pa., Copyrighted 1921.” For the song “Solid Rock”, page 150, it has “Edward Mote” as the author and “William B. Bradbury” as the composer. From pages XXXIV to XXXVI is found a list of authors. Rev. Edward Mote is listed on page XXXV as the author and flourished from 1797 till 1874. From pages XXXVII to XXXIX are listed composers. William B. Bradbury is listed on page XXXVII as the composer and flourished from 1816 till 1868 and composed 21 melodies including “Solid Rock.” **Now Jones is telling an absolute outright bold-faced lie when he says that “Martin Luther” wrote these words, (and Jones changed the words to his own use to boot). Now if “Martin Luther” wrote these words, then Edward Mote is a plagiarist.** In this hymnal the words, “*Used by permission of The Biglow & Main Company, Owners*”, is used. This indicates that this company had copyrights against this song and only could be used by their permission. Question: How could “Edward Mote”, “William B. Bradbury” and “The Biglow & Main Company” get a copyright on something “Martin Luther” wrote hundreds of years before? Under copyright law, it would be unethical and illegal for Mote to claim authorship if it were Martin Luther’s work! **THIS IS A GOOD EXAMPLE OF JONES’ CHARACTER AND PROVES HE IS A DOWNRIGHT LIAR, AND THIS IS THE BOY**

THE “ONE SEED-LINERS” ARE PARROTING!!! Well, anyway, now you know more about Stephen Jones!!!!!!

Let’s take a look, now, at the true words to this line of the stanza of Mote’s poem which was later put to Bradbury’s melody:

“I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus’ name.”

(Not) *“I dare not trust the serpent’s lie, Concerning immortality.”*

Jones was using “subliminal suggestion” in his deceitful tactic to get you to buy his argument. The average person would say in his/her mind, “Oh yes, I know those words, so Jones has a good point here.” “Subliminal suggestion” is a science and is practiced much by the Jews. The question here is: “Who is the Jew behind Jones doing this?” There are several other things about this work of Jones that spells “Jew” like the use of “double-talk.” Have you ever observed the Jews on television or in the movies using it? — they are really good at it! They can actually be saying “no” when they mean “yes”, and be saying “yes” when they mean “no.” Jones employed this tactic throughout this book!

For the record, let’s observe what the true words of the song, “The Solid Rock” are:

Stanza #1,

My hope is built on nothing less Than Jesus’ blood and righteousness. I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus’ name.

Stanza #2,

When darkness seems to hide His face, I rest on His unchanging grace. In every high and stormy gale, My anchor holds within the veil.

Stanza #3,

His oath, His covenant, His blood Support me in the whelming flood. When all around my soul gives way, He then is all my Hope and Stay. (By the way, the “whelming flood” is all of these “strange” aliens coming into Israel countries.)

Stanza #4,

When He shall come with trumpet sound, Oh may I then in Him be found; Dressed in His righteousness alone, Faultless to stand before the throne.

Refrain,

On Christ, the solid Rock, I stand; All other ground is sinking sand. All other ground is sinking sand.

Notice, here, again, no words about *“the serpent’s lie, Concerning immortality.”* They were added by Jones who also lied about the author and thought you would never notice! I am going to reproduce one of the pages, 154, at the end of this book review.

Well, this is not all. Since I started this “book review” of Jones’ book, *The Babylonian Connection*, I have come into some very interesting information. If the information I

received is true, it sheds a lot of light on the situation we have here with Stephen Jones and his connection with the late Sheldon Emry of “America’s Promise” who published Jones’ book. This information (and I am not free at the moment to reveal the source) alleges that Sheldon Emry was half-Jew on his mother’s side. At this point in time, it is learned that Sheldon Emry is alleged to have been possibly half-Jew on his mother’s side. Sheldon Emry is the one that promoted this book, *The Babylonian Connection*, which we are now reviewing. This information goes on to allege that “Emry” ... “was great at stealing the works of others.” This information also alleges that “Emry was a first cousin to James Warner”, and it doesn’t take long to figure the implications of that! (By the Way, “Warner” is a name used by some Jews.) At this point, a question should be asked: Could Emry have been using Jones (even influencing Jones’ own words) to divert the teachings of Bertrand L. Comparet, Wesley A. Swift, C. O. Stadskev, William Gale and other fine “Two Seed-line” ministers? Well, this would be right in line with Protocol #14 as we mentioned before!

