

THE SATANIC SEEDLINE

Its Doctrine and History

By Jeffrey A. Weakley

Copyright © 1994

All rights reserved

Published by:

CPA BOOKS
P.O. Box 596
Boring, Oregon 97009

C O N T E N T S

	To the Reader	iii
CHAPTER 1	<i>What It Teaches</i>	1
CHAPTER 2	<i>Compared to Scripture</i>	4
CHAPTER 3	<i>The True Teaching From Scripture</i>	10
CHAPTER 4	<i>The Origin of the False Teaching</i>	14
CHAPTER 5	<i>Arguments Answered</i>	21
CHAPTER 6	<i>Results of the Satanic Seedline Teaching</i>	30
CHAPTER 7	<i>Conclusion</i>	34

T O T H E R E A D E R

The following work is the result of my diligent research into this subject. You are not required to agree with my conclusions, but if you disagree, it should be based upon God's Word as your final authority. If my conclusions are wrong, I pray that God would open my eyes (for I have been wrong before). However, in this case, I think the reader will agree that I have gone to great lengths to be intellectually honest in arriving at my conclusions.

Many of my friends (dear brothers and sisters) believe in the Satanic Seedline doctrine. They are the ones that first caused an interest in this subject for me. Once understanding its basic teaching, I felt compelled to do a complete study on this subject. This work is humbly presented to you, the reader, with the prayer that God will be glorified by it.

What It Teaches



he best way to understand what the Satanic Seedline doctrine teaches is to let those that teach it speak for themselves. Thus in the following you will find quotes from various people that teach this doctrine.

"One day Nachash, a beautiful shining creature, seduced the woman by lying to her, telling her she would not die if she partook of carnal knowledge, but would become a God, as they were, by the creative power of reproduction. . . . Their first child, Cain, 'was of that evil one' (Joh 3:12). . . . Cain was sent from the face of the Earth and the Cannanite [sic] line has carried down the seed of the Evil one to this day."

(*The Divine Design* by Gladys M. Demaree, pp. 11-12.)

"What is the real meaning in [Genesis] 3:13 when Eve answered God by saying, 'The Serpent deceived me, and I ate?' [sic] The King James Version uses the word 'beguiled' instead of 'deceived.' A look at Strong's Concordance shows the Hebrew word 'nasha' is used here, the only time this Hebrew word is used in scripture. It carries this meaning: 'To lead astray, that is, (mentally) to delude, or (morally) to seduce.' Strangely enough, my dictionary defines "seduce," 'to lead astray . . . to induce (a woman) to surrender her chastity.' Yes! Sexual intercourse! Is the Bible telling us that Satan had sexual intercourse with Eve? Let us look further.

"The act perpetrated by Satan was serious enough to cause God to curse him 'more than all cattle, and more than every beast of the field' (3:14). Notice also that after Eve had 'eaten the fruit,' 'she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate' (3:6). Immediately they were aware of their nakedness and attempted to cover themselves. While the evidence is circumstantial, we are led to believe that Satan seduced Eve, Eve then introduced sexual intercourse to Adam. If this be the case, it would help our literal understanding of Satan's seed and Eve's seed in verse 15. . . .

"Cain was of the evil one! Cain was the son of Satan! Satan had seduced Eve and impregnated her with his evil seed. This is the very seed line referred to in 3:15, Satan's seed line

"Cain's father was Satan; Abel's father was Adam. Eve had conceived in the garden with Satan. She conceived again in 4:1 with Adam. If Cain and Abel were twins, then Eve's pregnancy carried two conceptions.

"... the Jews, were of mixed blood; they were half-breeds. ... This is why Jesus could acknowledge that they were of Abraham's seed, because on one side of their ancestry they could actually trace their lineage back to Abraham. But on the other side of their ancestry Jesus traced it back to the devil himself."

(*Last Battle Cry* by Jarah B. Crawford, pp. 333-334, 337, 45.)

"... Satan ... was the serpent who entered into and seduced Eve, producing the first murderer, Cain.

"The Prince of Darkness had a number of disguises, but when he incarnated sexual desire, as he did for Eve, he always appeared as a serpent.

"... God accepted the offering from Abel, but rejected the offering of Cain because he was unworthy, that is, he was of the serpent."

