

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #165; January, 2012 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser

1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830

Website: emahiser.christogenea.org

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and sixty-fifth monthly teaching letter and continues my fourteenth year of publication. This is the fourth interruption of my series *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*, which I started with WTL #137, giving a general overview, which I have been expanding on in more detail in seven stages, as follows: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage. Since then, I got sidetracked with the erroneous allegation that Queen Charlotte of England (who was the wife of King George III) had black ancestry, proclaimed by the so-called civil rights movement's mouthpiece, *The Nubian Times*, which circulated the article among their adherents to promote that royalty is mixed with negro blood, plus other false claims.

With this lesson, I will finish Queen Charlotte's history from:

The History Of Queen Charlotte from:

wikipedia.org/wiki/Charlotte_of_Mecklenburg-Strelitz

"... The queen also founded orphanages and a hospital for expectant mothers. The education of women was of great importance to her, and she saw to it that her daughters were better educated than was usual for young women of the day. However, she insisted that her daughters live restricted lives close to their mother, and refused to allow them to marry until they were well-advanced in years, with the result that none of her daughters had legitimacy issues (one, Princess Sophia, may have had an illegitimate son).

"In 2004, the Queen's Gallery at Buckingham Palace staged an exhibition illustrating George and Charlotte's enthusiastic arts patronage, which was particularly enlightened in contrast to that of earlier Hanoverian monarchs; it compared favorably to the adventuresome tastes of the king's father, Frederick, Prince of Wales.

"Up until 1788, portraits of Charlotte often depict her in maternal poses with her children, and she looks young and contented. However, in that year her husband fell seriously ill and became temporarily insane. It is now thought that the King was suffering from a genetic metabolic disorder, porphyria, but at the time the cause of the King's illness was unknown. Sir Thomas Lawrence's portrait of her at this time marks a

transition point after which she looks much older in her portraits. Indeed, the Assistant Keeper of Charlotte's Wardrobe, Mrs. Papendiek, wrote that the Queen was 'much changed, her hair quite grey'.

"Relations with Marie Antoinette:

"Charlotte sat for Sir Thomas Lawrence in September 1789. His portrait of her was exhibited at the Royal Academy the following year. Reviewers thought it 'a strong likeness'. The French Revolution of 1789 probably added to the strain that Charlotte felt. Queen Charlotte and Queen Marie Antoinette of France kept a close relationship. Charlotte was eleven years older than Marie Antoinette, yet they shared many interests, such as their love of music and the arts in which they both enthusiastically took an interest. Never meeting face to face they kept the friendship to pen and paper. Marie Antoinette confided in Charlotte upon the outbreak of the French Revolution. Charlotte had even organized apartments to be prepared and ready for the refugee royal family of France to stay in. After the execution of Marie Antoinette and the bloody events that followed, Charlotte was said to be shocked and overwhelmed that such a thing could happen to a kingdom, and right on Britain's doorstep.

"Husband's illness: After the onset of his madness, George III was placed in the care of his wife, who could not bring herself to visit him very often, due to his erratic behaviour and occasional violent reactions. It is believed she did not visit him again after June 1812. However, Charlotte remained supportive of her husband as his illness, now believed to be porphyria, worsened in old age. While her son, the Prince Regent, wielded the royal power, she was her husband's legal guardian from 1811 until her death in 1818.

"Later life: The queen died in the presence of her eldest son, the Prince Regent, who was holding her hand as she sat in an armchair at the family's country retreat, Dutch House in Surrey (now known as Kew Palace). She was buried at St George's Chapel at Windsor Castle. Her husband died just over a year later. She is the second longest-serving consort in British history (after the present Duke of Edinburgh), having served as such from her marriage (on 8 September 1761) to her death (17 November 1818), a total of 57 years and 70 days.

"Her eldest son, the Prince Regent, claimed Charlotte's jewels at her death, but the rest of her property was sold at auction from May to August 1819. Her clothes, furniture, and even her stuff was sold by Christie's. It is highly unlikely that her husband ever knew of her death, and he died, blind, deaf, lame and insane, fourteen months later."