This information should really be proved true or false (one way or the other) once and for all time as it could affect the Emry family adversely in Identity. The Law of Yahweh says that everything should be proved by two or three witnesses. If anyone has information to prove these allegations (pro or con), please contact me. If these allegations are true, the motive might have been to divert our mind to accept Esau as the “enemy” instead of Cain (although Esau does fit into the equation). In this information there is another allegation that “At the north west some years ago an old lady from Arkansas showed Emry an out of print book on *There Is No Satan*. Shortly after that Emry came out with a sermon ‘There Is No Satan.’” It doesn’t take long to figure out, (if the allegation is true that Sheldon Emry was half-Jew) that he might want to divert the attention of “Two Seed-line” doctrine that the Jews are genetically a people of Satanic origin or (devils in shoe leather). Maybe this is the reason he was so anxious to promote the idea of “No Satan.” At this point, in time and place, I cannot confirm all of these allegations, but if they are true, you can see the reason for Jones writing this book, *The Babylonian Connection* and his buddy-buddy friendship, at the time, with Sheldon Emry.

Notice, here, again, no words about “*the serpent’s lie, Concerning immortality.*” They were added by Jones who also lied about the author and thought you would never notice! I am going to reproduce one of the pages, 154, at the end of this book review.

Well, this is not all. Since I started this “book review” of Jones’ book, *The Babylonian Connection*, I have come into some very interesting information. If the information I received is true, it sheds a lot of light on the situation we have here with Stephen Jones and his connection with the late Sheldon Emry of “America’s Promise” who published Jones’ book. This information (and I am not free at the moment to reveal the source) alleges that Sheldon Emry was half-Jew on his mother’s side. At this point in time, it is learned that Sheldon Emry is alleged to have been possibly half-Jew on his mother’s side. Sheldon Emry is the one that promoted this book, *The Babylonian Connection*, which we are now reviewing. This information goes on to allege that “Emry” ... “was

great at stealing the works of others.” This information also alleges that “Emry was a first cousin to James Warner”, and it doesn’t take long to figure the implications of that! (By the Way, “Warner” is a name used by some Jews.) At this point, a question should be asked: Could Emry have been using Jones (even influencing Jones’ own words) to divert the teachings of Bertrand L. Comporet, Wesley A. Swift, C. O. Stadskev, William Gale and other fine “Two Seed-line” ministers? Well, this would be right in line with Protocol #14 as we mentioned before!

This information should really be proved true or false (one way or the other) once and for all time as it could affect the Emry family adversely in Identity. The Law of Yahweh says that everything should be proved by two or three witnesses. If anyone has information to prove these allegations (pro or con), please contact me. If these allegations are true, the motive might have been to divert our mind to accept Esau as the “enemy” instead of Cain (although Esau does fit into the equation). In this information there is another allegation that “At the north west some years ago an old lady from Arkansas showed Emry an out of print book on *There Is No Satan*. Shortly after that Emry came out with a sermon ‘There Is No Satan.’” It doesn’t take long to figure out, (if the allegation is true that Sheldon Emry was half-Jew) that he might want to divert the attention of “Two Seed-line” doctrine that the Jews are genetically a people of Satanic origin or (devils in shoe leather). Maybe this is the reason he was so anxious to promote the idea of “No Satan.” At this point, in time and place, I cannot confirm all of these allegations, but if they are true, you can see the reason for Jones writing this book, *The Babylonian Connection* and his buddy buddy friendship, at the time, with Sheldon Emry.