(*The Curse of Canaan* by Eustace Mullins, pp. 3, 5, 35.)

"Cain was the son of Eve's seduction by Satan. Cain was the progeny of 'that wicked one.' This makes Cain a son of Satan. It is from the Cain line that we have the so-called white Jew, Cain being the first of that type."

(Teaching of William Potter Gale as found in
Committee of the States by Cheri Seymour, p. 203.)

"We believe that there is not one, but two fathers to the human race and that Satan sired children bringing them into this world through the seedline of Cain (Matt. 13:38, I John 3:10). These people are eternal enemies of the household of Yahweh."

(*Identity Bible Reference Manual Vol. II*
by Rev. George Udvary, pp. 1-3.)

"... Eve says, 'The Serpent beguiled me, and I did eat thereof.' Here again is the Hebrew word Nachash meaning enchanter, but instead of 'beguiled' the Hebrew word nawshaw means 'seduced.' ... And Yahweh God said unto the woman, 'What is this (that) thou hast done?' And the woman said, 'The enchanter seduced me.' That is what it says in the Hebrew, and Cain was the product thereof."

(*The Cain-Satanic Seed Line* by Dr. Bertrand L. Comparet, pp. 5-6.)

"Scriptures, in these specific verses, are translated so that they could remain family reading and thus intended to screen from children's eyes certain aspects of these events in the interest of good taste. It is sufficient for the immature to think of Eve as just eating a forbidden apple, and

Adam doing likewise. Regrettably, 90% of Christians today still accept the immature understanding of their youth.

"... It was not to be the seed of an apple that would cause pain and stress when children of Adam-kind are delivered. When Eve was cross-examined, she is quoted as admitting:

'Nachash beguiled (Strong's word #5377, nasha, sexually seduced) me and I did eat.' Genesis 3:13

There are several opinions regarding the actual nature of this seduction which can not be clearly decided by the text alone. One was that it was Nachash himself who provided the Wicked Seed as a surrogate of Satan and thus the off-spring Cain was an Adam-Chay cross having a natural propensity to take a wife from pure-bred Chay in the land of Nod. The other concept, which I feel is more clearly borne out by Christ's words as in St. John 8:42-45, and St. John's words in I John 3:12, is that this Nachash merely performed as a pimp setting up the Event so that Satan could plant his own seed in the woman. Eve knew that Nachash was not The Lord, but just a nice looking Chay who worked for her husband. Why then did she say that her first child, Cain, was from The Lord? (Genesis 4:1) I think it was because she had been deceived by Satan into believing that he was God and wanted her to thus perform for him. No question but what Eve was thoroughly deceived. Adam, however, knew better and his sin was to take things into his own hands and go in unto Eve, a defiled woman.

"... Eve bore a set of fraternal twins, the first born Cain sired by Satan and the other sired by Adam."

(*Star Wars—Part One* by Nord W. Davis, Jr., pp. 11-12.)

"The Synagogue of Satan is composed of men and women of many nationalities which have their origin in Cain, Eve's son.

"Satan's conquest of Eve was an entirely different matter, as it is re-enacted in the ritual of the Adonaicide Mass (Black Mass). According to the ritual in this Mass, Satan's love-play was calculated to arouse the animal passions in Eve to the point when the gratification of the sexual urge overcame all other considerations."

(*The Conspiracy to Destroy All Existing Governments and Religions* by William Guy Carr, pp. 4, 6.)

As you can see, there is not total agreement on this teaching. There is, however, an agreement on the main issues. Seedliners (as I call them) all believe that:

1. Satan, Nachash, or a Chay sexually seduced Eve.
2. Cain was the product of this sexual encounter.
3. The descendants of Cain are the Satanic seed today.

You now understand the basics of the Satanic seedline doctrine.

Compared to Scripture



We will now look at the Satanic Seedline doctrine as compared to Scripture. Any teaching that we hear should not be accepted or rejected as truth until we have reexamined the Scriptures. This is what the Bereans did in Acts 17:10-11. So let us now be "more noble" as the Bereans and search the Scriptures on this matter.

The first point of the seedline doctrine is that Eve was sexually seduced. In Genesis 3:6 we find

"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."

