

THE CAIN / SATANIC SEED LINE

By Pastor Bertrand L. Comparet, A.B., J.D.

It has been brought to my attention many times, that there are preachers and teachers in the world who don't recognize there are literal children of Satan surviving in the world today. Since this is one of the central themes of the Bible, the fight for supremacy between the children of God and the children of Lucifer, I wonder what Bible these preachers and teachers are reading and studying.

The battle lines are drawn by God in Genesis 3:15, where He states he is going to put enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent.

Let's start at the beginning; of course Satan wasn't a serpent. The entity that deceived and seduced Eve wasn't a scaly thing wriggling along on the ground. Serpent was translated from the word nachash, which means enchanter or magician. A fallen angel, still retaining a lot of his angelic powers, no doubt could be very much of an enchanter or magician.

Lucifer's children, and I do mean children not just followers, through the centuries used a serpent as a symbol or emblem of their ancestor, until they attached a secondary meaning of serpent to the word nachash. In Genesis 3:1-3 Satan said to Eve, "Is it really true that God said, you can't eat of any tree in the garden?" As it reads in the Hebrew, Eve replied to Satan, "And the woman said unto the enchanter, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden". Now I am going to switch to the King James translation and I will correct it as I go.

"Of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God has said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." Let's see what it actually said in the Hebrew. Fruit is the Hebrew word pirchach, meaning progeny, brood, children or descendants. Do you talk about the children of a walnut tree or an apple tree? Of course you don't!

Of the pirchach, of the descendants of the tree, which is in the midst of the garden, God has said, "Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it". That word touch is the Hebrew word naga, which is a more polite expression meaning, to have sexual intercourse with. Do you need to be warned not to have sexual intercourse with an apple? Of course not, it isn't that kind of a tree.

God had millions of the pre Adamic, Asiatic and African people around. If He just wanted somebody wide between the shoulders and narrow between the eyes to spade up the garden, He had them. He didn't have to create a special being for that purpose.

Satan had been the governor of this planet until he forfeited the right to this position by rebellion. God sent Adam here and it is recorded in Luke chapter

3 that Adam was the son of God. It doesn't record that about any of these pre Adamic people mentioned in Genesis chapter 1. Adam was the son of God and s God sent Adam here to take over by force, kick Satan out and govern this planet. The trees in the Garden of Eden were the family trees of nations and races.

Adam and Eve weren't supposed to intermingle with these people. If Negroes and Asiatics were all that God wanted, He already had them. What He created was a different and separate being who was to be a different sort of person, whom the Negroes and Asiatics could never produce.

The Hebrew word Awdawm, which we translate Adam, means of a rosy, fair complexion. Adam was the first person of a specifically created new race. Adam and Eve were told not to mongrelize their race with these per Adamic people that were in the world.

When you come to Genesis 3:13, God has called Adam, Eve and Satan before Him to give an accounting of their misdeeds. According to the King James Bible Eve said, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat thereof". Here again is the Hebrew word nachash, meaning enchanter. Then there is the use of the word beguiled; the Hebrew word there is nawshaw, which means seduced.

Beguiled means no more than deceived. Somebody who sells you some mining stock in a mine that doesn't have any good ore in it beguiles you. The word nawshaw means seduced, not in any way or sense can it mean beguiled. "And Yahweh God said unto the woman, what is this thou hast done? And the woman said the enchanter seduced me." This is what it says in the Hebrew and Cain was the product of this seduction.

In reply in Genesis 3:15 God says to Satan, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed". The same word zehra was used for both the seed of Satan and the seed of Eve. Zehra literally means seed; there is no other meaning. It also could be used as grains of wheat but it is used throughout the Bible as meaning the descendants of a person. Satan was to have just as literal children in this world as Eve was to have. The same word zehra is used for Satan's seed and Eve's seed.

The reply of the churchianity preachers is usually to quote Genesis 4:1. "And Adam knew his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain." Notice that what is not said is more significant than what is said, the Bible nowhere says Adam begat Cain. As you have read in the Old Testament, the monotonous regularity with which it always says, and so and so begat who is and who is begat what's his name and what's his name begat somebody else, and so on. It was important to know your ancestry in those days, because you didn't get your citizenship for two box tops and a dime. You got citizenship because your ancestors, for over twenty generations, were Israelites and no other way.

So Adam knew his wife and she conceived. I can tell you something and I can prove every bit of it by witnesses. I went to a movie one night and the next morning the sun rose in the east. I didn't say the one caused the other. I said two things happened, one happened first and the other happened second. I never said they were cause and effect. The Bible never says there was cause and effect here. If you want further proof of this, go right on to Genesis chapter 5 where you will find the list of Adam's descendants. Cain's name is nowhere to be found. Neither Cain nor Abel is mentioned among the descendants of Adam.