Much of what I have written in my research defending Queen Charlotte is revealed on the front page of *The Barnes Review*, #10 for July 1995, with the headline announcement: "SHAKESPEARE WAS WRONG ABOUT OTHELLO". The article *The Untold Tale Of Othello*, by John Tiffany is featured on pp. 3-7, of which I will quote important excerpts as follows:

"... 'He that is robb'd, not wanting what is stol'n, / Let him not know't, and he's not robbed at all' – Othello, III, iii. Have we been 'robb'd' of the truths of history? Was Othello, the Moor of Venice, really black? As Lago said: 'Men

should be what they seem; Or those that be not, would they might seem none!
But was Othello what he seemed, racially speaking?

“Shakespeare wrote *Othello, the Moor of Venice* in, probably, 1604. This was more than 100 years after the last Moor was driven out of Europe and centuries after the Moorish civilization had reached its peak and entered into decline.

“For nearly 800 years the Moors had held sway over most of what is today called Spain and Portugal. The post-Moorish history of those nations, by contrast, is a mere 500 years or so. Thus the civilization had ample time to go through its life cycle.

“Shakespeare (as well as everyone who has since produced the play*) pictured the Othello character as a black man, but the bard was mistaken on this point. Othello, had he been a real-life person and not a fictional character, would have been white. As a true Moor (unless it was of the late, decaying stages of the civilization), he would have been a member of the Caucasian race, without a tinge of Negro blood.

“[*Othello was performed by the King’s men in the banqueting house at Whitehall on Hallowmas Day, November 1, 1604. So far as is known this was the first public presentation of the play. It was probably written earlier that year.]

“Shakespeare took the plot for his Othello a splendid, heroic and good man and a natural leader. Yet Shakespeare’s Othello is hotblooded, somewhat simple-minded and completely unable to understand his white wife, Desdemona. Nor is he any kind of intellectual match for his treacherous white friend-cum-enemy, the cynical Iago.

“But the real-life Moors, at least until shortly before their downfall, were not Negro. Thus, as Shakespeare’s play was set during the hey-day of Moorish culture, Othello could not have been black.

“The name ‘Moor,’ given to the Muslims of the Hispanic peninsula and North Africa by the Christians, derives from an ancient word for North Africans contained in ‘Mauretania,’ the Roman name of northern Morocco (not to be confused with today’s Mauritania, which of course is south of Morocco). The name acquired the sense of swarthy, even black or Negro, apparent in Shakespeare’s *Othello*, ‘the Moor of Venice,’ so that eventually it became necessary to talk of ‘white Moors,’ a redundancy somewhat like saying ‘white Scot’ or ‘white Frenchman.’

“The Moors-as-blacks stereotype stems from the number of Negroes imported over the years from the western and central Sudan, and who were employed as servants and soldiers as well as concubines. Inevitably, as always happens when two races inhabit the same territory, racial mixing took place so that it was possible to call the great Moroccan sultan Abu’l-Hasan (r. from 1331, d. 1351) in the middle of the 14th Century Abu’l-Hasan ‘the Black.’

“But the image also owes much to the identification by Christians of followers of the rival faith with the grotesque black fiend, as they envisioned Satan to be.

“The word ‘Arab’ is probably derived from a Semitic root implying nomadism, ‘*abar*,’ or pass, from which the word ‘Hebrew’ is also derived. The original Arabs were a white or Caucasoid people. The natives of the interior of the Arabian peninsula were (and still are) the Bedouin, a tribal people whose way of life centered around the camel. But in the south of the peninsula, the land known to the ancients as Arabia Felix (roughly corresponding with modern Yemen), although Arabic was spoken, the people

had an ancient history of settled kingdoms and agriculture. Little, however, is remembered now of their ancient, pre-Islamic cultures. [*ereb also = Arab, but means "mixed".*]

