

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #187 November 2013; Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830 / 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 eighty-seventh monthly teaching letter and continues my sixteenth year of publication. Since WTL #137, I have been continuing a series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*, and have been expanding on its seven stages ever since: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage.

### **THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 46, THE DIVORCE:**

In many of my previous lessons, I have covered much concerning Yahweh's divorce from His Cinderella bride, the twelve tribes of Israel. With this lesson, we'll examine both the Biblical and secular concepts of what constitutes a divorce. Should one investigate the various Biblical dictionaries on the subject, one will find little-to-nothing regarding this all-important theme, and what little can be found is grossly inadequate. It should be noted that "divorce" or "divorcement" in Hebrew, and both Koine and Septuagint Greek, simply means "*a cutting off*" or "*a separating*". I will start this discourse by citing Matthew 1:18-25:

**"<sup>18</sup> Now the birth of Yahshua Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. <sup>19</sup> Then Joseph her husband, being a just *man*, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily. <sup>20</sup> But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of Yahweh appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. <sup>21</sup> And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Yahshua: for he shall save his people from their sins. <sup>22</sup> Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of Yahweh by the prophet, saying, <sup>23</sup> Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. <sup>24</sup> Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel Yahweh had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: <sup>25</sup> And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name Yahshua.**

One little side note here: Oftentimes there are disputes as to what kind of creatures these angels are (or for that matter, fallen angels). We know that at times, "angel" can simply mean "a messenger", as witnessed in this passage. On occasion, an

angel can be a mortal man, but a mortal man cannot appear to another mortal man in a dream, so the angel of Yahweh that appeared to Joseph in his dream had to be something other than a mortal man. I personally am not an interpreter of dreams, nor can I understand my own dreams, and I really have a problem with those tongue-wagging pentecostal-types who claim they carry on “conversations with God!”

The above quoted passage in Matthew speaks volumes concerning the subject of divorce! As a matter of fact this passage is parallel to that of Genesis 3:1-6, plus v. 13:

**“<sup>1</sup> Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which Yahweh Elohim had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath Elohim said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? <sup>2</sup> And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: <sup>3</sup> But of the fruit of the tree which *is* in the midst of the garden, Elohim hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. <sup>4</sup> And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: <sup>5</sup> For Elohim doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. <sup>6</sup> And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make *one* wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat ... <sup>13</sup> And Yahweh Elohim said unto the woman, What *is* this *that* thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.”**

From the *Aramaic Targum*, called pseudo-Jonathan, on Genesis 3:6, which is unique inasmuch as it identifies the angel Sammael as the “serpent”:

**“And the woman saw Sammael, the angel of death, and she was afraid and knew that the tree was good for food, and that it was a remedy for the enlightenment of the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise. She took of its fruit and ate and also gave (*it*) to her husband and he ate.”**

Again, the *Aramaic Targum* pseudo-Jonathan, on Genesis 4:1: **“And Adam knew that his wife Eve had conceived from Sammael the Angel (of death) and she became pregnant and bore Cain. And he was like those on high and not like those below. And she said: ‘I have got a man from the angel of the *LORD*.’”**

This rendition of Genesis 4:1 is interesting, for it speaks of the “angel of death” plus “like those on high” and “like those below.” This seems to accord with John 8:23, where Yahshua told the Canaanite variety of jews: **“... Ye are from beneath; and I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world.”** Satan was on high until his fall, when he fell like lightning; Luke 10:18.

The *Palestinian Targum* to Genesis 4:1: **“And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain; and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord ...”**

In another Rabbinic work: Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, 21: **“And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord.”**

For more on these verses from the Aramaic Targums, read my essay, *The Problem With Genesis 4:1*.