If you say Abel might have been omitted because he was probably killed before he left any descendants of his own, we don't really know. However, this isn't true of Cain because the Bible traces Cain's descendants for six generations, naming them right down the line. Never once does it record that Cain was a descendant of Adam, never in any way, shape, form or manner. The first time it records that Adam begat a child is Genesis 5:3. "And Adam lived 130 years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth." This child Adam begat was not named Cain it was named Seth.

The satanic bloodline crept in through Cain, possibly earlier, among the pre Adamic people. There were pre Adamic people who were not necessarily satanic. There were some pre Adamic people into whom the satanic bloodline came, and there were even some of the descendants of Adam who probably mongrelized. In fact, it is evident they did mix their bloodline for the fact that those living around Noah were wiped out by the flood. The Bible tells us that Noah was perfect in his ancestry, with no mongrelization. He and his family were the ones in the area that were still pure in their bloodlines.

This is why the flood wiped out the mongrelized Adamites around Noah. As I documented in "Noah's Flood Was Not Worldwide", this flood did not cover the whole earth as is falsely taught in the churches of today.

The pure descendants of Adam multiplied and then you come to the fact of the satanic bloodline getting in there. Remember, God had announced His purpose; He was going to take back the world from Satan's domination. God was going to rule it according to His purposes. He was going to rule it through His children, through the pure descendants of Adam. What would be the obvious move on Satan's part to thwart this plan? The obvious thing to do would be to mongrelize the descendants of Adam, then he could sneer in Yahweh's face and say, "These are my children but where are yours? All these have my blood in them." This is exactly what Satan set out to do.

Genesis 6:2 records, "The sons of God saw the daughters of men (Adam) that they were fair; and they took them wives of all they chose". You don't get the full significance of it in this translation, "the sons of God" (beni-ha-elohim, also means sons of magistrates or mighty men of the earth and angels).

A double race mixing took place here; both the rulers of the pre Adamic races and the fallen angels took wives of the fair Adamic women. It is written with obvious disapproval. The male descendants of Adam were not allowed, by God's law, to marry anybody but the daughters descended from Adam. If they were marrying within their own racial line in this instance, it couldn't have been spoken of with disapproval. So the beni-ha-elohim are evidently those of the pre Adamic darker races and the fallen angels who followed Satan into rebellion. Greater details of this event are found in the book of Enoch.

Go on to Genesis 6:4 where it is speaking of the same subject, again it is botched up in the King James Bible. "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 (enowsh) of renown."

This is what it says in the Hebrew. "There were nephilim (the fallen ones) in the earth in those days." They were fallen angels. That is what the bible calls them in so many places. Jude 1:6 records, "Angels who had not kept their first estate," who had fallen from heaven and from their former powers. "When the sons of God", and again it's the beni-ha-elohim, "came in unto the daughters of Adam..." so it's the same thing.

Here we have the spreading of the satanic bloodline. Genesis chapter 6 goes on to trace many of these descendants of the fallen angels. You find that all through Palestine, on both sides of the Jordan river, clear down through Mount Seir, the rugged mountain range southeast of the Dead Sea where Esau and his family lived, all through this area there are these various people with the satanic blood in them.

There are two different places, one in Isaiah the other in Ezekiel, where it speaks of what it calls a king or a prince. In the one case it speaks of Babylon and the other case of Tyre. Nevertheless it speaks of him in language, which could not possibly apply, to anybody except Satan. Therefore this indicates that at some time or other, Satan had incarnated in the form of these various kings, one king of Babylon and one king of Tyre.

Don't think this is so impossible because many times the Old Testament tells of these angels appearing in very solid form. They came and talked with Abraham on several occasions, one of them wrestled with Jacob almost all night.

Another of these angels came when the people of Israel were about to cross the Jordan River and take over Palestine. Joshua, making a scouting trip around his camp, saw this armed man standing there in armor and with a sword and Joshua asked, "Are you with us or for the enemy?" And the man said, "I am the captain of the hosts of God".

Let's take Isaiah 14:12-21 and note that these verses could not possibly apply to anyone except to Satan himself. We will quote from the King James Bible. "How art thou fallen from the heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning. How art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations: for thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north." Lucifer then said, "I'm going to be the ruler over Israel (God's people). I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High".

Yahweh our God then told Lucifer the devil, "Yet thou shall be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee and consider thee saying, is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms? That made the world a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof, that opened not the house of his prisoners? All the kings of the nations, even all of them lie in glory, everyone in his own house; but thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with a sword, that go down to the stones of the pit; as a carcass trodden under foot. Thou shalt not be joined with them in burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people; the seed of evildoers shall never be renowned."

You could not say this about any kings of Babylon. The only one, who may possibly have failed to get burial and an elaborate tomb, might have been Belshazzar. Belshazzar was nothing but an incompetent drunkard and nobody ever could say of him that he was the one who shook kingdoms and so on. He didn't even rule Babylon, because he was drunk all the time.