"But an Arab today is not what an Arab has been over the centuries. More than 4.5 million square miles in Africa and Asia are Arabic-speaking. But there has been much racial mixing, because the vast majority of Arabs are Muslims, and in Islam there are supposedly no distinctions of race. Every physical type is represented today in so-called Arab communities. Some are [*almost*] entirely white; some are almost entirely black. The Hijaz is one of the most racially mixed areas on the Earth; Mecca has been a city of mulattos and quadroons [i.e., ¼ black], of all racial blends, since the 14th century. [*brackets mine*]

"The ancient Arabs were aristocratically haughty, proud of the [*purported*] purity of their blood. The proof of being Arab by birth, of being a member of the true elite, was in the pedigree. Genealogies were carefully preserved [*or contrived*] and cultivated by anyone with any pretensions, pushed further and further back until they blended into the lineages of the Arab tribes before Islam ... Yet the vast number of unions with slaves (which included Turks and white Europeans as well as Negroes), in a polygamous society, had provoked such fantastic mingling of all sorts of stocks during the Abbasid period that from then on it was impossible even for the caliph to make a point of racial purity"

There is more to Tiffany's article, *The Untold Tale Of Othello*, and I would recommend everyone who is interested to get a back copy from *The Barnes Review* for July 1995. As I see it, what I have written helps reinforce Tiffany's *The Untold Tale Of Othello*, and Tiffany's story helps reinforce my research defending Queen Charlotte's pure White Caucasian Israelite bloodline! The evidence which I have presented in these last four *Watchman's Teaching Letters*, 161-165, should demonstrate beyond all doubt that the Royal Family of Britain has remained racially pure down through history from king Zedekiah until today's Queen Elizabeth II, who now occupies the throne of England. It does appear, though, that Queen Elizabeth II is the end of the line of pureblooded, qualified candidates from the house of David to take the throne, other than Yahshua Christ Himself, for Queen Elizabeth II violated Yahweh's law of "kind after kind" when she married Philip Mountbatten (i.e. Battenberg). To review this evidence concerning Queen Elizabeth II and Philip Mountbatten, I will quote excerpts from my paper, *How Long Can Queen Elizabeth II Live?:*

"Some are of the opinion that if the Queen were to suddenly die, the throne could be transferred to another branch of the family. That would be the usual process, but those who make that statement don't take into account there were only to be three "overturns" as declared, Ezekiel 21:27, and all three have already happened (i.e., Jerusalem to Ireland, to Scotland, to England). Queen Elizabeth II undoubtedly represents the last surviving pureblooded heir to the throne on behalf of the third "overturn." Let's now document why the tainted-blood offspring of Elizabeth by Philip are unqualified to take that throne.

“Philip was of the line of Battenberg until the name was changed to Mountbatten. I will now quote from two encyclopedias on the background of the Battenberg side of Philip’s lineage:

“The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1963), volume 3, page 281: ‘Battenberg, the name of a family of German counts, which died out about 1314, whose seat was the castle of Kellerburg, near Battenberg, in Hesse. The title was revived in 1851, when Alexander (1823-88), a younger son of Louis II, grand duke of Hesse, contracted a morganatic marriage with the Polish lady, Countess Julia Theresa von Hauke (1825-95), who was then created countess of Battenberg. In 1858 the countess and her children were raised to the rank of princes and princesses of Battenberg, with the title of *Durchlaucht*, or serene highness.

“‘In 1917 the eldest son of this union, Louis Alexander (1854-1921), who had become an admiral in the British navy, was created marquess of Milford Haven ..., and, at the request of King George V, the members of the family who lived in England renounced, in 1917, the German title of prince of Battenberg and adopted the surname of Mountbatten. The second son, Alexander Joseph (1857-93), was elected Prince Alexander I of Bulgaria in 1879 ... Henry Maurice, the third son, married on July 23, 1885, Beatrice, youngest daughter of Victoria, queen of England, became a naturalized Englishman and was appointed captain general and governor of the Isle of Wight and governor of Carisbrooke. He died at sea on Jan. 20, 1896, of a fever contracted on active service with the British troops during the Ashanti War. The fourth son, Francis Joseph (1861-1924), married in 1897 Anna, daughter of Nicholas I, prince of Montenegro, and was the author of *Die volkswirtschaftliche Entwicklung Bulgariens von 1879 bis zur Gegenwart* (1891).