Now according to the seedliners, this passage is just written with good taste and is really talking about a sexual encounter. Let's see. First we'll examine some words in this verse:

tree (*ets*)

- a tree (from its firmness); hence wood. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- (1) a tree (follows analogy of the verb *atsah*, to be hard, firm) (2) wood, specially of a wooden post, stake, gibbet. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- tree, wood, timber, stock, plank, stalk, stick, gallows. (*Theological Word-book of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word is translated over 100 times in the Old Testament as: "tree(s)," "wood," "timber," "sticks," "helve," "stalks," "staff," "gallows," "stock(s)," and "plank." From the above, I find it difficult to believe that this tree from which Eve obtained the fruit was anything other than a tree.

food (*ma'akal*)

- an eatable food (including provender, flesh and fruit), fruit, victual. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- food, especially corn, fruit tree, sheep to be killed. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- food, fruit, meat. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word is translated 29 times in the Old Testament as: "food," "meat(s)," "victual," and "fruit." This food from the tree seems to be clearly something that is eatable. There is no hint of it being a sexual act.

desired (*ta'avah*)

- a longing, a delight (subj. satisfaction, obj. a charm) dainty, desire, exceedingly, greedily, lust. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- (1) desire, longing, whether good and just or wicked. (2) in bad sense, lust, desire. (3) delight, object of desire, honour, ornament. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- desire, pleasant, lust, greed, dainty, desirable, has the meaning of desire extending to both good and bad objects. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word is translated 26 times in the Old Testament as: "pleasant," "utmost bound," "lusting," "lust," "dainty," "desire," "lusted *exceedingly*" and "coveteth *greedily*." This word is neutral in our discussion. It does not prove the point one way or the other as it does not indicate what the object being desired is. Nonetheless, I put this here so that the reader can see how to fairly treat a neutral word.

took (*laqach*)

- to take (a primary root) accept, bring, buy, carry away, fetch, get, seize, etc. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- to take, to take with the hand, to lay hold of, to take away, to take possession of, to take captive, to send after, to fetch, to bring, to receive. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- take (get, fetch), lay hold of (seize), receive, acquire (buy), bring, marry (take a wife), snatch (take away). (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word is translated over 100 times in the King James Version as: "take," "taken," "took," "fetch," "receive," "accept," "bring," "married," "have (wife)," "brought," etc. With this word seedliners will be quick to point out that it is sometimes translated as "marry" or "have to wife." I have bad news for these people. The idea of marry and have to wife is the possession of a wife—NOT SEXUAL RELATIONS! So the idea expressed when Eve "took" the fruit was that she took possession of it. This word does *not* indicate that she was participating in sexual intercourse.

fruit (*periy*)

- fruit (lit. or fig.) bough, firstfruit, reward. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- (1) fruit whether of the field or of a tree, Metaph, used of the result of labour. (2) offspring. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- fruit, as a verb—make fruitful—to increase—to multiply, the fruit of a tree/vine, the fruit of the womb (children), fruit as consequences resulting from an action (reward). (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word is used over 100 times in the King James Version and is translated as: "fruit(s)," "fruitful," and "reward." The meaning of this word is clear in this verse as we have already established that tree means (of all things) tree—thus fruit in this verse means fruit of a tree.

eat (*akal*)

- to eat (lit. or fig.) consume, devour, burn up, dine, eat up, feed (food). (*Strong's Concordance*)
- (1) to eat, to devour (food); to eat of a land, a field, a vine; to eat of its produce or fruit; to take food, to take a meal, to dine or sup, to feast (used of sacrificial banquets), to devour a people (the poor), to destroy by war and slaughter. (2) to devour, to consume (fire). (3) to enjoy (good fortune, fruit of actions and sexual pleasures). (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- eat, consume, devour, burn up and feed. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word is used over 100 times and is translated as: "eat," "eaten," "consumed," "at meat," "devoured," etc. Once again the seedliners will be quick to point out that this word can be used of sexual pleasures. While this

is true, it is only true when used in that context. In the present case the context is that of an actual "tree" with "fruit" and thus "eat" rightly means the consumption of food (not sexual pleasures). So we see that only by incorrectly defining words can Genesis 3:6 be taken to support the view that Eve was sexually seduced.

Now we will look at 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."