These passages are speaking of none other than Lucifer. Note how it goes on in Isaiah 14:21. "Prepare slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers; that they do not rise, nor possess the land, nor fill the face of the world with cities." The word translated as children is from the Hebrew word Beni meaning sons. Satan obviously was to have children who could be slaughtered, to keep them from multiplying to the point where they would take over and rule the world. Old Testament, of course it is, now let's see what the New Testament has to say about it.

Jesus plainly says, in a number of places, that the devil has children, not merely followers. Remember the parable of the tares and the wheat. Jesus spoke of the farmer who sowed good seed in his field and his enemy came along during the nighttime and sowed these poisonous weeds, the tares among the wheat. When the farmer's servants saw the tares growing among the wheat they asked him if they should go and pull them up now.

The farmer said, "No, you might pull up some of the wheat with them. Let them grow together until the time of the harvest, and then the reapers will first gather the tares into bundles to be burned, and then put the wheat in my barn".

Then Jesus explains this parable to His disciples. In Matthew 13:38-39 Jesus says, "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom (the Greek word used here in the plural is huios meaning sons, the good seed are the sons of the kingdom); but the tares are the children (huios) of the wicked one. Satan has just as true children in the world as does God.

Speaking to the Pharisees, who as you know were Jews, Jesus said in Matthew 12:34 "O generation of vipers, how can ye being evil, speak good things? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh".

The word is not generation at all. A generation is a number of people of not too different an age, living at the same time. You, for example, constitute one generation. Jesus wasn't talking just about the people living then. They weren't any more wicked than the generation that lived before them or the generation that lived after them. What Jesus said was, as we will paraphrase it (it's the Greek word genema which means children or offspring): "O children of vipers... sure all these centuries you Jews have used the serpent as the emblem or symbol for your ancestor. All right, taking you at your word, you children of serpents," right down the line they were vipers. Jesus knew who they were.

In Matthew 23:29-35 it is recorded, "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! Because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets." Here again is the Greek word huios. "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye genema (ye offspring, children) of vipers. How can ye escape the damnation of hell? That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom you slew between the temple and the altar."

Was Jesus so unjust that He was going to punish these Jews for the murder of Abel, if they weren't descendants of Cain? Of course not, Jesus was tracing the children of the serpent, the enchanter Satan, down through the centuries. He was tracing those who had murdered the righteous, including all the prophets, right down the line. So Jesus said, "Upon you (upon this race) these descendants of the serpent, will come the responsibility for all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel even unto the blood of Zacharias."

Throughout the Bible it records the two seed lines, God and Lucifer's. The Bible makes no reference as to what your religious point of view may be; it is talking about literal descendants. Romans 8:16 tells us, "The spirit itself bears witness, that we are the children of God". The word children there, the Greek word teknon, means one born a child, not adopted. Nothing is more fallacious than this church doctrine about being adopted children of God.

Read what Paul said on this subject and nothing in it can justify the mistranslation of that as adoption. Paul states that before the coming of Christ we were held in bondage under the law. He then says the law just like an heir under age strictly governed us. The heir has inherited from his father, who has died all the estate but he is still a minor and cannot take control of it.

The heir is under the control of trustees and governors, appointed guardians, appointed by his father, until he comes of age. Paul continues that all the time the heir is owner of it all and yet he is controlled as though he is just a servant. You couldn't say that about anybody who was adopted. If you take somebody else's illegitimate child and decide you are going to adopt him, is he already the owner of your property before you adopt him? Of course not, Paul wasn't stupid enough to think he was only the churchmen are stupid enough for that.

What Paul was talking about was the coming of age ceremony by which they marked the fact that the heir had now become of full age and his property was put into his hands to control as an adult. As I said before, Romans 8:16 tells us, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God", teknon, one born a child, not adopted.

Romans 9:26 reads (Paul is quoting from Hosea 1:10), "And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it is said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God". It is the Greek word huioi, meaning sons. We are the born, not adopted, children of Yahweh. As to the born, not adopted or converted, children of the devil, read Acts 13:8-9. This tells about a Jew sorcerer Elymas, who opposed Paul when Paul was trying to make some converts. "Then Saul (who was also called Paul) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him and said, O full of sublimity and mischief, thou son of the devil (the same Greek word huios, meaning son), thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?"

The offspring of a cat is another cat, isn't it? The child of a Negro is a Negro and a child of God is what? He is not as wise and not as powerful or important as his Father, but nevertheless he partakes within his limitations of a godly nature. This is what the Bible tells us about and this is exactly why we of Yahweh's people Israel are held to so much greater responsibility than other people. After all, you can't expect a Negro to act like anything but a Negro, but a child of God is expected to act like one.

