ARGUMENT: I John 3:12 says that "Cain . . . was of that wicked one . . . ."

ANSWER: This does *not* show that Cain was of that wicked one physically, but rather he was of that wicked one spiritually. Let's look at part of I John 3:8: "He that committeth sin is of the devil . . . ." When one studies out I John 3:8-12 the meaning becomes crystal clear. It *must* be talking about who we are serving spiritually. If it is talking about physical descendants, then all of us are physical descendants of Satan because we all have sinned. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God . . ." (Rom. 3:23) and, yes, this includes the Judeans and the Gentiles (tribes); see Rom. 3:9-12.

So if we have all sinned and if he that committeth sin is of the devil, we must conclude that all of us are of the devil.

So what is it saying? Are you of the devil by physical descent or are you of the devil because you serve him (or have served him in the past)?

ARGUMENT: John 8:44 says, "Ye are of your father the devil . . . ." This shows that the devil is their physical father.

ANSWER: Wrong. This once again shows that the devil is their spiritual father (the one that they serve).

Dan Gentry correctly wrote in *Facts For Action* (Autumn 1993, p. 14) that:

> ". . . modern Pharisees seek to disparage those who believe the truth of our Israelite heritage . . . by claiming that we believe 'Jews are children of Satan' . . . . While there may be some who anthropomorphize 'father the devil' as found in the KJV of John 8:44, we understand that Christ here spoke of those who 'turn from the truth' . . ., not because of a genetic defect, but a spiritual one."

Also Elizabeth Dilling explains it this way in *The Jewish Religion: Its Influence*

Today (formerly titled *The Plot Against Christianty*), p. 1:

> "Christ is as utterly devastating of Pharisaism in the record of John 8. Although He admitted that His hearers were descendants of Abraham, He said they were, spritiually, of the devil."

The word "father" in John 8:44 does not have to mean a physical father. It can also be used of a spiritual father; see I Cor. 4:15. Thus John 8:44 does *not* prove that the devil is anyone's physical father.

ARGUMENT: In Matthew 23:33 Christ said of the Pharisees: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers . . . ." This verse and others show that the Pharisees were a physical serpent race.

ANSWER: Just as in John 8:44, we are dealing with whom they served. Fredk A. Tatford, Litt.D., explains it like this in *Satan—The Prince of Darkness*, pp. 32-33:

> "The seed of the serpent patently includes the evil spirits who are his willing associates, but it also covers those human beings who surrender themselves to his control. 'Offspring of vipers,' cried John the Baptist as he viewed the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to be baptised (Matt. 3:7). 'Offspring of vipers,' said our Lord later of those who attributed His healing power to an evil source (Matt. 12:34). 'Serpents, offspring of vipers, how should ye escape the judgment of hell?' He asked the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23:33), whilst He told them plainly on another occasion, 'Ye are of your father, the devil' (John 8:44). The apostle John also declared that 'Cain was of that wicked one' (I John 3:12). Those, therefore, who manifest the same independent pride as Satan and who are motivated by the same spirit as he, are regarded as his seed."

Please note that the Dictionary in *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance* shows that the word "generation" or "offspring" (word No. 1081) can be used both literally and figuratively.

Once again we must conclude that these verses do not prove a physical race.

(This answer also applies to Matt. 13:37-39.)

ARGUMENT: The offering of Cain was rejected because of his lineage (he was physically of Satan).

ANSWER: To hold this position one must also believe that God lied to Cain in Genesis 4:7: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?"

If the rejection of Cain's offering was based upon his lineage, he could never be accepted because he could never change his lineage.

Further, Hebrews 11:4 shows that Abel's sacrifice was accepted because it was "more excellent" compared to Cain's. Lineage had nothing to do with it.

ARGUMENT: Genesis 4:1, "And Adam knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD," is not in the original manuscripts.

ANSWER: This is a bold argument, considering we do not have the original manuscripts today. All we have are "copies" of the originals. In any case, Gen. 4:1 is in the surviving copies today. Thus there is no reason to believe that this verse has been added to the Sacred Writ (unless, of course, you don't like what it says).

ARGUMENT: In Gen. 4:1 Eve says 'I have gotten a man from the LORD." This shows that she believed that she had sex with God and that Cain came from the LORD.

ANSWER: This is not the idea at all. Even today when a Christian gives birth you will hear the parents saying things like "God has given me a son," or "God has given me a daughter," etc. This is the same thing that Eve was saying. This is a correct thing to do, because it is God that opens or closes the womb (Gen. 29:31, 30:22, I Sam. 1:5-6).

ARGUMENT: In the garden, trees were people or races of people (as shown in Ezekiel 31:3-9). Thus the tree of knowledge of good and evil was a person and the fruit

Eve took was sex.

ANSWER: While there are strong arguments for the belief that there were pre-Adamic races and that these races were present in the garden, this does *not* prove that the tree of knowledge of good and evil was a person/angel.