The understanding of this verse hangs on the word "beguiled." Have the seedliners been honest with this word? What does it mean?

beguiled (*nasha*)

- to lead astray, i.e. (mentally) to delude, or (morally) to seduce, beguile, deceive. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- to err, to go astray (kindred to the verb "to forget") to lead into error, to cause to go astray, to deceive, to seduce, to corrupt. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- beguiled, deceive; This verb is used mainly in the sense of "lead astray, seduce, mislead, deceive," even for self-deception (Jer. 37:9). (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This Hebrew word in its various forms is used 16 times and is translated in the King James Version as:

- 1 time—"utterly forget"
- 1 time—"seize" (Ps. 55:15-16)
- 1 time—"beguiled"
- 13 times—"deceive" or "deceived."

The seedliners will insist that it be translated "seduced" and they define it as a physical sexual seduction because the English word "seduce" can mean that. But can the word "deceive" mean a sexual seduction? Is it not proper to take the three definitions given as synonyms?

As a matter of fact, I give more than one definition for every word because each source was written by a fallible man and therefore could be wrong (as is the case for Dr. Strong: when he defines the word "Gentile" in the New Testament his theology

knowledge gained by the senses. . . . It is also used for sexual intercourse on the part of both men and women in the well-known euphemism "Adam knew Eve his wife" and its parallels (Gen. 4:1; 19:8; Num. 31:17, 35; Jud. 11:39; 21:11; I Kings 1:4; I Sam. 1:19). It is used to describe sexual perversions such as sodomy (Gen. 19:5; Jud. 19:22) and rape (Jud. 19:25). . . . to distinguish . . . to have knowledge . . . etc. (*Theological Word-book of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

This word is used over 500 times in the Old Testament and is translated in the King James Version as: "knew," "know," "known," "perceived," "wot," "knowest," "wotteth," "can tell," "sure," "wist," "understand," "had knowledge," "consider," "was aware," "learned," etc. This word is clearly being used as a euphemism meaning "sexual intercourse" because from this Eve "conceived" and "bare" a son. The one who had intercourse with Eve was Adam. The son produced was Cain.

Cain is clearly the son of Adam. Let me make note here that many seedliners fail to understand Eve when she said, "I have gotten a man from the LORD." This statement carries the same meaning as found in Gen. 33:45 and Ps. 127:3. It is appropriate to use phrases as these because it is YHWH who opens or closes the womb (Gen. 29:31; Gen. 30:2, 22; Deut. 7:13; I Sam. 1:5-6; Isa. 44:2, 24). Thus we have seen in clear and honest study that Cain was the son of Adam and Eve. Therefore, Point 2 of the seedline doctrine (i.e., Cain was the product of Eve's sexual encounter with Satan) is shown to be inconsistent with the Scriptures.

Now Point 3 of the seedline doctrine may be true to some degree, as I will show in the next chapter.

The True Teaching From Scripture



he teaching of a physical Satanic Seedline is not that far from the truth. However, this physical seedline did not originate with Satan and Eve. This physical seedline is more correctly called "demonic" rather than "Satanic." The Scriptures clearly show that fallen angels had intercourse with humans and produced offspring, as we will now explore.

Genesis 6:1-4:

"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them,

That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.

There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown."

William Tyndale translated Verse 4 this way in 1530:

"There were tyrants in the world in those days. For after that the children of God had gone in unto the daughters of men and had begotten them children, the same children were the mightiest of the world and men of renown."

Robert Young translated Verse 4 as:

"The fallen ones were in the earth in those days, and even afterwards when the sons of God come in unto daughters of men, and they have borne to them—they are the heroes, who, from of old, are the men of name."

The Hebrew word translated "giants" in the King James Version, "tyrants" in Tyndale's version, and "fallen ones" in Young's Literal Translation is *nephiyl*, which is transliterated into English as "Nephilim."

giants (*nephiyl*)

- a feller, i.e. a bully or tyrant: —giant. (*Strong's Concordance*)
- giant; it means excellent, noble, skillful. Those who used to interpret the passage in Genesis of the fall of the angels, were accustomed to render it: fallers, rebels, apostates. (*Gesenius' Lexicon*)
- giants, the nephilim (Gen. 6:4, Num. 13:33 only). . . . some scholars attempt to relate this term etymologically to *napal I* via the noun *nepel* "untimely birth" or "miscarriage" (as productive of superhuman monstrosities) . . . the translation "giants" . . . may be quite misleading. The word may be of unknown origin and mean "heroes" or "fierce warriors" etc. The RSV and NIV transliteration "Nephilim" is safer and may be correct in referring the noun to a race or nation. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris)

The view that fallen angels produced offspring by human women is a common view.