What we see here is: as Joseph had to make a decision to keep Mary, the mother of Christ, Adam had to make a similar choice to keep Eve, rather than divorce her because of her adultery with the serpent! Therefore, Adam ended up with a second-handed woman! We can be sure that this is how it happened, as Gen. 4:3-7 states of the two half-brothers:

**“<sup>3</sup> And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto Yahweh. <sup>4</sup> And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Yahweh had respect unto Abel and to his offering: <sup>5</sup> But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. <sup>6</sup> And Yahweh said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? <sup>7</sup> 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 [Abel’s] desire, and thou shalt rule over him.”**

In Holy Writ, only firstborn sons can inherit the priesthood and offer sacrifices! Therefore, Cain was claiming the family priesthood because he was the firstborn of Eve by the serpent, and Abel was claiming the family priesthood since he was the firstborn of Eve by Adam. **Read vs. 7 over again very carefully! Hybrids are never accepted!**

From this Biblical account of the story of the creation of Adam and Eve and the narrative explaining the battle for the priesthood between Cain and Abel, we can comprehend that the potential for a divorce existed, had Adam chosen that prerogative. Had Adam desired a pure virgin instead of Eve, it would have required Eve’s death by stoning at the hand of Adam himself, leaving Adam again without a “help meet”, and we can only conjecture what would have happened in such a case. What we do know is: Yahweh laid down the law to Eve at Gen. 3:16, saying in part, “... **thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.**” Therefore, Yahweh had decreed that a woman is entirely out of her place when she attempts to rule over Adam-man! The problem we have today is, there are very few men left who are capable of ruling over a woman, let alone a family of one or several children! One can generally spot those men who are capable of ruling over their house; they take on the responsibility of a wife and family, stop running all night with the boys, and stay home where they belong.

Had Eve found her proper place in life, it would have been unnecessary for Yahweh to remind her, “... **thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.**” As a result, being of the weaker gender, she let the serpent (i.e., Satan) rule over her. This shows that Eve wasn’t satisfied with being a helpmeet to Adam, but decided (like the White women of today) to have full control over her own body, and abort (actually murder) any child she was carrying at will, so she could get a position with a Fortune five-hundred company run by some Edomite-jew. First of all any unwanted pregnancy by such a woman is only half of her body, as she only contributes 23 chromosomes to the genetics of that child, while the male she had sex with contributed the other 23 chromosomes from his body. Therefore the male has as much say in the matter as the female, but the male is never consulted, giving the female **superior dominance** over the male. Secondly, if the White Adamic female doesn’t mate with a White Adamic male (i.e., kind after kind), Yahweh requires that both the White Adamic mother and bastard child be “aborted” by “stoning”! Such a woman is not

a “helpmeet” to anyone! So, again, we see what kind of punishment Eve deserved, had Adam chose to enact it, Lev. 20:16:

**“And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman, and the beast: they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be upon them.*”** Here, “beast” is an idiomatic pejorative for a two-legged nonwhite person. This is the best reason in the world why every God-fearing White Adamic-man should have complete ruler-ship over his own household! That, however, doesn’t give him license to be a tyrant! But, how can a good God-fearing man enforce Yahweh’s law of “kind after kind” as long as the pastors in churchianity continually promote sending missionaries to the nonwhite lands of the earth, or encourage nonwhite aliens to attend and enter into fellowship with the White-Caucasian-European-Americans in their congregations?

### **ORIGIN OF WHITE ADAMIC MARRIAGE BY DIVINE ORDER**

The Divine origin of the institution of marriage of the White Adamic people is recorded at Gen. 2:18-25:

**“<sup>18</sup> And Yahweh Elohim said, *It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.* <sup>19</sup> And out of the ground Yahweh Elohim formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought *them* unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. <sup>20</sup> And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him. <sup>21</sup> And Yahweh Elohim caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; <sup>22</sup> And the rib, which Yahweh Elohim had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. <sup>23</sup> And Adam said, This *is* now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. <sup>24</sup> Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh ....”**

It is quite apparent from this passage that it is not natural for Adam-man to live alone without a wife to call his own. Neither is it natural for a White Adamic couple to get a divorce one from the other. It usually takes a third party to cause a split to occur between the bonded married couple, and this third party is usually influenced by the “seed of the serpent” via his several criminal agencies. Therefore, Satan is forever playing his deceptive game of the eternal triangle. All Satan has to do is make the grass appear a little greener on the other side of the fence, and this is exactly how Satan seduced Eve, and it nearly caused a divorce between Adam and Eve, our first parents. Although It should be noted that Yahweh, being a just Elohim, placed the blame for Eve’s sexual seduction squarely on the serpent, whose seed in Cain was totally rejected forever!