If we conclude that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was a person and its fruit was sex, for the same reasons we must conclude that the tree of life was a person and its fruit must also be sex. In Rev. 2:7 we read in part:

> "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."

Further, in Rev. 22:1-2, we read:

> "And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.
>
> "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations."

Now if we accept the argument that the tree was a person, etc., we must also accept that in Rev. 2:7 God will give us sex with the tree of life (person) if we are overcomers. Further, we must also accept that in Rev. 22:1-2 it teaches that we will have twelve manner of sexual pleasures.

If sex was the original sin, then why would God give sex as a reward?

Just because there may be some good reasons to believe that there were pre-Adamic races represented as "trees" in Ez. 31, this does not prove that the specific trees dealt with in Gen. 2 and 3 were people also. As was shown before, we have every reason to believe that these trees were, in fact, TREES.

ARGUMENT: "Beguiled" in Gen. 3:13 means seduced, and "seduced" in English means led astray to illicit sexual intercourse.

ANSWER: Many Identity people of good intentions make this mistake. They take a Hebrew word translated into English and then use the English definition. This is incorrect. To be accurate with God's Word, you must use the Hebrew definition.

Here's an example of this mistake that I hear quite often: Exodus 20:14 says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The word "adulterate" in English can mean to make inferior or impure; thus this verse is saying not to mix the races because it makes the bloodlines inferior.

Now I agree that the Bible teaches that the races are to stay separate, but Ex. 20:14 has just been explained incorrectly because an English definition was used for the word "adultery." The Hebrew definition for the word "adultery" is to break wedlock. Thus Ex. 20:14 correctly means that once married, we are not to break or violate that condition (relationship). This can be mentally or physically.

In like manner, the word "beguiled" means "deceived," and "seduced" when used as a synonym of "deceived" does *not* mean sexual intercourse.

ARGUMENT: We know that the sin in the garden was sexual because of the aprons they made to cover their nakedness.

ANSWER: This does not prove there was sexual sin, although it might suggest it. However, there are several other plausible answers, one being that prior to the fall Adam and Eve had the shekinah glory of God as their covering, but at the fall they lost it and saw their nakedness and realized that they needed some other covering. Of course, this explanation cannot be proved either, but it is more consistent with what we have already proved.

ARGUMENT: The Satanic Seedline teaching makes sense.

ANSWER: What makes sense to us is not always true. The serpent deceived Eve because he made a lie appear to make sense to her. People today believe that those

who call themselves Jews are physical descendants from the Jews of the Bible. Why? Because it makes sense—they use the same name. People don't usually question things that make sense. The truth is that most of the people today who call themselves Jews have no bloodline connection to the Jews of the Bible. We need to ever keep in mind that we are finite creatures—we are not all-knowing. We need to seek the mind of God, who is all-knowing. When we do this, many of those things that make sense will be revealed as lies. Had Eve waited until the next time that God walked in the garden, she could have sought clarification of what God wanted. Instead, she accepted what made sense to her and was deceived.

There are other arguments, but the ones addressed here are the major ones that I have encountered. If you have encountered an argument and you are sincerely seeking an answer, I suggest that first you completely study it out in God's Word (look up definitions, check parallel passages, be sure of the context, etc.). After that, I suggest you contact men such as Pete Peters, Dan Gentry, Earl Jones, Jack Mohr, etc., because:

> "Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety." (Prov. 11:14)

CHAPTER 6

Results of the Satanic Seedline Teaching

The results of the Satanic Seedline teaching (if accepted as true) should speak for themselves. Most seedliners hate Jews today (those who claim to be) because of their ethnic origin. For this same reason, they honor the white races because of their ethnic origin. This easily leads to race worship. They stress the physical aspect of God's Word (that is, the physical descent of Israel), which is ignored by most churches today, so much that they forget or neglect the spiritual aspect, which is of more importance (Gal. 3:26-29). They make true the words of God in I Sam. 16:7:

> "... for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart."

Many seedliners go so far as to say that only whites (Israelites) can have eternal life with Christ. Now it is clear that only Israelites can be "redeemed" (Gal. 5:4), but this is not to say that other races can't be born again. Our eternal life is the result of our election by God to accept His Son by faith. If the Scriptures are to be accepted, we must conclude that people of all races can be born again.

> "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons:
> "But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts 10:34-35)

Even more shocking to seedliners is the fact that Cain could have been accepted of God (Gen. 4:3-7).

The seedliners that worship their race are no different than those who purport to be Jews. Jews today take pride in their race and consider themselves better than everyone else. Even the Jewish religion (Judaism) teaches that Jews are superior by race. This ludicrous belief was taught at the Baptist Bible college I attended.

There is no doubt that God chose Israel to be His people, but nowhere do I find that it was because Israel was a superior race. So whether it be seedliners or Jews, the idea of a superior race is inconsistent with the teachings of God's Word.