“The only daughter of the princess of Battenberg, Marie Caroline (1852-1923), married in 1871 Gustavus Ernest, prince of Erbach-Schönberg. Princess Alice of Battenberg (b. 1885), daughter of Prince Louis Alexander, and Victoria Eugénie (Princess Ena of Battenberg; b. 1887), only daughter of Prince Henry Maurice, were both married before 1917, the former to Prince Andrew of Greece and the latter to Alphonso XIII, king of Spain. Prince Henry’s youngest son, Maurice of Battenberg, was killed in action near Ypres on Oct. 27, 1914’...”

“For another witness I will quote from the *Encyclopedia Americana* (1991), volume 3, page 356: ‘Battenberg ... is a title of nobility taken from the name of a village near Marburg, West Germany. A family of counts held the title until it died out about 1314. In 1851, upon the morganatic marriage of Prince Alexander of Hesse-Darmstadt to Julia Teresa, countess von Hauke, the latter received the title of countess of Battenberg. The countess and her children were raised to the rank of princes and princesses in 1858. Their descendants retained the title until World War I, when those living in England anglicized it to Mountbatten’.”

“LET’S EXAMINE THE EVIDENCE

“It seems that we have a castle by the name of Kellerburg, near a town called Battenberg in an area known as Hesse in Germany. It also appears that there was a family of German counts that lived there until they all died out in 1314. That area seems to have been settled mostly by Kelts in early times. Did the family physically die out, or

did the succession of royal authority die out? It makes a lot of difference. Be that as it may, it also appears that this heir apparent, Alexander, married a Polish lady. Again, one must ask the question, what kind of ladies might one find in Poland at that time (actually Warsaw)? Then, we are told there was a “morganatic marriage” arranged between this Polish lady named Julia Theresa von Hauke and Alexander. Interestingly, we have another morganatic marriage to compare with that of Alexander to Julia Theresa von Hauke. The party was Constantine Pavlovich (1779-1831) grand-duke and Sarevitch of Russia, born to Paul Petrovich and Mary Feodorovna. His grandmother, empress Catherine II, arranged for his marriage to Juliana of Coburg, which failed miserably. Later, he fell in love with a Polish lady, Johanna Grudzinska, and signed a paper resigning all claim of succession to the throne. Question: Why wasn’t Alexander required to sign a similar paper?, Or did he?

“Well, let’s investigate what is meant by a ‘morganatic marriage.’ From *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1969), we read this: ‘morganatic ... *adj.* Of or pertaining to a type of legal marriage between a man or woman of royal or noble birth and a partner of lower rank, in which agreement is made that any titles or estates of the royal or noble partner will not be shared by the commoner or by any of the offspring. [New Latin *morganaticus*, from Medieval Latin *matrimonium ad morganaticam*, ‘marriage for (no dowry but) the morning-gift’ (i.e., the husband’s token gift to the wife on the morning after the wedding night), from Old High German *morgan*, morning’...”