As Adam had every right to put Eve away, as Joseph had every just reason to put away Mary, the mother of Christ, so under some circumstances can a woman dissolve her tie of marriage from a man, Exo. 21:7-11:

“<sup>7</sup> And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do. <sup>8</sup> If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. <sup>9</sup> And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. <sup>10</sup> If he take him another *wife*; her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish. <sup>11</sup> And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.”

**Note on vs. 7:** An Israelite was not allowed to sell his daughter except under extreme financial stress – when he reached the point where he no longer had any tangible or intangible assets left at his disposal, even the clothes on his back; and he only had this alternative as long as she remained *unmarriageable*. At first it may seem strange that such a law should have ever been given; but let it be remembered that this servitude extended at the utmost only *six* years; and in some cases was equivalent to an *apprenticeship* where the parents would *bind* the child for *seven* years, during which time the child was given a weekly allowance.

**Note on vs. 9:** He, the master, is obligated to give the purchased daughter the same dowry he would give to one of his own family daughters. We further learn from these laws that if the master’s son marries the purchased daughter by the master’s consent, the master is obligated to treat her in every respect as a *daughter*; and if the master’s son should marry a second woman (as vs. 10 alludes to) the master’s son, in such a case, would be obligated to make no abatement (*i.e.*, reduction) in *food, raiment* or *duty of marriage* (*i.e.*, cohabitation, sexual activity) to the master’s son’s first wife. And should the master’s son not be able to supply all three of these, the purchased daughter can go free, without money (*i.e.*, divorce the master’s son), and be free to marry another! And if the master’s son should think he needs two wives, let him be prepared to work twice as hard to support them, or any children he might father by them! **Yes! Women have rights too!**

This should also show that any man taking a wife is obligated to furnish her with *food, raiment, duty of marriage, and a roof over her head*. Should such a husband, after taking on the responsibility of a wife, start chasing other women and share some of his *duty of marriage* with them on the side, he is no longer worthy of the woman he swore to be faithful to, and like the purchased daughter of vs. 7-11 his *duty of marriage* is diminished, and his promise has been broken. Therefore, such a woman should have the same right, and be able to free herself from the unfaithful husband by divorce, and be free to marry another worthy of her affection! Of course, Exo. 21: 7-11 is only instructing White Israelites! If it’s not White Adam-kind after White Adam-kind, it’s not a marriage! It’s an affair! It’s miscegenation!

There are two sides of the coin, though, for a woman to become divorced from her husband: (1) If a woman finds herself married to a man who will not furnish her with *food, raiment* or *duty of marriage*, she can free herself by leaving him, never to return, or (2) If the husband has furnished his wife with *food, raiment* and *duty of marriage*, and she is unfaithful and commits adultery with another man, she can expect to be divorced, never to return to that particular husband, Deut. 24:1-4a.

Let us next examine Yahweh's Sovereign Will toward marriage and divorce found at Matt. 19:3-9: **"<sup>3</sup> The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? <sup>4</sup> And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female, <sup>5</sup> And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? <sup>6</sup> Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. <sup>7</sup> They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? <sup>8</sup> He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. <sup>9</sup> And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except *it be* for fornication<sup>4202</sup>, and shall marry another, committeth adultery<sup>3929</sup>: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."**

It should be noted that Yahshua Christ used two different Greek words for sexual misconduct, fornication<sup>4202</sup> and adultery<sup>3429</sup>. It should be noted that the Greek word "fornication" covers a wider range of sexual misbehavior than does the Greek word "adultery". Fornication would cover all of the sexual deviations that were carried on by the Canaanite nations of the Old Testament, which we find at Leviticus 18:24-25:

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

We will not 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-laws were having incest with their daughters-in-laws.
- The nephews were having incest with their aunts.
- The uncles were having incest with their nieces.
- The brothers-in-laws were having incest with their sisters-in-laws.
- The sons-in-laws were having incest with their mothers-in-laws.
- 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.