"... for many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength, for the tradition is that these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants."

(*The Works of Josephus*, Book 1, Chapter 3, Section 1)

"There cannot be any reasonable doubt regarding the meaning of the Hebrew term translated 'sons of God': it is used only five times in the Old Testament—twice in Gen. 6 and three times in the book of Job (Job 1:6;

2:1; 38:7)—and where used in Job, it obviously relates to angels."

(*Satan—The Prince of Darkness* by Fredk A. Tatford, p. 37)

"That the 'Sons of God' of Gen. 6:1-4 were ANGELS was maintained by the ancient Jewish synagogue, by Hellenistic Jews at, and before, the time of Christ, and by the Christian Church up until the Fourth Century, when the interpretation was changed to 'sons of Seth' for two reasons. First, because the worship of angels had been set up, and if the 'Sons of God' of Gen. 6:1-4 were angels and fell, then angels might fall again, and that possibly would affect the worship of angels. The second reason was, that Celibacy had become an institution of the Church, and if it was taught that the angels in heaven did not marry, and yet that some of them seduced by the beauty of womanhood came down from heaven to gratify their amorous propensities, a weakness of a similar kind in one of the 'earthly angels' (celebrates) might be the more readily excused. In the Eighteenth Century the 'Angelic Interpretation' was revived, and is now largely held by Biblical scholars. . . .

"As the older nations of the earth have traditions, and in some cases records of the Flood, showing that they can trace their origin back to that catastrophe, we have in these traditions the source or origin whence the classic writers of antiquity obtained their conception of the 'Gods' and 'Demi-Gods' whose loves for members of the human race led to the birth of beings half human and half divine. Thus the writers of antiquity, who must have had some basis for their stories, indirectly confirm our contention that the 'Sons of God' of Gen. 6:1-4, whose descendants are described as 'Mighty Men,' were more than human, that they were of heavenly origin."

(*The Spirit World* by Clarence Larkin, pp. 26-27, 36)

The early Christian writers confirm this view.

"For this is the office of angels,—to exercise providence for God over the things created and ordered by Him; . . . Just as with men, who have freedom of choice as to both virtue and vice . . ., so is it among the angels. . . . of those who were placed about this first firmament . . .; these fell into impure love of virgins, and were subjugated by the flesh, and he became negligent and wicked in the management of the things entrusted to him. Of these lovers of virgins, therefore, were begotten those who are called giants. . . . These angels, then, who have fallen from heaven, and haunt the air and the earth, and are no longer able to rise to heavenly things, and the souls of the giants, which are the demons who wander about the world, perform actions similar, the one (that is, the demons) to the natures they have received, the other (that is, the

angels) to the appetites they have indulged."

[*A Plea for the Christians* by Athenagoras the Athenian
(A.D. 177), Chapters 24 and 25
(as found in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. II, p. 142)]

"... the angels ... yet having become in all respects men, they also partook of human lust, and being brought under its subjection they fell into cohabitation with women; and being involved with them, and sunk in defilement and together emptied of their first power, were unable to turn back to the first purity of their proper nature, ... being fettered with the bonds of flesh, were constrained and strongly bound; wherefore they have no more been able to ascend into the heavens. ... wishing to please their mistresses, ... they ... imparted the discovery of magic, and taught astronomy, ... And all things, in short, which are for the adornment and delight of women, are the discoveries of these demons bound in flesh.

"But from their unhallowed intercourse spurious men sprang, much greater in stature than ordinary men, whom they afterwards called giants; not those dragon-footed giants who waged war against God, as those blasphemous myths of the Greeks do sing, but wild in manners, and greater than men in size, inasmuch as they were sprung of angels; yet less than angels as they were born of women. ... All things, therefore, going from bad to worse, on account of these brutal demons, God wished to cast them away like an evil leaven, lest each generation from a wicked seed, being like to that before it ..."