“ELIZABETH II AND PHILIP MOUNTBATTEN HAVE SAME GREAT-GREAT-GRANDMOTHER

“The marriage of Philip Mountbatten to Elizabeth II was a tragedy of the utmost magnitude, and is only part of the story. While they both had a great-great-grandmother in common the bad blood came through Louis Battenberg, and in turn through Julia Theresa von Hauke, not Victoria. Julia Theresa von Hauke (the Polish lady’s) father’s name was Maurice von Hauke who had married Sophia of Lafontaine. Alexander Louis George Frederick Emil contracted a ‘morganatic’ marriage to Julia Theresa von Hauke and had the following children: (1) Mary Battenberg, (2) Louis Alexander Mountbatten, (3) Alexander Joseph Battenberg, (4) Henry Maurice Battenberg, and, (5) Francis Joseph Battenberg. The bad blood followed down from Julia Theresa von Hauke to her son Louis Alexander Mountbatten, to his daughter Victoria Alice of Battenberg, to her son Philip Mountbatten (Queen Elizabeth II’s husband), to his son Charles, Prince of Wales (whose very telltale appearance defies all reasonable doubt of a “jewish” bloodline connection). Here is what the book *Kings & Queens Of England* by David Williamson says on page 121:

“Not long after the royal family’s return to England, the princess’s engagement to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten, RN. was announced. He was born at Corfu on 10 June 1921, and like her was the great-great-grandchild of Queen Victoria, being the only son of Prince Andrew of Greece and Denmark and his wife, Princess Alice of Battenberg’.”

“Because this may be somewhat confusing, I will show you that alleged bad bloodline from a different perspective:

- Julia Theresa von Hauke.
- Louis Alexander Mountbatten.
- Victoria Alice of Battenberg.
- Philip Mountbatten.
- Charles, Prince of Wales.

“Thus, I will repeat what I said before: ‘The present Queen Elizabeth II is the last pureblooded Israelite of the Tribe of Judah, of the House of David, to sit on David’s throne, and she has no legitimate heirs to take her place.’ If anyone has evidence to the contrary without an additional “overturn”, let’s please see it!

“From the book *Mountbatten* by Philip Ziegler, ©1985, pages 21-22: ‘Prince Alexander of Hesse, Mountbatten’s grandfather, was the third son of Grand Duke Louis II and godson to the Tsar of Russia. When his sister married the Tsarevich, the future Tsar Alexander II, it seemed both sensible and in keeping with the national tradition that Alexander of Hesse should take service in the Russian army. He achieved distinction, had a regiment of the Lancers named after him and was awarded the Cross of St George. The Tsar intended him as a husband for his niece and his future in Russia promised to be secure and prosperous. For Alexander, however, at this stage of his life at least, security and prosperity did not count for much. He fell in love with Julia Hauke, one of his sister’s ladies-in-waiting, a Polish girl who, if hardly a nonentity [nobody], was not from a family sufficiently grandiose to justify so princely a match. The Tsar indignantly forbade the marriage. Alexander went to England to forget, remembered, returned to St Petersburg and in 1851 eloped with Julia to Warsaw and thence to Breslau where he married her.

“‘This impetuous escapade effectively exiled him from Russia. It did little to improve his standing in his native Hesse. His elder brother, now Grand Duke Louis III, was almost as outraged as the Tsar, but felt that he could hardly let Alexander starve. An uneasy settlement was reached. Alexander was allowed to retain his status as a royal prince of Hesse; the defunct title of Battenberg — a pleasant town in the north of the Grand Duchy — and the quality of countess was conferred on his wife; any children of the marriage, though without claim to the throne of Hesse, would at least be of the same rank as their mother. Even this qualified disgrace did not last long. In 1858 Countess Julia of Battenberg was raised to the level of a Serene Highness and four years later the couple returned to Darmstadt. A new house had been born; royal, after a fashion, but bearing about it a faint aura of wildness and irregularity ... There had always been much to-ing and fro-ing between the courts of Great Britain and of Hesse, and this was intensified after the marriage in 1862 of the future Grand Duke Louis IV to Queen Victoria’s daughter Alice.’

“From this, we can clearly see that indeed all heirs of Julia Hauke were disqualified as royal members entitled to the throne. The Almighty’s promise to David was a seedline promise. Therefore, take away the element of seedline, and we have nothing. The only way we have access to the Kingdom is through the seedline Promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. If one cannot claim that kinsman seedline Promise, there is no Redemption in Messiah’s blood. As Hebrews 12:8 says, we are either ‘sons’ or we are ‘bastards.’ ...