The child of a devil is what, another devil isn't he? John 6:70-71 is part of a very important passage which began in this manner. Yahshua asked His disciples who were all gathered together, "whom do men say that I am? And they said, Oh some say that you are this prophet or that one who has been reincarnated and come back here. Then Christ said, whom do you say that I am? And Peter spoke up and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Christ then said, blessed art thou Simon, son of Jonah: because flesh and blood didn't tell you that fact: it was

My Father in heaven who told you that. And He said, upon this rock (petra, the solid bed rock of the earth) I will found my church."

Jesusw didn't say He was going to found the church on Simon Peter (petros), a little stone. In Greek petros means a little stone, just barely bigger than a pebble. Was Jesus going to found His church on a pebble that anybody could kick out from under it? No, Yahshua said, "I will found it upon petra." the solid bedrock of the earth.

Remember the example Jesus gave, the parable wherein He said one man had built his house on the sand and when the storm came along, the flood washed the sand out from under it and it collapsed. Another man built his house upon the rock (petra, bed rock) and the storm beat upon it and couldn't do anything to it, because it was founded on a rock (petra).

If any of you have ever been to Yosemite Valley and have seen that enormous cliff El Capitan, you have seen a good example of what the Greeks meant by the word petra. You could build a castle on El Capitan and nothing could blow it off or wash it away. "So upon this fact, that you have recognized who I am: the Christ, the Son of the Living God; upon that I will found My church, and the gates of death shall not prevail against it."

John 6:70-71 records, "Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spoke of Judas Escariot, (the son) of Simon, for he it was that would betray Him, being one of the twelve". Our Savior was not just being vulgarly abusive by calling people names He never did that. He denounced these Pharisees, He called them hypocrites and they were. Jesus wasn't abusing them with lying epithets, they were hypocrites and He was accurate.

When Jesus called these Jews children of serpents, they acknowledged the statement was true, for that was the emblem they had used from ancient times. When He said that one of them was a devil, He wasn't being abusive He was speaking the literal truth.

The First Epistle of John again states the existence of these two seed lines. I John 2:29 tells us, "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that does righteousness is born of Him". I John 3:2 continues, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God". Here we have the Greek word teknon meaning a born child, not adopted, thus a child born of Yahweh. Let's continue with I John 5:9-10. "Whosoever is born of God does not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

By this John didn't mean that none of us commit any sins at all. If that were the case, we wouldn't have needed the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. We all have our sins but people are divided into two classes. There are the one who are only sorry because they don't get a chance to sin more and the others who are sorry because they have sinned only a little. What John means is, whoever is born of Yahweh

doesn't habitually sin. So John says in I John 3:10, "In this the children (teknon) of God are manifest, and the children (teknon) of the devil". Remember, John has talked about us as the born teknon of God and the others as the born teknon of the devil.

I John 3:12 records that as for those that are our brothers, not the children of Satan, we should love them and not be as Cain. The King James Bible says, "...who was of that wicked one and slew his brother." The people that have churchianity rather than Christianity say, "Oh well, you know it doesn't say that he was a son, it just means that Cain was morally associated with Satan and was bad and a reprobate and so on."

There weren't two separate Greek languages in those days. There wasn't one language to write the Gospel according to Luke and a different one to write the First Epistle of John. As you well know, different languages have their different idioms. In many languages one word may have a meaning that can only be expressed by a phrase of several English words. I think nearly all of you have a King James translation of the Bible and you know that in most editions of it, some words are printed in italics. Those words in italics are the words which the translators added because they thought it was necessary to give the English the same meaning the Hebrew or the Greek had, without these added words.

Luke chapter 3 traces the genealogy of Christ, starting with Christ and going all the way back to Adam. Let's start with Luke 3:23 as it is translated in the King James Bible. "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli (the words "the son" are in italics showing they were not in the Greek and the translators added them), which was the son of Matthew (the son is in italics), which was the son (italics) of Levi, which was the son (italics) of Melchi, which was the son (italics) of Janna," and so forth. All "the son" were in italics so were added.

Some people would read Luke 3:23-24 as follows: "...the son of Joseph, who was as big a reprobate as Heli, who was morally no better than Matthew, who was as bad as Levi..." Is this the way some people think Luke wrote this? If this is not the meaning of the Greek here in Luke, it is not the meaning of the same Greek phrase in John 3:12. So where it says, "not as Cain who was of that wicked one", in Greek it means he was the son of that wicked one.

In Greek, if you say John was of William, in English it would read, John was the son of William. The better English translations recognize this. For example in the Weymouth translation, this same verse, John 3:12 reads, "We are not to resemble Cain who was a child of the evil one and killed his brother." Phillips' translation reads, "We are none of us to have the spirit of Cain who was a son of the devil and murdered his brother." The New English Bible, a magnificent job of translation reads, "Unlike Cain who was a child of the evil one and murdered his brother".