[*Homily VIII*, Chapters 12-17 (A.D. 211-231) by Clement
(as found in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII, pp. 272-273)]

So we see that fallen angels came in unto women and produced these Nephilim. These Nephilim apparently produced offspring as we find them in Num. 13:33. Thus it is not unreasonable to believe that these demons have descendants today. If this is true, it is a "demonic seedline" with its origin in the fallen angels and NOT a "Satanic seedline" originating from Satan, Eve and Cain.

The Origin of the False Teaching



f, as I contend, the Satanic Seedline doctrine (as taught by the seedliners) is not found in the Scriptures, and since it was not taught by any of the early church fathers as being correct, how did it find its way into the Christian belief system known as "Identity?" To find this answer we need to properly define Identity. There are at least three specific systems of belief which are very similar, and yet each is distinctly different. There are the Anglo-Israel, British-Israel, and Christian-Israel beliefs. Identity can include all three of these beliefs, depending on how they are taught.

For a definition of Identity we will go to the man who first made the term popular in America over 50 years ago (see *The National Christians*, 1991 Ed., p. 25). That man is Howard B. Rand.

"The preaching of that identity has been going on for years now. It has resulted in millions in Anglo-Saxondom becoming acquainted with the fact that they are the lineal descendants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel. . . . Thus, the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic people stand out as Israel in these latter days."

(*Study in Revelation* by Howard B. Rand, p. 115)

Thus Identity is the belief or teaching that the Anglo-Saxon and kindred peoples are the physical descendants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament.

I will note here that many believe that Wesley Swift founded Identity (see *Bitter*

Harvest by James Corcoran, p. 38) in 1946 and others believe that the "Identity movement was conceived and first spread by three men with ties to the Radical Right: Wesley Swift, Bertrand Comparet, and William Gale" (See *God, Guts, and Guns* by Phillip Finch, p. 68). Although this view is set forth, it is simply the product of those who do too little research and do not yet have all the facts. The simple fact is that the term "Identity" as used to describe the Anglo-Israel history was used as far back as 1884, when Elieser Bassin used it. He tells how he picked it up from others before him. However, it was Howard B. Rand that called the Anglo-Israel history "Identity" and made the term popular in America. Howard B. Rand did not hold or teach the Satanic Seedline doctrine.

"Two sons were born to Adam and Eve and they were named in their order of birth: Cain and Abel."

(*Primo-Genesis* by Howard B. Rand, p. 41)

The Satanic Seedline doctrine was brought into the Identity teaching with San Jacinto Capt and Wesley A. Swift. Actually, San Jacinto Capt claimed to have gotten Wesley Swift started (in Identity) (see *Committee of the States* by Cheri Seymour, p. 83). In any case, Wesley Swift presented the seedline doctrine to Gerald L. K. Smith (see *Besieged Patriot* by Gerald L. K. Smith, pp. 238-239). From there Swift got Bertrand Comparet started (who was an attorney that represented Gerald L. K. Smith) and shortly later San Jacinto Capt (father of E. Raymond Capt, who has written many outstanding books on archaeology) introduced William P. Gale to Swift. In later years Richard Butler would take over Swift's Church (now known as Aryan Nations).

As this is not meant to be a history of the Identity movement, I will stop here, but suffice it to say that the seedline doctrine saturated Identity through the influence of San Jacinto Capt, Wesley Swift, and William P. Gale. Where did they get this belief? Capt and Swift both got it from the Ku Klux Klan (they both were members—see *Committee of the States* by Cheri Seymour, p. 84).

The Klan takes some explaining. The first Ku Klux Klan was organized in

Tennessee in 1867 under the leadership of Gen. N. B. Forrest. This Klan was disbanded sometime in 1869 (see *Vigilantes of Christendom* by Richard K. Hoskins, pp. 245, 247). The next official Ku Klux Klan was founded in 1915 as The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. The founder was William Joseph Simmons, who was a Royal Arch Mason (see *Occult Theocracy* by Lady Queenborough, aka Edith Starr Miller, p. 607). Thus the Ku Klux Klan got its seedline doctrine from the Masonic teaching.

Many people do not know that a Mason started the Ku Klux Klan, and fewer people know that Masons teach the seedline doctrine.