“THE DEMISE OF THE THRONE AS WE KNOW IT

“In 1948 there was something grave that happened in England which was a catastrophic tragedy of the greatest magnitude. And, once that appalling disaster manifested itself, it could never be corrected, for there simply is no remedy once such a thing takes place. On November 14, 1948, Charles Philip Arthur George (a “jew”; a descendant of Cain) was born to Queen Elizabeth II by her non-Royal husband, Philip Mountbatten. By that birth, the ‘nail’ of Isaiah 22:25 was ‘removed’, ‘cut down’ and there was a great ‘fall.’ It marked the end of David’s Monarchy on that Throne until the rightful “Shiloh” comes. Absolutely none of Philip Mountbatten’s issue are **Biblically, lawfully** qualified to be coronated to that dignity. The day Charles was born brought death to that Great Royal line of kings. With the advent of Julia Theresa von Hauke, the ‘seed of the serpent’ of Genesis 3:15 entered that Royal line. Additionally, it should be noted that Julia Theresa von Hauke’s shield has no Israelite symbols as do other royal members. Hers’ is what appears to be a cartwheel on a red background; indeed, a befitting emblem for a ‘rolling-stone’ upon Satan’s color, RED!

“Taking excerpts from the book *Prince Charles, The Sustainable Prince* by Joan Veon, pages 28-31:

“... Prince of Wales, the future Charles III has an abundance of titles which include: Earl of Chester, Duke of Cornwall, Duke of Rothesay, Earl of Carrick, Baron Renfrew, Lord of the Isles and Great Steward of Scotland, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, Knight of the Most Ancient and Most Noble Order of the Thistle, and Great Master and Principal Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath ... Paget writes: His Royal Highness is cousin or nephew, in varying degrees, of all the six wives of King Henry VIII. ... In addition to Charlemagne and William the Conqueror, he numbers amongst his ancestors such historic characters as King Alfred the Great, King Harold, who was slain at Hastings, Llewelyn the Great Prince of North Wales, Owain Glyndwr, Warwick the Kingmaker, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury (the last of the Plantagenets), the Protector Edward Seymour, the Duke of Somerset and his rival John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland ... Louis IX, King of France, the Emperor Rudolph of Hapsburg, Catherine I, Empress of Russia, Robert Bruce, Mary Queen of Scots ... Charlemagne and Frederick Barbarossa ... Hapsburg and Hohenstaufen, Guelph and Hohenzollern, Bavaria and Saxony, Hesse and Baden. ... the Dukes of Savoy and the Emperor Frederick II ... and the medieval Kings of Sicily, as also the Orsini of Rome (Pope Nicholas III was his ancestral uncle) ... Ferdinand and Isabella ... and thus El Cid himself ... Woden ... King Niall of the Nine Hostages ... kings of Tara ... Through the Lusignan crusader kings of Cyprus, titular kings of Jerusalem ... from King Tiridates the Great ... and thus from the divine Parthian imperial House of Arsaces (247 B.C.), which reigned over Persia and Babylonia and was in its time the mightiest dynasty in the Ancient World’...”

I would state emphatically that I believe the Bible over what some jew-blooded negro wrote in *The Nubian Times* about Queen Charlotte being a black. Here is an excerpt from my *Watchman’s Teaching Letter #21*:

“JEREMIAH’S COMMISSION: The next thing we really need to know is all of what Yahweh commissioned Jeremiah to do. Jeremiah’s commission is recorded in Jeremiah 1:10:

“See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant.’

