

Queensland BIAF Journal

2015

No. 36

British Israel World Federation (Qld) Inc.,
P.O. Box 192, Ferny Grove, Qld. 4055
email: micdor1@optusnet.com.au



Gog and Magog being paraded through the streets of the City of London (not to be confused with London proper, but the financial quarters with the Bank of England in the backdrop, this being a City within a city) during the Mayor's Parade.

“Seek ye first the Kingdom of God
And his righteousness”

OUR BELIEF STATEMENT

The Federation accepts and adheres strictly to the Bible as the revealed Word of God, and as the only rule of faith and practice for Christians; to the Deity of Our Lord Jesus Christ and to the sufficiency of His Atoning Sacrifice for all mankind; and to the unconditional and unchangeable Covenant of God with Abraham as the fundamental truths by which all doctrine must be measured.

In particular the Federation holds as follows:—

That the Bible is Historically, Scientifically, and Doctrinally accurate.

That the Bible contains God's Plan for the Salvation of the Human Race and that this Plan is worked out through His People who:—

“ . . . are Israelites,
To whom pertaineth the Adoption,
And the Glory,
And the Covenants,
And the giving of the Law,
And the service of God,
And the Promises,
And of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came,”

(Romans 10:4-5)

That the Covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is in the final stages of fulfilment through the descendants of the Ephraim-Israel Kingdom—as distinct from the Judah-Israel Kingdom.

That the descendants of the Ephraim-Israel Kingdom are officially organised today in the Commonwealth of British Nations, and in the United States of America.

That the correct interpretation of the Bible depends: upon the terms 'House of Israel', 'House of Judah', and 'House of David' being properly understood in their historical and prophetic settings, and upon an understanding of the distinction between Israel and Judah.

CONTENTS

The Bible Distinction Between the “House of Israel” and “The “House of Judah”	3
The Invasion of Gog and Magog	23
Gog, Magog and the City of London	28
God's Israel People Under His Protection	33
Our Neglected Heritage (continued)	35

The Bible Distinction Between "The House of Israel" and "The House of Judah"

RADIO ADDRESS

By Evangelist F. F. Bosworth

Today there is much teaching on the subject of prophecy, and it is important that there should be. It is very important for every student of prophecy, in fact, it is absolutely necessary for their understanding, to see the distinction the Bible makes between the Jews and the other Tribes of Israel. Until this distinction between the two Houses, Israel and Judah, as that distinction is taught in the Scriptures, is clearly understood, a great portion of the Bible will remain a closed book. This clear distinction between the two Houses is never lost sight of in the Bible, and until it is understood, it is impossible to follow the truth of Scripture on this subject, or to understand the Bible story of Israel. If we had time we could show you that ignorance of this distinction is responsible for much of the infidelity today. Because the pre-millennial promises God made to the "House of Israel" have not been fulfilled to the "House of Judah," they have accused God of unfaithfulness.

Many people today suppose that where Israel is mentioned in the Bible, it means the Jews. We read articles and hear sermons today in which the writers and speakers refer to

"Abraham, the Jew." Isaac and Jacob are often called Jews, the most absurd and impossible thing as we shall see from the Scriptures. It is a common thing today to hear ministers and writers use such phrases as the following:

"The Jews in Egypt"
"The Exodus of the Jews"
"The Jews at Mt. Sinai"
"When the Jews entered Canaan"
"12 Tribes of the Jews"
"Abraham, the Jew"

Thousands of Christians use the terms "Israel," and "Jew," "The House of Israel," "The House of Judah," employing these and similar words and phrases as if they always referred to the same people. They do not know that according to Biblical history, there were no "Jews" known as such until about 15 centuries after Abraham was born, and until 600 years after the death of Moses.

MOST HEBREWS NOT JEWS

Beginning with Adam, we have the start, not only of chronology, but of the genealogical tables of the Bible. There are ten generations from Adam to Noah, and ten generations from Shem (Noah's son) to Abraham. Eber or Heber was the fourth in generation from Shem. All of the descendants of Heber were Hebrews. Abraham was six generations later. He, therefore, was a Hebrew. The Hebrews were not Jews, because Judah, from whom the Jews descended, was not yet born. When the time came that there were Jews on the earth, of course, they also were Hebrews — a very small portion of them — but the great mass of Hebrews were not Jews, and are not today. Let us closely follow the facts.