The verses that people use, as proof positive there isn't any basis for the belief that the Jews are the descendants of Cain and therefore from the devil, is John 8:31-33. Jesus was talking to the Judeans who were the people we know of as Jews today. It isn't simply that Christ was behaving like a petulant spoiled child because somebody didn't believe in Him, because it says, "those Judeans who believed in Him". Check Strong's Concordance, the word Jew is mistranslated from the word meaning Judean. Yes so called converted children of the devil.

Jesus Christ said to these Judeans (Jews), "If ye continue in My doctrines indeed, then ye shall be My disciples; and you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. They answered Him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man". Anybody that knows their Bible knows that all of Abraham's children had been in bondage at one time or another. Here is evidence that these people weren't descendants of Abraham. Who is it who could say he was descended from Abraham and had never been in bondage to any man?

If these Jews were of any of the twelve tribes of Israel at all, they would have been in bondage the first time in Egypt. If they belonged to the ten tribe northerly kingdom of Israel, they would have been in bondage the second time in Assyria. If they belonged to the two tribes southern kingdom of Judah, they would have been in bondage the second time in Babylon. Yet the Jews admitted they had never been in bondage to any man, thus demonstrating they weren't of Israel or Judah.

Who could say that 1,800 years earlier that Abraham was one of his ancestors, Esau? Remember Esau and Jacob were twin brothers, born with (presumably) the same bloodline. However, Esau married two Canaanite women in violation of God's law. Esau couldn't leave anything but mongrelized satanic descendants, because among these Hittite Canaanites there was the satanic bloodline.

When the Bible records Esau selling his birthright to Jacob for a bowl of lentil stew, this isn't when he lost his birthright. This was only a formal ceremony by which he gave up any claim to it. Esau lost the birthright when he did the thing that rendered it impossible for him to continue as the head of the clan.

Esau's descendants from then on would be mongrelized. Recognizing he was already out of the line for leadership, Esau sold his inheritance for a bowl of stew. The Bible records that Esau and his two Canaanite wives moved down to Mount Seir, a very rugged mountain range southeast of the Dead Sea. Mount Seir is exactly where some of these people lived who were descendants of the fallen angels. Read Genesis chapter 6, among the people who had the blood line of the fallen angels were these Horites. They were the cave dwellers who were known as Horim.

Suppose a white man married two Negresses here and then moved to the interior of the Congo. For the next 18 centuries his descendants lived there with nobody they could marry except the Negroes around them. Of course the last trace of

white blood would have vanished. Nevertheless, after 18 centuries they could still say they had a white ancestor.

These weren't Negroes, they were satanic Canaanites, but the principle is the same. These Jews talking with Jesus had identified themselves as Edomite Jews. Genesis 36:20-30 lists Esau's descendants. Listed are all the various chieftains among the family of Seir, the Horite satanic line, including his daughter Timna. Genesis 36:12 records that Timna was a concubine to Esau's son Eliphaz and bore him a son Amalek. What a pestilential lot the whole tribe of Amalek was, they all behaved according to their satanic bloodline. You will find a good deal about this in Exodus 17:8-16 and Numbers 20:14-21.

This same satanic conduct, on the part of the Edomites, was repeated as the opportunity arose. Remember when the people of Israel came out of Egypt in the exodus, they wanted to march up to Palestine, they were then attacked by the Edomites. The Israelites were driven back so they had to detour around, down through the wilderness, in the Sinai Peninsula.

When the Babylonians, under Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem, they looted and burned the city and massacred a lot of the inhabitants. Then the Edomites came rushing in to help in the massacre and plunder. The whole book of Obadiah is just one continuous condemnation of the Edomites for the way they acted. This book also predicted their eventual slaughter and punishment for what they did. Obadiah verse 10 records, "For thy violence against thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off forever".

Obadiah verse 15 continues, "For the day of God is near upon all the heathen: as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head". Obadiah verse 18, "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; for there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for God has spoken it."

Exodus 17:14-16 continues, "And God said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven. And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it God Nissi (Yahweh our banner). For he said, because God hath sworn that Yahweh will have war with Amalek from generation to generation."

How did these satanic, mongrel, Edomite Jews get up there into Judea? They came in two principle waves. During the time the southern kingdom of Judah was practically empty during the Babylonian captivity, the Edomites were driven out of Mount Seir by a heavy invasion by the Arab people, the Nabateans from the east. So the Edomites were driven westward. They couldn't go southwest or straight west, they would then be getting into Egyptian territory and they weren't strong enough to fight the Egyptians. Consequently they went slightly northwest

and took over the southerly half of what had been the kingdom of Judah and settled there.

When the small remnant of Judah came back from the Babylonian captivity, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah record that 42,600, or something like that, came back. It lists them by their families and when you run those down you find that slightly over 8,000 of these people were not from any tribe of Israel or Judah. Only 34,000 of the 42,000 that came back were Israelites of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and a few Levites among them.