Even this doesn't cover the entire gamut of what all the Greek word "fornication" could include! Now the sexually clean spouse has every lawful right to divorce their partner in marriage who is guilty of any kind of "fornication"! The Greek word "fornication" also includes "race mixing" in the New Testament, as verified by Hebrews 12:14-17:

**“<sup>14</sup> Follow peace with all *men*, and holiness, without which no man shall see Yahshua: <sup>15</sup> Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of Yahweh; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble *you*, and thereby many be defiled; <sup>16</sup> Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. <sup>17</sup> For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.”** Esau joined himself to non-Hebrew women: Two Hittites, one so-called Hivite, and one of Ishmael’s daughters, and put them all in a blender by fathering their children! So now we know what the phrase “**root of bitterness**” stands for. What does the “root of bitterness” accomplish? Answer: The unforgivable sin of causing one’s pure White seedline to become defiled, without a cure throughout all downline generations!

A racially clean White spouse simply cannot continue to live under the same roof with a husband, wife or child who has eaten of the “**root of bitterness**”, as it would give license to other clean members of the family-line to do likewise. It would spread like wildfire! So when Christ used the Greek term “fornication” at Matt. 19:9, it covered a lot more sexual territory, and was to be distinguished from mere “adultery”. Now the Hebrew word “adultery” in the Old Testament is **primarily** “race mixing”, but occasionally can mean humbling another man’s wife or husband. Exodus 20:14 should really state: “Thou shalt not mix thy race.” The 10th Commandment directs in part: “... thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife ...” Yahweh is surely intelligent enough not to make two Commandments just alike, but that is how the majority of people read it! The fact of the matter is: White people don’t have nonwhite people for “neighbors”, even though the nonwhite people might live next door! Of note here, any of the many types of “fornication” is grounds for a divorce! Even divorcing a whole family, or an entire church for that matter! 2 Cor. 6:14-17, amplified for a better understanding:

**“<sup>14</sup> Be ye not unequally yoked together with [*nonwhite*] unbelievers: for what fellowship hath [*White*] righteousness with [*nonwhite*] unrighteousness? and what communion hath [*the children of*] light with [*the children of*] darkness? <sup>15</sup> And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? <sup>16</sup> And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye [*Whites*] are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. <sup>17</sup> Wherefore come out from among the [*nonwhites*] , and be ye separate, saith Yahweh, and touch<sup>680</sup> not the [*nonwhite*] unclean; and I will receive you ....”**

**“‘touch’ in the Greek, #680 ... *haptomai*, meaning in part: 1) to fasten one’s self to, adhere to, cling to 1a) to touch 1b) of carnal intercourse with women or cohabitation ....”** (BibleWorks).

An occasion for the forceful putting away (a type of divorce from foreign women) is found at Ezra 9:1-3, 6-7:

**“<sup>1</sup> Now when these things were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, *doing* according to their abominations, *even* of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the**

Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. <sup>2</sup> For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of *those* lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass. <sup>3</sup> And when I heard this thing, I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonished. ... <sup>6</sup> And said, O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities are increased over *our* head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens. <sup>7</sup> Since the days of our fathers *have we been* in a great trespass unto this day; and for our iniquities have we, our kings, *and* our priests, been delivered into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to a spoil, and to confusion of face, [*i.e., miscegenation*] as *it is this day.*”

This violation for breaking Israel's marriage Covenant with her Husband, Yahweh, is found at Deut. 7:1-8:

“<sup>1</sup> When Yahweh thy Elohim shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; <sup>2</sup> And when Yahweh thy Elohim shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: <sup>3</sup> Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. <sup>4</sup> For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of Yahweh be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. <sup>5</sup> But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images with fire. <sup>6</sup> For thou *art* an holy people unto Yahweh thy Elohim: Yahweh thy Elohim hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth. <sup>7</sup> Yahweh did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye *were* the fewest of all people: <sup>8</sup> But because Yahweh loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath Yahweh brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.”