William P. Gale became an honorary member of the Ku Klux Klan after he had already been teaching the seedline doctrine for some time. He denied that he developed his belief from the Ku Klux Klan, and this may be true. William P. Gale was a long-time Mason and developed his seedline belief from the same place the Ku Klux Klan got theirs: the Masons. Now I will prove that the Masons teach seedline.

"Ialdabaoth, . . . to pass for the Supreme Being, made the world, and man, in his own image; . . . henceforward the contest . . . between light and darkness, good and evil, was concentrated in man; and the image of Ialdabaoth, reflected upon matter, became the Serpent-Spirit, Satan, the Evil Intelligence. Eve, created by Ialdabaoth, had by his Sons children that were angels like themselves."

(*Morals and Dogma of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry* by Albert Pike, p. 563)

"In Chapter 4:1 of Genesis, Eve says: 'I have gotten a man from the LORD.' . . . this indicates that Cain was not the child of Adam, but of the archangel Samael, the old serpent, . . . rabbins . . . insist that Cain was the son of Samael, and Abel the son of Adam. . . . two orders of human beings are therefore reported."

[*Old Testament Wisdom* by Manly P. Hall
(a respected Mason), p. 120]

". . . at the same time claim superior knowledge on the subject of Masonry. Thus in a book by the leader of this group we find it solemnly stated that according to Max Heindl, Eve cohabited with serpents in the garden of Eden, that Cain was the offspring of her union with 'the Lucifer Samael,' and that from this 'divine progenitor' the most virile portion of

the human race descended, the rest being merely the 'progeny of human parents.'"

(*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*
by Nesta H. Webster, p. 317)

"Master Mason. . . . The word of this degree is 'Mohabone'; while the substitute word is 'Tubalcain.' In the instructions to the neophyte, it is explained that: Eblis, the Angel of Light, could not see the beauty of the first woman (Eve) without coveting her. Cain was born: his soul was the spark of the Angel of Light, the Fire-God, Abaddon (Apoc. ix, 11)."

(*Father of Lies* by Warren Weston, p. 221)

Once again there are many different versions, but it's the same old seedline doctrine. So where did the Masons get this teaching? Answer: the Gnostics.

". . . the Order of Knights of the Temple was at its very origin devoted to the cause of opposition to the tiara of Rome and the crowns of Kings, and the Apostolate of Kabalistic Gnosticism was vested in its chiefs."

(*Morals and Dogma of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry* by Albert Pike, p. 817)

"In his *Secret Sects of Syria*, Springett (a Mason) traces the influence of the Jewish philosophers of the celebrated Alexandrian School upon Gnostics and Manichaeans and through them upon the Templars."

(*Trail of the Serpent* by Inquire Within, aka Miss Stoddard, p. 39)

"The seven founders of Freemasonry were all Gnostics . . . Gnosticism, as the Mother of Freemasonry, has imposed its mark in the very centre of the chief symbol of this association. . . . It is Gnosticism which is the real meaning of the G in the flamboyant star, for, after the grade of Kadosch . . . the Freemasons dedicate themselves to the glorification of Gnosticism . . . which is defined by Albert Pike as 'the soul and marrow of Freemasonry.'"

(*Occult Theocracy* by Lady Queenborough,
aka Edith Starr Miller, p. 34)

Did the Masons get the seedline doctrine from the Gnostics? Of this there can be no doubt. The teachings of various Gnostic sects (Ophites, Cainites, etc) survive in written form today. In *Against Heresies* (Book I) by Irenaeus, under the section

entitled "Doctrines of the Ophites and Sethians" we find:

"They have also given names to (the several persons) in their system of falsehood, . . . he who was first descendant of the mother is called Ialdabaoth Moreover, they represent these heavens, potentates, powers, angels, and creators, as sitting in their proper order in heaven, according to their generation, and as invisibly ruling over things celestial and terrestrial. . . . Ialdabaoth . . . (his) . . . son is Nous . . . twisted into the form of a serpent They declare that the father imparted still greater crookedness to this serpent-like and contorted Nous of theirs. . . . Ialdabaoth exclaimed 'Come, let us make man after our image.' . . . Ialdabaoth . . . was pleased to form the design . . . and produced a woman But the others coming and admiring her beauty, named her Eve, and falling in love with her, begat sons by her, whom they also declare to be the angels. . . . this one (Eve) sinned by committing adultery."