"Abraham had eight sons. One son was Ishmael whose mother was Hagar. One son was Isaac, whose mother was

Sarah. After Sarah's death, Abraham married Keturah, and she bore unto him six sons. Abraham, being a Hebrew, or descendant of Heber, his descendants would of course be Hebrews, and their descendants would also be Hebrews, but their descendants are not Jews. If they are, then Ishmael, that would make the Arabs Jews. The descendants of Keturah's six sons became the Brahmins of India. It would be foolish to declare that they are Jews, although as the descendants of Abraham, they are of the stock of Heber, and therefore Hebrews. The same reasoning applies to Isaac, Isaac was a Hebrew, the son of Abraham. Now Isaac had two sons, Esau and Jacob. If Isaac was a Jew, then both Esau and Jacob would be Jews. This would make the descendants of Esau also Jews, but the descendants of Esau became the Edomites, later the Turks."

To call Abraham a Jew would make him a descendant of Isaac's yet unborn grandson Judah. The Tribe of Judah had no existence on earth during the time of Abraham and Isaac. If Isaac was a Jew, then surely his twin sons, Jacob and Esau would be Jews. We all know that Esau, Jacob's twin brother, became the progenitor of the Turks, as they are known today. If Jacob was a Jew, how could it be that his twin brother would not be, since they were both born of the same father and mother?

DESCENDANTS DO NOT NAME THEIR ANCESTORS

Jacob, one of these twin brothers had 12 sons, which came from four different mothers. None of these 12 sons were Jews. One of his 12 sons was Judah, but in the sense in which we use the word "Jew" today, the term cannot be applied to Judah, for "he was not a Jew," because of the fact that they whom we call Jews today have certain characteristics and are racially a type that came into existence hundreds of years after

Israel left Egypt. This racial type or remnant we know as the Jews is only a small portion of the descendants of Judah, who was only one of the 12 sons of Jacob. There are no Jews among any of the descendants of Jacob's other 11 sons. Now Judah had three sons. "The descendants of one son, Zarah, peopled the shores of the Mediterranean, leaving Egypt before the exodus of the children of Israel." Pharez, the twin brother of Zarah, became the progenitor of the tribe of Judah. The tribe of Judah descending from Pharez was divided by the Lord into two Houses — the "House of David" and the "House of Judah."

Abraham was the father of Isaac; Isaac was the father of Jacob; Jacob, who was later named "Israel," became the father of Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Dan, Naphthali, Gad, Asher, Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph and Benjamin. The 12 sons each became the head of a Tribe called after his own personal name. From Judah, the fourth son of Jacob, are descended the Jews; the word "Jew" being simply an abbreviation of the name "Judah." A glance at the genealogy will show that it is impossible for Abraham, or Isaac, or Jacob, to have been Jews. Only the descendants of Judah — those coming after him, could be called by his name — not his ancestors. No one had ever been named "Judah" until more than 200 years after Abraham was named. Suppose your parents gave you the name of Charles. That does not name your ancestors, who lived two hundred years before you, Charles. And naming Jacob's fourth son Judah would not make Abraham, his great grandfather, a Jew.

ISRAEL AND JUDAH SEPARATE NATIONS

The 12 Tribes of Israel became two nations, with widely different destinies, until the time when they will be united in the coming age. (Ezek. 37:22) The distinction or

separation between Judah and Israel was foreshadowed at an early date. We read in Psalm 114:1, 2 "*When Israel went out of Egypt...Judah was His sanctuary and Israel His dominion.*" In Samuel's day, the two Houses, Judah and Israel, were numbered separately. In I Samuel 11:8 we read "*And when he numbered them in Bezek, the children of Israel were three hundred thousand and the men of Judah thirty thousand.*" Notice that even at this early date, Israel numbered ten times more than Judah. The Numerical contrast today is very much greater. The Bible tells us that the Jews would be "*few in number,*" but it tells us that Israel would be as the sands of the sea for multitudes (Hosea 1:10). The Scriptures tell us that David reigned seven years over Judah before he was made King over Israel. If Judah and Israel are the same, how could David be king for seven years over Judah before he was made King over Israel? Until the year 975 B.C. the descendants of Jacob formed one nation. But they are spoken of as "*the two families which the Lord hath chosen*" (Jer. 33:24).