Since they were too few to drive out these numerous and warlike Edomites, all they could do was settle in the little territory left vacant. To give you an idea of the size of this territory, the entire area of the twelve tribe nation of Israel, before it broke up, picture it as follows. If it were set down here in southern California, it would extend from the Mexican border to the southern part of Los Angeles and inland from the coast it was never more than 40 miles wide.

Now divide this into thirds, the northern two-thirds of that comprised the kingdom of Israel, the ten tribe northern kingdom. Only the southerly one-third of that was the kingdom of Judah. Of that one-third, take out the southern half of that now occupied by the Edomites. This little strip of land is all that remained for the true Judaites and Benjaminites to settle in.

Before the captivity, the tribe of Judah had been in the south, the tribe of Benjamin in the north, with the city of Jerusalem lying right on the boundary line between them. They sorted themselves out as well as they could, the way they were before. Judah was in the south and Benjamin pushed to the north. However, Benjamin couldn't just move up to the north a little bit, because north of them was Samaria. Remember I said you divide this twelve tribe territory into thirds, the middle third constituted Samaria.

Isaiah, Kings and Chronicles record that when the Assyrians captured the northern kingdom of Israel and deported its entire people, they brought other people from Assyria and settled them in Samaria. It purposely failed to say the Assyrians settled anybody in Galilee, the northern most portions, because they didn't, they left it vacant. Now the Judahites pushed the Benjaminites to the north, as they returned from the captivity. They couldn't just move up into Samaria that was fully settled. So Benjamin had to leapfrog over Samaria to the vacant land of Galilee, to the north.

In Galilee was Jesus' own hometown of Nazareth. He was born in Bethlehem, down close to Jerusalem, but His family home was up in Nazareth. Remember, Christ got almost all of His converts up in Galilee and of the twelve disciples only Judas was a Jew. In Bible translations Judas is called Judas Iscariot. There is no such word as Iscariot in any language known to man. This is a corruption of the Hebrew word Ish Keriioth, meaning a man of Keriioth. Keriioth was a little village in the southwestern portion of Judea, down in the territory occupied by the

Edomites. Judas was an Edomite Jew and the only Jew of the twelve disciples. The other eleven were all Galileans, therefore Benjaminite. If a Jew could walk with Jesus for three years and still betray Him, is there any Jew we can trust?

When Jesus was arrested and taken into the high priest's home for illegal questioning, Peter followed Him in. The servant said "Well, you're one of them, you're a Galilean, and your accent shows it". You certainly don't have any trouble telling the southerners from a northern Yankee here in this country do you. They speak English with a different accent and the Galileans spoke the Aramaic of the day, with a little different accent from the Judeans down around Jerusalem.

When the people were gathered at Pentecost, and the Holy Spirit came upon the disciples, they were all there except Judas Iscariot. The disciples began speaking to this assembled multitude in a multitude of different languages. How astonished the people were when they heard the disciples speaking in all these different languages, which obviously they didn't know. The people said, "Aren't these Galileans?" All the remaining disciples were.

Down to the south of what was left of the territory of Judah, these Edomite Jews settled. They were always a pestiferous people and were constantly raiding the southern boundary of Judea. Their descendants are raiding the Arab's territory the same way today. A leopard doesn't change its spots. For a long time, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, the people in Judea were a conquered province of one empire or another, Syria, Egypt and finally Rome. They got their little flare up of independence under the Maccabean kings beginning about 150 B.C. and about 120 B.C.

John Hyrcanus, one of the Maccabean kings, who had by that time a good disciplined army, got tired of these Edomite Jew raids on his southern border. So, Hyrcanus marched down south and defeated these Jews thoroughly. Saul, the first king of Israel, had been told by God, "You go down there and absolutely exterminate these Edomites, don't you leave one of them alive". Saul made a big mistake, as it is always a mistake to disobey God's commands and instructions, he didn't exterminate these loathsome people. When Saul came back the prophet Samuel said, "Because you have disobeyed God, God has deposed you from being king, and He is going to put a better man in your place".

Approximately 900 years later, John Hyrcanus made the same mistake. After he had defeated the Edomites, he then decided he was going to be a missionary; he would convert them to the religion of Judaism. He offered the Edomites a choice; he would spare them if they would accept the religion of Judaism. This was not the religion of the Old Testament ever; it was what was brought back from Babylon with the Babylonian Talmud. The late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise said it briefly and accurately; I have never been able to improve on his words.

The learned Rabbi said, "The return from Babylon and the introduction of the Babylonian Talmud marked the end of Hebrewism and the beginning of

Judaism". The people of the Old Testament were real Hebrews and the religion Yahweh had given them could well be called Hebrewism. This Talmud/Judaism began as the Jews destroyed the religion of the Old Testament. In Christ's time they had not yet given it the name of the Talmud they called it "the tradition of the elders". Remember how often Jesus rebuked them for following their tradition. "Why have ye by your tradition set aside the laws of God?" Jesus was referring to the Talmud.