(As found in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, pp. 354-356)

Under the section entitled "Doctrines of the Cainites" we find:

"Others again declare that Cain derived his being from the Power above, and acknowledge that Esau, Korah, the Sodomites, and all such persons, are related to themselves."

(As found in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, p. 358)

In *The Other Bible*, edited by Willis Barnstone, under the section "Diverse Gnostic Texts" we find:

"Ialdabaoth created woman, Eve Angels seduced her and generated sons from her." (p. 659)

"Eve sinned when she committed adultery with angels." (p. 662)

"For they glorify Cain, as if conceived by some potent power which operated in him." (p. 652)

In *Occult Theocracy*, by Lady Queenborough, aka Edith Starr Miller, under her chapter entitled "The Gnostics" we find:

"The Ophites, or Cainites, say, that Cain was the Progeny of a higher Principality than Abel; and they confess that Esau, Corah, and the Sodomites, and all such, were their Relations" (p. 120)

Going back yet further, we find that the Gnostics were produced by the Kabalists (Cabalists).

"The Kabalah is the key of the occult sciences; and the Gnostics were born of the Kabalists." (*Morals and Dogma* by Albert Pike, p. 626)

"The Gnostic leaders were sprung from the heart of Judaism: Simon, Menander, Dostheys, and Kerinthos were Jews. This explains the early relations between Gnosticism and the Kabbalah."

(*Father of Lies* by Warren Weston, p. 174)

The Kabala (Cabala) is the esoteric teachings of the Pharisees.

"The obligations and rules of the rite for the Jewish masses are contained in the Talmud . . . but the esoteric teachings for the higher initiates are to be found in the Cabala. . . .

"Among the most noted Pharisees . . . [were] Simon ben Yohai, who might be termed the great Magician and Father of the Cabala . . ."

(*Occult Theocracy* by Lady Queenborough
aka Edith Starr Miller, pp. 76, 80)

Would you be amazed if I told you that the Kabalists taught the seedline doctrine? They did.

". . . in the Jewish Cabala . . . Eve is . . . accused of cohabiting with the Serpent."

(*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*
by Nesta H. Webster, p. 34)

"In Zohar (I, 28b) we read: 'Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, etc.' (Genes. III, 1.) 'More subtle' that is towards evil; 'than all the beasts' that is, the idolatrous people of the earth. For they are the children of the ancient serpent which seduced Eve. . . .

"The best argument used by the Jews to prove that Christians are of

the race of the devil is the fact that they are uncircumcized.

"... This ancient serpent, the parent of Christians, that is, the devil in the form of a serpent, is called Sammael . . ."

(*The Talmud Unmasked* by Rev. I. B. Pranaitis, p. 52)

Next we find that the Kabalists got their teaching from the Jewish Babylonian Talmud.

"... what evil, however, could be involved here? 13—That of infusing her with sensual lust. For R. Johanan stated: When the serpent copulated with Eve, 14 he infused her 15 with lust. . . .

"(14) In the Garden of Eden, according to a tradition. (15) I.e., the human species. . . ."

[*The Babylonian Talmud* (Soncino Press Ed.),
Seder N,ashim (Yebamoth 103b)]

The Babylonian Talmud is the written form of the "tradition of the elders" (Matt. 15:2-3) which had been orally taught since the Babylonian captivity. This teaching was a perversion of God's Law. These traditions were actually a combination of Baal worship (as practiced in Babylon) and the Law of God as given to Israel by Moses.

"The beginnings of Talmudic literature date back to the time of the Babylonian Exile When we come to the Babylonian Gemara, we are dealing with what most people understand when they speak or write of the Talmud. Its birthplace, Babylonia, was an autonomous Jewish center for a longer period than any other land . . ."

(Foreword to *The Babylonian Talmud* by Rabbi J. H. Hertz)

"Those Pharisees had picked up the entire Babylonian gnostic religious system."

[*Be Wise as Serpents* by Fritz Springmeier, p. 113
(Also note *Israel—Our Duty . . . Our Dilemma* by T. Pike, p. 107)]

Thus we have arrived at the human origin of the Satanic Seedline doctrine: Babylon. What I find especially fascinating is that most seedliners express unfathomable hostility toward those who call themselves Jews today and at the same time they adopt the "Jewish fables" (Titus 1:14) that came out of Babylon.