In the year 975 B.C. at the death of King Solomon, the nation was divided into two nations. In I Samuel 18:16 the expression "*All Israel*" is used, when Judah is excluded. I will quote you this passage: "*But all Israel and Judah loved David, because he went out and came in before them.*" In II Chronicles 10:12-14 we are told that when Solomon died, and his son Rehoboam came to the throne, the ten tribes rebelled, and under Jereboam, formed the NORTHERN NATION; while Judah, along with Benjamin and certain Levites, formed the SOUTHERN NATION.

The NORTHERN NATION, which consisted of the Ten Tribes, was known under the following national titles: Israel, Ephraim, Isaac, Samaria, The House of Israel, The House of Judah and The Ten Tribes.

THE DIVISION WAS OF GOD

The SOUTHERN NATION, which consisted of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, was known as "Judah," "The House of Judah" or "The Jews." The capital of the SOUTHERN NATION was Jerusalem. If I had more time, I would quote you the Scriptures which show that this division of the Tribes of Israel into two nations was Divinely Predetermined, Divinely Predicted, Divinely Emphasized, Divinely Maintained, Divinely Accomplished, Divinely Explained, Divinely Approved. The Scriptures show that this division into Two Kingdoms had behind it and controlling it, the fore-ordaining eternal councils of God; and it took place for great, beneficent, well-defined and Divine reasons.

In Jeremiah the 3rd chapter, Israel is five times called "*Backsliding Israel*," a term never once applied to Judah, and Judah is four times called "*Treacherous Judah*," a term not once applied to Israel. I will read you this passage: "*And I saw, when for all the causes whereby BACKSLIDING Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.*" (Jer. 3:8) Ask those who declare that Israel and Judah are the same people to read that passage, analyzing it in the light of their belief. And there are many such passages showing the clear distinction between Israel and Judah. There are more than 2000 references to Israel in the Bible that have no reference whatever to the Jews. On the other hand, there are more than five hundred references to Judah that have no reference to Israel, and yet there are those continually trying to tell us there is no distinction between Israel and Judah, and continually refer to Israel as Jews, and even change the name of Judah to Israel. It is absurd as to use the words America and England interchangeably.

Here is another quotation for them to explain: "*Backsliding Israel hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah.*" Make Israel and Judah one and the same people referred to, and the statement becomes ridiculous. Many today are evidently unacquainted with the fact that, according to Biblical history, there was not a single "Jew" known as such upon the face of the earth earlier than 600 years after the death of Moses, or about 1500 years after Abraham was born. There were, of course, Hebrews and Israelites long before that time; Abraham and Isaac were Hebrews; but they were neither Israelites nor Jews. The 12 sons of Jacob were Hebrews and Israelites, but they were not Jews. The same may be said of Moses and Aaron, of the people of the Northern Kingdom, of Elijah and Elisha. To avoid confusion over the expression "Israel" it is necessary to determine in which sense it is used in any particular passage, whether it means:

- (1) "The whole of the Twelve Tribes;
- (2) Or the House of Judah alone as being a part of the Twelve Tribes;
- (3) Or the Ten-Tribed Kingdom."

TEN TRIBED ISRAEL NEVER CALLED JEWS

Nothing can be more unscriptural than to call all Israelites "Jews;" it is as absurd as calling all Americans Californians. Most of Israelites are not Jews because they are the descendants of the other tribes of Israel. There is just as much reason for calling all Israelites "Danites" or "Gadites" or "Ephramites" as there is for calling them Judahites or "Jews." It is just as reasonable to call all "Jews" "Danites" as it is to call all "Danites" "Jews." The term Jew is never used until more than a thousand years after Abraham. It appears for the first time in II Kings 16:6, where we are told that the King of Israel,

together with the King of Assyria, made war against the King of Judah. Now since in this passage Israel, one Kingdom, made war against the Jews, another Kingdom, how can they both be the Jews? The Scriptures never once refer to the Ten-Tribed House of Israel as "The Jews;" neither past, present, nor future. The term "The Jews" is never, in God's Word, applied to the 12 Tribes, collectively, or to the Ten-Tribed House of Israel.