So, John Hyrcanus was going to be the Billy Graham of his day, he was going to make converts. Hyrcanus told them, "If you will adopt the religion of Judaism, I will give you full citizenship in the kingdom of Judea. If you don't, I will cut your throats". As you well know, this is the most effective missionary technique that has ever been developed. Even Billy Graham doesn't make converts that fast. Naturally the converts made by the sword are of doubtful validity. So the Edomites adopted the religion of Judaism and were accepted in full citizenship in the kingdom. You will find this described in great detail in the one reliable history of that period, Josephus in his history, "Antiquities of the Jews", book 13, chapter 9.

The second wave of Edomites came in when the Edomite chieftain Herod conquered and became king of Judea, under the Roman Empire. Herod was a very able and very evil scoundrel. He raised a large sum of money by taxation and by raiding his neighbors. With this money he bribed Mark Anthony, who was over in Egypt with the Roman legions at this time, to lend him a couple of the Roman legions to add to his own Edomite troops, for the conquest of Judea. With the Roman troops and his own, Herod did capture Judea.

In 40 B.C. the Romans recognized Herod as governor with the title Ethnarch. In 37 B.C., Rome formally recognized Herod as the local king of Judea. He was still subject to Roman foreign policy but he had complete self-government at home. Herod had come in with a conquering army and his Jewish Edomite followers came in with him for the sake of the plunder they could get, they overran the area. They have also gone back to Germany for the same reason. You can learn much about these events in Josephus' "Antiquities of the Jews" books 14-18.

In his other history, the "Wars of the Jews", book 4 chapters 4-5, book 5 and chapter 6 and thereafter, Josephus writes of the horrible conduct of these Edomite Jews within the besieged city of Jerusalem while it was undergoing siege by Titus in the year 70 A.D. Their robbery and massacre of the inhabitants inflicted probably more casualties than the Roman army did. In the Jewish encyclopedia, the article "Edom" (in the edition I used to look it up, it was Volume 5, page 41) the article "Edom" concludes with these words: "The Edomites are found today in modern Jewry".

These Edomites had come in the first time when John Hyrcanus gave them full citizenship. The second time they came in was as a wave of conquerors under Herod. This is the same Herod that tried to murder Christ as a baby. They had

overrun the land. They had control of the entire civil and religious government until the death of Herod.

By will, Herod left the kingdom of Judea to his son Herod Archelaus. The Romans were too wise to trust somebody with the kingdom when they didn't know anything about him. The Romans gave the new Herod a trial period as governor, under the title Ethnarch. For ten years he gave the country the most miserable misrule that any nation ever had. The people finally petitioned Rome to send a Roman to govern them.

The people didn't like the tyranny of Rome at all but conditions were so bad, anything was better than what they had. When a Roman would rather govern the people, you can understand how bad the situation was. The Romans put Herod Archelaus on trial, found him guilty of misrule and banished him to Vienne.

From that time on there were a series of Roman governors called procurators, Pontius Pilate was number 6 in that series. The military government was entirely in the hands of the Roman procurators. They were also in full charge of the tax collections for Rome.

On the other hand, these Herodian Jews had control of the entire religious government and the temple. They also had control of the civil government, in all respects concerning purely local self government, could collect their own taxes and so on.

When the priests were getting greatly upset about Jesus' teachings they said, "If we let Him alone, all men will believe on Him. The Romans will take this kingdom away from us." The way the clergymen have taught it, this is meaningless stupidity. The clergy picture Jesus as a whining, cringing milksop, going around whimpering to people they ought to be good. If this was all Jesus did, these Jews would not have bothered with contempt for Him, much less worry about His teachings.

Jesus was explaining to the people the utter evil of the Jewish economic and religious system under which they were living. Let's paraphrase what the Jews might have said, based on what is recorded in the Bible. "Look, if we let Him alone, He is going to awaken the people to these controls we have over them. They will petition Rome just as they did about Herod Archelaus and the Romans will kick us out of here. We will lose control of the money and might have to pay fair wages. The people might rebel against the usury we charge them for use of their own money." This is what they were talking about.

Here were these Edomite Jews, who told Jesus they were descendants of Abraham. However, they revealed they really couldn't be true Israel when they said they had never been in captivity to any man. They might have had some Israelite ancestors but, no alien blood was allowed in those called Israel. As we read in John 8:31-44, we will come to the place where Christ tells these Jews they

were the children of the devil. They would do the lusts of their father who was a murderer from the beginning.

Jesus recognized the two seed lines. He didn't say these Jews had only adopted some of the bad principles of the devil, He said they were the children of the devil. The Old Testament as well as the New Testament recognizes the two seed lines. The Adamic seed line, God's children, came down through a carefully selected best one in each generation from Abraham, Isaac, Israel, then on down through the twelve tribes of Israel. So there are the two seed lines, that of God's children through Israel and the children of Satan, some of the most pestiferous of which have come through the line of Cain.