Do understand that Israel is to remain separate from other peoples and that Israel will be elevated above other peoples as they obey God, but this is not because Israel is racially superior; it is because Israel was chosen by God to be His special people.

So the seedline teaching results in race worship (of themselves) and race hatred (of Jews). Their focus is on race and not on Christ (and bringing people to Him). This problem is briefly discussed by Jack Mohr:

> "This is one of the biggest problems with the SEEDLINE people. They are more concerned with 'pulling up the tares,' whom they say are the Jewish people, then in [sic] getting their own house in order and their own Israelite people in a right relationship with God, so that He can do the 'rooting out work.' As a result, we find the SEEDLINERS doing exactly what Jesus warned them not to do, 'rooting up the wheat along with the tares.'"
>
> (*Seed of Satan: Literal or Figurative?* by Jack Mohr, p. 15)

The normal spirit emanating from most seedliners is one of bitterness and hatred rather than what Christ instructs Christians to be like:

> "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,
>
> "With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love;
>
> "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. . . .
>
> "But speaking the truth in love . . .

"And be renewed in the spirit of your mind;

"And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. . . .

"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice:

"And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." (Eph. 4:1-3, 15, 23-24, 31-32)

The next result of the seedline teaching is the most devastating. The Satanic Seedline doctrine results in many former believers in Christ turning from Him and denying faith in Christ. This is a most serious charge and needs to be explained.

It has worked like this many times. One will embrace the seedline teaching, and with it comes their method of Scripture twisting. Next this person will use this same manner of twisting to deny that the Devil or Satan exists. From there they will end up denying that Jesus is equal with the Father. Naturally following this they discover that there is no trinity. They next learn that the Bible is a completely Jewish book that was written to enslave the white race. They finally confess that they no longer believe that Jesus is the Christ and that they oppose all forms of Christianity (to include Identity). From here they go many places. Some go to Odinism, some to paganism, some to Aryanism, and others to a New Age religion that teaches that God came from a twelfth planet on a space ship. I'm sure that others have gone elsewhere, but these are the most common destinations I have encountered.

Examples of this are many:

- Jarah B. Crawford, author of *Last Battle Cry*, has now written a manuscript entitled *Fire Storm*, in which he rejects Christ, the Bible, and all forms of Christianity and sets forth his belief in the alien-twelfth planet stuff.
- James Hazel, in many letters, has stated that he has abandoned Christianity and hints that he has turned towards paganism. In any case, he rejects the Bible as a totally Jewish book used to enslave the white race.
- Robert Johnston denies Identity Christianity (of which he was once a preacher), and the Bible as a Jewish book. He does believe in some type

of creator, but he denies the "Jewish/foreign gods, i.e., YHWH/Christ."

The above are examples of those that have gone the full course and finished by rejecting everything to do with Christianity. There are others who are not far behind, such as:

- Ben Williams, who denies that Jesus is God and teaches that Jesus was a mortal man only (not YHWH in the flesh). He also denies the trinity and various other doctrines. He has not come out (to my knowledge) and said he is against Christianity, nor does he reject the Bible. He just twists the Scriptures to the point of teaching "another Jesus" (II Cor. 11:4).
- Francis Christen, like Ben Williams, denies the deity of Christ and the trinity, as well as other doctrines. He does accept the Bible and twists it to his liking.

All these have denied Christ and have committed the unpardonable sin: blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:31-32). Their condition is related in Hebrews 6:4-6:

> "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost,
> "And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,
> "If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance . . . ."

Once someone has received Christ and the Holy Spirit has been in them, if that person denies Christ and thereby blasphemes the Holy Spirit and falls away—IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO RENEW HIM AGAIN UNTO REPENTANCE!

This is serious, dear Christian. The end results of the seedline teaching have eternal consequences. I realize that not ALL seedliners go this far, but understand that once a person accepts the type of Scripture twisting that the seedliners do, this is an easy and common path to take.

Thus the results of the Satanic Seedline teaching are bad fruit everywhere I look, from race worship to un-Christian-like spirits, to Scripture twisting, to the very gates of Hell.

C H A P T E R 7

Conclusion


must agree with Jack Mohr when he wrote:

> "Knowing how the leaders of International Jewry act, and how they hate our King and everything He stands for, it would be easy for me to accept the SEEDLINE DOCTRINE, and say they were the literal 'seed of Satan.' But it wouldn't be true, since this is not what the Scripture says."
> (*Seed of Satan: Literal or Figurative?* by Jack Mohr, p. 24)

We have examined the Satanic Seedline doctrine from the Scriptures and have found those who teach it to be either ignorant or, in most cases, intellectually dishonest. We have examined this teaching from its roots and have found it to be a "Jewish fable" (Titus 1:14) derived from Babylon. We have faced and answered their arguments. Lastly, we have looked at the results of this teaching.

The only honest conclusion that can be drawn is that this is a false teaching which has been brought in by Satan to get those off track who have discovered the truth of Identity (that we are the descendants of Israel).

May God get all the glory—Amen.