Bishop J. A. Allen of California, speaking of this modern confusion which we are discussing writes:

"For ecclesiastical writers to ignore the national and racial representative Israelitish names of Joseph, Ephraim, and Samaria — the name of Israel's former capital city, as used in history and prophecy — and to substitute "The Jews" either as a name or as a people, calling them the sole representatives of Israel's race, is not only the height of ignorance, but THE GREAT ECCLESIASTICAL CRIME OF THE AGES. Truly an enemy hath done this."

In Jeremiah 13:11, nearly 400 years after the tribes were divided by God into the two kingdoms, "The Whole House of Israel" and "The Whole House of Judah" are both spoken of in the same verse, proving that neither House without the other constitutes all of the Lord's chosen people. "The Whole House of Judah" are not all of the Lord's people, and "The Whole House of Israel" are not all of the Lord's people. It takes "The Whole House of Israel" together with "The Whole House of Judah" to make all of God's chosen people; and comparatively few of these are Jews. This text proves conclusively that there is a people called the "Whole House of Israel" of which the "Whole House of Judah" is regarded as neither part nor parcel. The Holy Spirit has never either in Biblical history or prophecy, called the 10 Tribed House of Israel "Jews". They have never been called "Jews" except by uninformed and unscriptural teachers.

BIRTHRIGHT PEOPLE ARE NOT JEWS

The fact that Jacob's two wives, Leah and Rachel, are spoken of as "*building the House of Israel*," of necessity divides the immediate household of Jacob into "*two families*." In Jeremiah 33:24 they are spoken of as "*the two families which the Lord hath chosen*." The Covenant promise of the BIRTHRIGHT was given to one of these families, and that of the SCEPTRE to the other family. Rachel was to be the mother of "thousands of millions" while Leah was to be the mother of royalty. Genesis 49:10 shows us that Judah represents the SCEPTRE family; and I Chronicles 5:2 tells us "*THE BIRTHRIGHT is Joseph's*." Never try to apply a BIRTHRIGHT blessing to the Jews. Judah and the Jews were excluded from the BIRTHRIGHT promises, Joseph from the SCEPTRE. The BIRTHRIGHT people are not, and are never in the Scriptures called Jews.

In Ezekiel the 37th chapter we are told that "the two sticks" which are still separate, but which are yet to be reunited, represent Judah on the one hand, and Joseph and the "House of Israel" on the other. One of these sticks represents the SCEPTRE people and the other the BIRTHRIGHT people. Judah, the inheritor of the SCEPTRE, is only a half bother to Joseph, the inheritor of the BIRTHRIGHT. The SCEPTRE and the BIRTHRIGHT inheritors are "two-families" with different mothers. How could the distinction between the SCEPTRE and the BIRTHRIGHT families Judah and Israel be more emphatic?

ISRAEL DISTINCT FROM JUDAH

Unless we see the distinction between the "House of Israel" and the "House of Judah" from the time of the division till the final and glorious reunion of the Two Houses, which

will take place at the end of the "latter days," the prophecies concerning Israel cannot be understood. From the time of the division into two kingdoms until now, Judah and Israel have remained absolutely distinct. They were carried into captivity separately, at different times and by different nations, because Israel was taken into captivity by the Assyrians, 721 B.C. (II Kings 17:6); while Judah was carried into captivity 133 years later by the Babylonians 588 B.C. (II Kings 25:21). A portion of Judah returned after 70 years, as had been predicted (Ezra 2:1), but Israel never returned, nor was there any prediction that she would return until the final, glorious, restoration in the near future. All the prophecies were written after the division of the tribes into two nations; and these prophecies give the whole future of Israel as entirely distinct from Judah.