“This commission breaks down into six phases thusly: (1) to root out, (2) to pull down, (3) to destroy, (4) to throw down, (5) to build, and (6) to plant. You may search all the Bible commentaries, dictionaries, atlases or encyclopedias on this verse and find next to nothing worth repeating. It’s almost as if the verse didn’t exist, and this commission is probably one of the greatest ever authorized by Yahweh. All the great minds of nominal theology are stymied for an explanation. What few utterances these sources do have to offer are preposterous generalizations which have little, if any, application. It is only in British-Israel that a satisfactory answer can be found, especially on the ‘building and planting.’ All others are helplessly mute on the subject. On this among a very few other key verses, the entire Bible stands or falls. If the ‘building’ and ‘planting’ cannot be explained, Israel Identity is a myth as well as all Holy Writ. Without this verse, we might as well quit and join the world order.”

I would also state that British-Israel started out on the right foot with John Wilson, but with the advent of Edward Hine absorbed much error. But the fact remains that Yahweh gave Jeremiah a six fold commission, and the Bible records only the completion of four! If Jeremiah’s “building” and “planting” didn’t take place in old Britain, pray tell, where did it take place? The “building” and “planting” was personally given to Jeremiah, not Ezra or Nehemiah! So, if you presumed that the “building” and “planting” occurred when a small remnant of Judah returned to Jerusalem after the Babylonian seventy years of captivity, you are terribly wrong.

I will next take excerpts from my paper *Nine Covenants With Adam-Man*, under the following subtitle:

“THE DAVIDIC COVENANT: 1 Samuel 16:13: **‘Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the spirit of Yahweh came upon David from that day forward.’**

“Psalm 89: 34-37: ‘My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips. Once I have sworn by My holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before Me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.’

“Jeremiah 33:20-21: ‘Thus saith Yahweh; If ye can break My covenant of the day, and My covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; *Then* may also *My* covenant be broken with David My servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne ...’

“David, as a lad, was a shepherd. He spent many days and nights tending his father’s sheep. The sheep could never be left alone for there were a tremendous number of wolves in those days. Because of the gun, in our day, the wolf population has been brought under control. David’s defense against the wolves was a sling. No doubt, he practiced by the hour to become proficient with it, so, when it became

necessary, he could kill a wolf with the first shot. Later, as a young man, he would put his skill to good use by killing a giant. Thus, David the warrior killed many men; a man after Messiah's own heart foreshadowing His glorious return.

"Many might say, 'Yahweh has broken his word to David, as the Throne of David was nonexistent in Palestine for nearly 600 years during the inter-testament period.' Though Zedekiah was taken captive by Babylon, and all of his sons killed before his eyes, he still had an heir, because in Israel there was a provision for daughters to inherit the throne if there were no male descendants (Numbers 27:7-8). Therefore, Jeremiah took Zedekiah's two daughters (Ezekiel 17:22-24) to Spain and Ireland. No sooner had Jeremiah arrived in Ireland with Tea Tephi (Zedekiah's daughter of the Pharez royal family) than he arranged for her marriage to Eochaidh, the Heremonn, a prince of the Tuatha de Danaans on his mother's side and a direct descendant of Fenesia Farsa, and thus of the line of Zerah, twin brother of Pharez of the Royal House of Judah, uniting the Royal House of Pharez and the Royal House of Zerah. Lastly, Yahshua, at His First Advent, became priest, but He is yet to be crowned King at His Second Advent."

This means that there would not be a single 24 hour day that one of David's heirs wouldn't be in kingly authority. The last time I checked, the sun and moon were still shining! If we chop it off with Zedekiah, that amounts to 2,600 years of Yahweh lying to David!

As one can clearly see, if Jeremiah's Yahweh-given commission cannot be squared with Scripture, it creates all kinds of ambiguities that cannot be solved, and Yahweh is not the God of confusion. I believe that it all boils down to Jeremiah transplanting the glory of Yahweh from old Jerusalem to the New Jerusalem (America) via Britain.

All of this substantiates that Queen Charlotte of England had to be a pureblooded Israelite of the tribe of Judah, whom Yahweh married at Mt. Sinai and later divorced, and to meet the requirements of the law, came and died in order to remarry all of Israel back to Him.