People have asked me if I thought the Jews know of their descent from Cain. They certainly do, and here is how they proved they know. The Jews have given the owner of the radio station on which I broadcast, a very bad time. As some of you may know, a radio-broadcasting station license is good for only three years. If it is renewed on a regular basis, you have a going money making business of considerable value. If the license isn't renewed, all you have is some used equipment. It makes a great deal of difference to the owner whether he gets his license renewed or not.

The Jews put pressure on this radio station owner to put two programs off the air. One of the programs was Richard Cotten, a conservative commentator and the other program was mine. Much to the owner's credit, he refused to take us off the air. His reply to the Jews was, "I have no authority to censor any of these programs, besides, this is the United States of America and I believe in free speech." They told him, "You've got to put these programs off the air." The owner of the station answered them, "If either one of them has said anything that you think is untrue, although they are paying for their time, I will give you an equal amount of free time for you to answer them."

Surprise, surprise, the Jews didn't take the station owner up on his offer. Neither Richard Cotten nor I go off the deep end with any statement we can't prove. The Jews still insisted the station owner put us off the air. When he refused, the Jews filed objections to the renewal of his radio station license, which came up for renewal about this time. They kept the matter before the Federal Communications Commission for more than a year so the owner operated his station on a day to day basis, not knowing if his license would be renewed or not.

During this time the Jews terrorized the station owner into to making an agreement. The agreement was the station owner would hire a Jew who would censor my program and Richard Cotten's. This Jew could cut out whatever material the Jews objected to.

I have never sent any cut and spliced tapes to the radio station. When I am paying \$100.00 an hour for broadcast time, tape is the cheapest thing you use. While I have never known of one of my splices to come apart, I don't take any chances on

it. The tapes I send in for broadcast are complete, without splices. When these tapes are returned to me, they are cut and spliced in a number of places where this Jew censor has cut portions of them out.

I don't like a Jew, to remove matters of essential Christian doctrine, can censor it one bit that a Christian broadcast. However, this station owner doesn't have to carry my program. The owner of the station still has to fight the Jews and this is three years later. He finally won before the Federal Communications Commission. The Jews appealed to the U.S. District Court of Appeals and the station owner won there also. The Jews then appealed to the Supreme Court. This radio station owner undoubtedly has spent somewhere between \$50,000 and \$100,000 in legal expenses fighting to retain his radio station license and indirectly to preserve my right of free speech. If I make myself too troublesome to him, he may just decide he doesn't want to carry my program any further so I don't argue with him about it.

On one of my broadcast tapes, I quoted the Bible verses telling that after Cain killed Abel, Cain had been a farmer up to that time, God said, "Cursed is the ground for your sake. I will not hereafter yield you its strength." Cain's reply was, "My punishment is greater than I can bear. You have driven me off the face of the land, and I'll be a wanderer and a vagabond." Then I went on to say that I suppose you have noticed that the children of Cain are not farmers today. You find them in financial and money lending institutions. I didn't use the forbidden word Jew, I just said the children of Cain. Guess what the Jew censor cut out of my tape! As a Jew he knew exactly whom I was talking about. Yes, they know who they are.

The Bible records Cain saying he was being driven out of the land where the descendants of Adam would be. He complained that wherever he went, whomever he met would kill him. In those days there were a lot of places that weren't too hospitable to strangers. If, as the preachers teach, Adam and Eve were the parents of the only people on earth who were these other people? The only other child of Adam and Eve, at this time, was Abel and he was dead.

With Cain driven away from Adam and Eve, out into some other part of the earth, who was Cain going to meet that would kill him? Remember, the Bible records Cain very speedily found enough people that with them he built a city. The Bible records these pre Adamite people. God told Cain He would put a mark on him so the people would recognize him and not kill him. Just what was that mark? Did God tattoo something on the sole of Cain's foot or where Cain would sit down on it? No, long before any hidden mark could possibly be seen, Cain would have been killed.

God had to put this mark where it was the first thing others would see, He put it in the exact geometrical center of Cain's face. This big Jew nose they have borne ever since, as the sculptured monuments of the ancient empires show.

The ancient kings were extremely vain of the conquests they had made. The Pharaohs of Egypt, kings of Babylon, Assyria, and Persia, all left elaborately carved monuments telling how they had captured this city or that. They recorded the massacre of so many of its inhabitants and made slaves of the others, plus how much loot they took and so forth.

In addition to the inscriptions, there was almost always a carved panel illustrating this, showing some of the captives. Wherever any of these panels showed an Israelite, it is invariably a straight nose, typical of what we would call an Anglo Saxon, Scandinavian or Teutonic type of face. Where it shows these Canaanite people, it is always a typical hook nosed Jew.

The evidence of the Bible and the evidence of archaeology all show one thing. There are definitely two different seed lines, the satanic seed line and the other seed line of Israel, God's own children.