The great Jewish historian Josephus, writing from Rome in the year 70 A.D. which was nearly 800 years after Israel was taken into captivity by the Assyrians says: "The entire body of the 10 Tribes are still beyond the Euphrates, an immense multitude not to be estimated by number." It is estimated that there were 50 million in Israel at the time of the division, and this was 800 years later.

Rev. Canon Faucett M.A. says in his "Critical and Expository Bible Encyclopedia" The idea that the House of Israel has been amalgamated and incorporated with the "Jews," is one of the most amazing errors in Biblical History.

The prophets write of Israel and Judah still being separate people in "the latter days," or the days of the Gospel dispensation. In the 37th chapter of Ezekiel is a prophecy yet to be fulfilled. God promising to unite the stick of Joseph, representing the House of Israel with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick in His hand. This and many other Scriptures require that Israel and Judah be kept separate until this union which has not yet taken place.

According to the prophet Hosea, the House of Israel in the last days was to become as the sands of the sea for number, before their reunion with the House of Judah, and their return, representatively, to Palestine (Hosea 1:10, 11). Also Jeremiah writes: "*When ye be multiplied and increased in the land in those days...the House of Judah shall walk with the House of Israel and they shall come together out of the land of the north, to the land that I gave for an inheritance unto your Fathers*" (Jer. 3:16-18).

In Jeremiah 30:3, 4 we have a prophecy yet to be fulfilled concerning the uniting of the two Houses. Here we read: "*For the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of MY PEOPLE Israel and Judah; and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers and they shall possess it. And these are the words that the Lord spake concerning Israel and concerning Judah.*" Here God calls Israel and Judah "My People Israel and Judah." So if Judah, the Jews, are the people of the Lord, then the Lord has a people besides the Jews whom He calls Israel and who are not counted among the Jews.

Long before the division took place, Moses, while prophesying unto the seed of Jacob, cried out: "*Hear, Lord, the voice of Judah and bring him unto his people:*" (Deut. 33:7). This plainly shows that Judah was to be separated from his people and finally brought back to them. And the Scriptures tell us that shall not be until at the end of "the last days."

NO EVIDENCE FOR AMALGAMATION THEORY

Orthodox Jews, even to this day, know that they do not represent the Ten-Tribed House of Israel. On the day of the Feast of Trumpets and on the Day of Atonement, they include in their prayer Jeremiah 31:20, and pray that Ephraim Israel (the Ten-Tribes) may be united with them. If we had time, we

could quote from the testimony of Jewish scholars, and from their literature, showing that they know they are not representatives of the Ten-Tribed House of Israel. We have quotations from the "Jewish Encyclopedia," "The Jewish Religion," "The Jewish Chronicle," Rabbi Gershom, Prof. Neubauer, "The History and Literature of the Israelites," "The Jewish Quarterly Review," etc. The Rabbi Dr. Hertz, of London, says: "People known at present as Jews are descendants of the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin...we look forward to the gathering of all the Tribes at some future date." The learned Isaac Leiser says that "The Israelitish nation was left in banishment after the return of the Jews from Babylon." Professor Neubauer wrote: "The hope of the return of the ten tribes has never ceased among the Jews in exile." Josephus, a Jew, and loyal to Jewish history and tradition, wrote about 70 A.D. or about 800 years after the captivity of Ten-Tribed Israel as follows: "The 10 Tribes did not return to Palestine; only two Tribes served the Romans after Palestine became a Roman province."

Jeremiah prophesied that only they who were taken by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon were to return. Then the historical fulfillment of that prophecy must see only a return of those taken to Babylon. Both Ezra and Nehemiah testify to the fact that historically only those taken by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon did return (Ezra Chapter 2: Nehemiah Chapter 7).

The return to Palestine of the 10 Tribes at any time in the past is contrary to Kings and Chronicles, contrary to Ezra, Nehemiah, Zechariah, Jerome and Josephus, and to history. In the prophecy that the "Two Sticks," Judah, and the House of Israel will become "*one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one King (the Lord Jesus Christ) shall be King to them all*" we have Divine proof that the two Houses are still

separate, because Christ is not reigning over them as King at the present time.