The only people Yahweh ever married were the White Adamic Israelites – the only people Yahweh ever divorced were the White Adamic Israelites – and the only people whom Yahweh (as Yahshua) will remarry are the White Adamic twelve tribes of Israel, and absolutely no one else! And those Israelites who have a percentage of Canaanite or other nonwhite blood in their woodpile, WILL NOT become part of the Bride of Christ; **for ONCE MIXED, ALWAYS MIXED!**

What we do comprehend in studying this incident in the book of Ezra is the undeniable fact that any Israelite, man or woman, has positively no lawful standing once they have joined themselves to a Canaanite, or some other nonwhite race. Any

so-called union with such a racially alien person is a violation of Yahweh's law of kind after kind! We only have to examine the incident where Judah joined himself with a Canaanite woman, whose father was named Shuah, at Genesis chapter 38, and by this Canaanite woman were born three half-breed sons, Er, Onan and Shelah. As time passed, Judah was faced with finding a wife for his hybrid son, Er. However, Judah tried to match Er up with a purebred White woman by the name of Tamar, whereupon Yahweh killed Er. Not learning a lesson from this, Judah tried to match up Onan with Tamar, and likewise, Yahweh killed Onan. Finally, Judah got the significance that Yahweh is not pleased with plural ethnicity, and didn't try again with Shelah. As time transpired, Judah's illegitimate sex-partner died, and Judah realized that his union with the Canaanite woman was entirely for naught. Judah, finding himself without any legitimate children, realized his union with the Canaanite didn't constitute a true marriage, so he was back to square one, a single unmarried person.

To make a long story short, Tamar, not wanting any hybrid Canaanite children, tricked Judah in living up to his compact with her to supply her with pure White Semitic seed, which resulted in the birth of twins, Pharez and Zerah, whom Judah fathered.

However, in the process of these twins being born, Zerah's arm appeared as though he would be the first born. Quickly, the midwife tied a scarlet thread around Zerah's wrist, for being the "firstborn" was very important in Israelite inheritance. But Zerah pulled his arm back, and then the entire body of Pharez came forth, making him "firstborn" rather than Zerah.

Hence, if one were to count the offspring (both legitimate and illegitimate) of Judah, it would be as follows: (1) Er, (2) Onan, (3) Shelah, (4) Pharez, and (5) Zerah. Therefore, we must ask the question: "Why then are Pharez and Zerah counted as numbers one and two?" The simple answer is: those not racially pure are not counted as part of the family, tribe or nation, as they are not of Yahweh's pure "kind after kind" Creation!

With this lesson, I have endeavored to present some of the Biblical cases of divorce, but there are many more examples in addition to what I have cited here. Through my eighty-six years, I believe I have witnessed almost every type of marriage and divorce one might imagine, and there are hardly any that comes anywhere close to perfect. Even Yahweh's marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel was not a perfect marriage, or there never would have been a divorce in the first place. Not only that, Christ's ancestral line had many individuals who were downright sinners, and bad examples of righteousness. However, the genetic line of Christ was flawless, and without any "root of bitterness". So whatever kind of complicated marriage one might encounter, or be a party to, regardless of how many wives, husbands or children involved, all the parties thereto must be of pure White-Caucasian-European lineage. Personally, I only ever knew one virgin White-Caucasian-European-American wife; ditto for her with me, so I don't have an ax to grind!

It may seem strange to some, but even Paul alludes to marriage, he being a father to the Ekklesia at 1 Cor. 4:15 and Philemon 10-13. I will cite William Finck's *Christogenea New Testament*:

1 Cor. 4:15: **“Although you may have a myriad of tutors among the Anointed, certainly not many fathers; indeed in Christ Yahshua through the good message I have begotten you.”**

Philemon 10-13: **“I exhort you concerning my child, whom I have begotten in these bonds, Onesimos <sup>11</sup> whom at one time was useless to you but now is useful to you and to me. <sup>12</sup> Whom I have sent back to you, he that is my own affections, <sup>13</sup> whom I have wished to detain for myself in order that in behalf of you he may minister for me in the bonds of the good message.”**

We really shouldn't overlook the Levirate marriage law. Rousas John Rushdoony (whom I seldom quote), in his book *The Institute Of Biblical Law* has this to say in part, pp. 375-376:

**“The Levirate ...** 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 ... 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).”

In Scripture, racial purity and the family unit have the highest priority, and the Levirate law helped insure these very goals. From the nonwhite's worldly point of view, this is considered nonsense and a gross contradiction. But Christ proclaimed to them: **“... Ye are from beneath; I am from above ...”**, John 8:23.