In connection with the return of the Jews from Babylon, Nehemiah says: "*I saw Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, and of Ammon, and of Moab,*" (Nehemiah 13:23). Ezra declares the same fact, naming the Hittites as among those with whom marriages were consummated. In Ezra 9:1, Ezra says "*They have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed has mingled themselves with the people of those lands: yea, the hands of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass.*" You can see how the facial expressions of all the descendants of these intermarriages would differ from that of the pure descendants of Judah, and still more from the BIRTHRIGHT TRIBES who were only half-brothers of Judah to begin with.

When Jesus told the Jews in his day that he would go where they could not find Him, though they should seek for Him, the Jews, knowing of Israel still in dispersion, inquired: "*Will He go to the dispersed among the Gentiles?*" (John 7:35). This passage shows that the Jews knew that the Ten Tribes were still in dispersion among the Gentiles.

God divided the Abrahamic promises among Jacob's twelve sons, and when He said through Jacob that Ephraim's "*Seed shall become a multitude of nations.*" He was not referring to the Jews who never have or ever will be "a multitude of nations," God was speaking to the BIRTHRIGHT heirs. The "Nation and a Company of Nations" promised in Gen. 35:11 was a BIRTHRIGHT BLESSING TO BE FULFILLED in the last days before Christ's Return (Gen. 49:1) to Joseph and his descendants (I Chron. 5:1), none of which are Jews. In Jer. 31:9, God said, "*Ephraim is My firstborn,*" and in Gen. 48:19, Jacob said of Ephraim, "*His seed shall become a multitude of nations*" — just the opposite of what was said of Judah — "*He shall become a remnant.*" That

this promise to Israel was not to Judah is proven by the fact that Judah has never been a multitude of nations, and never will be. And so, more than 2,000 times God refers to Israel when what He says has no more to do with the Jews than with the Germans, or the Italians or the Chinese, or the Russians. On the other hand, the word "Jew" is mentioned 265 times, and in no instance does it refer to the Northern Kingdom of Israel or to any of their descendants.

THE AMALGAMATION THEORY RECEIVES NO SUPPORT FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE

The book of Micah plainly teaches that the Jews who "halted" were to become "A remnant," while Israel "that was cast far off," was to become "a strong nation" (Micah 4:7). The bringing together of these "two families" is to be associated with the Kingdom-Age. Till then, they would be separate. Some errors are slow in dying but this amalgamation-assumption which falsifies hundreds of Scriptures is now only lingering upon its death bed.

It is important to notice that neither the Major nor the Minor Prophets appear in the Old Testament until about 200 years after the division of the Twelve Tribes into two nations. What then did they find was the condition of God's chosen race? Was there any sign of amalgamation among them? Not a scintilla. The prophets found them still divided into two nations; as separate as France and Italy, or Britain and America. They had separate Kings, separate administrations, separate national alliances, and of course, separate national titles. The National title of the Ten Tribes was "Israel," or "Ephraim," because the Tribe of Ephraim had become the Tribe of the Birthright owing to the sin of Reuben. We have seen that the national title of the other two tribes was "Judah," a remnant of which were later called "The Jews."

It was during this state of affairs that the prophets commenced their ministry — some residing in the territory of Israel, and others in that of Judah. The Prophets addressed these two nations by the names that God gave them — "Israel" being the title which the Northern Nation had decided to retain; and "Judah" being the title which the Southern Nation had decided to assume. Hence we find that all through their writings, whether of warning, of rebuking, or directing, or consoling; and whether their words were historical or prophetic, the prophets recognized the separate condition of the Two Nations, and accordingly addressed them by their chosen and well-known national titles.

TEN TRIBED ISRAEL A NON-JEWISH PEOPLE

The separation into the Two Nations took place many years before any of the major or minor prophets wrote; therefore, the "Israel" known to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the minor prophets, our Lord, the evangelists, and the apostles, had no Tribe of Judah in it. Israel, as known to all of these writers, was a non-Jewish people. Israel has remained a non-Jewish people to this day. The amalgamation theory is hopelessly discredited in the presence of the Bible. The closing books of Bible history leave Israel and Judah in separation from each other, while Bible prophecy keeps them separated until reconciled and united in the Kingdom-Age, and are dwelling representatively in the Holy Land under the personal reign of the Lord Jesus Christ, their welcomed and Crowned Messiah.

Hosea's statement that Israel shall be "*as the sand of the sea which cannot be measured nor numbered*" is not made concerning Judah (Hosea 1:10). In the first chapter we read "*Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of*

Jezebel." Did the two nations of captives "gather together" and amalgamate while in the land of their captivities? Did they "together appoint themselves one head" when the small remnant of Judah returned from Babylon? Both Ezra and Nehemiah, who were the historians of the Babylonian return, inform us that this was not the case.

That this uniting of Judah and Israel did not take place when the remnant of Judah returned after the Babylonian captivity, is clearly proved by Jeremiah's prophecy in the third chapter where we are told that "*The House of Judah shall walk with the House of Israel and they shall come together out of the land of the North to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers*" (Jer. 3:18). Nothing like this has yet taken place. The 17th verse of this chapter shows us that when Israel and Judah unite, Jerusalem will be so fully under Divine truth and influence that she will be called "The Throne of Jehovah." This shows us that this uniting of the Two Houses has not yet taken place, and when it does it will not be a Jewish Nation. It will be the Israel Nation.

Of this reunion of Israel and Judah, Jeremiah in the 50th chapter and 4th verse says, "*In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together: They shall go on their way weeping, and shall seek the Lord their God.*" It was not in "the former days" but at the end of "the latter days" [after the "seven times" or 2520 years punishment of both Houses has run out] that this is prophesied to take place; and if Israel is already amalgamated with Judah — this and other prophecies can never be fulfilled. Jeremiah goes on to say in the 20th verse, "*In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found; for I will pardon them whom I leave as a remnant.*" We all know that such a return and union of Israel and Judah has never yet taken place.

RETURN "TOGETHER OUT OF THE LAND OF THE NORTH"

According to the amalgamation theory, which has no support of the Scripture, Israel would have gone south to join Judah instead of Judah going north to join Israel for Jeremiah says *"In those days, the House of Judah shall walk with the House of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers."* We know that this has never yet happened. This is not true even of Judah's return from Babylon. They returned from the south. When Israel and Judah become *"one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, they are to have one King and be no more two nations"* says Ezekiel (37:22). That this uniting of Israel and Judah was not in the past is again proven by the fact that the Jews have never had a King since they went into Babylonian captivity. As a matter of undeniable fact, there never has been, to this very day, a Davidic King reigning in the Holy Land from the year B.C. 586, when the temple was destroyed, and the House of Judah was carried away captive to Babylon. Anyhow it was not of any human monarch that Ezekiel wrote when his prophetic vision spanned the gulf of ages, and he beheld the glories of the Crowned Redeemer and of His ransomed, restored, and united Israel. Ezekiel had reference to Him of whose Second Coming we read; *"And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written: KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS"* (Rev. 19:16).

And then, I ask, did the returned captives abide in the land "forever"? The prophet tells us that when Israel and Judah are reunited, their descendants were to be in perpetual occupation of the land. We know that this has never taken place because the Jews were suddenly driven out in A.D. 70,

and have been wanderers for 18 centuries. This shows again that the Ten Tribes did not go back with the Jews when they returned from Babylon.

Jerome was one of the most eminent of the early fathers of the Church. He wrote, in the 4th century, which was more than a thousand years after Ten Tribed Israel went into captivity as follows: "Unto this day, the ten Tribes are subject to the Kings of Persia" - - "The Ten Tribes inhabit at this day the cities and mountains of the Medes." He knew that Israel had not returned to Judah, that the ten tribes were still separated from the Jews.

Ezra, in the 2nd chapter and the 1st verse, shows us that those who returned to Jerusalem were all from one "province." This word is in the singular. This is proof that the House of Israel who were captive not in this "province," but in another country, did not return.

In the book of Ezra, which mentions the two tribes that returned, none of the Ten Tribes were listed. And in the book of Nehemiah, which says that only Judah and Benjamin returned, none of the ten tribes are mentioned.

In Zechariah the 10th chapter, which was written 18 years after the Jews had returned from Babylon, the prophet shows that when he wrote, the Two Houses of Israel and Judah were still separate. And then all His prophecies concerning Israel require that they shall be kept separate from Judah as a people until their future uniting. On page 500 of the Scofield Bible, Dr. Scofield says, "The two Kingdoms are to be reunited in the future Kingdom" and then cites a number of Scriptures to prove the assertion.

The amalgamation-theory is hopeless. It is a mere assumption. All who hold that theory will have to abandon it if they follow the testimony of Holy Scripture. If they adhere to their theory they will be in conflict with the Word of God, and with all the historical facts. Their theory breaks down at every

point. None of those who hold that Israel was amalgamated with the Jews can tell you when the amalgamation took place. Just so the Scriptures, which require that Israel shall be a great military power in the last days, cannot be applied to the Jews; and they are not applicable to Israel during the Millennium when there will be no wars. These promises are pre-millennial, and not consistent with millennial times.

The many Scriptures also which require that Israel in these last days shall be a maritime people "*whose seed shall be in many waters*" cannot be applied to the Jews; but they apply perfectly to the BIRTHRIGHT section of Isaac's descendants to whom the promises were made.

We have seen in other broadcasts that Jerusalem was trodden down of the Gentiles exactly "seven times" or 2520 years to the very day. Obadiah in the 17th verse speaks of the soldiers under General Allenby, who delivered Jerusalem from the Turks on the exact day and in the exact manner in which God says Jerusalem would be delivered, as belonging to the House of Jacob (verse 17). The next verse shows us what part of "The House of Jacob" they were — "The House of Joseph." And the next verse shows what part of the House of Joseph they were — "Ephraim;" and in the same verse He speaks of them as "the children of Israel." Also in Ezekiel 25:14 God shows us that it would be Israel who would drive out the Turks and end the "treading down of the Gentiles" in Palestine. To insist that these Scriptures addressed to Israel are to be applied to the Jews is to call the soldiers of General Allenby Jews.

Thus, you see that if we were to discuss each of the hundreds of Bible references to Israel as distinct from the Jews, it would furnish matter for a large volume.

In the authorized daily prayer book of the United Hebrew Congregation of the British Empire, there are three prayers which they pray for Israel as distinct from themselves. They pray both for "Judah" and "Israel." In one of these

prayers they speak of Ephraim-Israel as "our brethren." Dr. V. Herman Adler, who in the past was chief rabbi of the Jewish Church in England, wrote:

"The Ten Tribes did not return to the Holy Land."

In this discussion over the air, we have given you but a small part of the Biblical and historical proof of the distinction between Israel and Judah. We have scarcely touched upon the many wonderful prophecies concerning "Israel" which have no reference to the Jews, nor upon those relating to "Judah" which have no reference to Israel. To discuss these even briefly would furnish material for a good sized book.

For instance, to apply to the Jews the many Scriptures which require that the descendants of Ephraim shall be "a multitude (or Commonwealth) of Nations" (Gen. 48:19) in these "last days," before the union of the Two Houses, Judah and Israel, would be equivalent to saying that the only "Commonwealth of Nations" on earth today are Jews. The Anglo-Saxon Nations are Isaac's sons or Saxons, but they are not Jews. Only one of the twelve Tribes are descendants of Judah. The Promise of "A Multitude of Nations" was made to Ephraim, not to Judah.

Again, Gen. 48:19 shows us that two great rival nations were to spring from Joseph "in the last days."

¹⁹And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.

To insist on applying this Scripture to the Jews, is equivalent to calling these great rival nations Jews.

THE INVASION OF GOG AND MAGOG

by Rev Stephen E. Jones D.D.

Ezekiel 38 and 39 prophesies an invasion of “*the mountains of Israel*” coming from a coalition of forces led by “*Gog of the land of Magog.*” This prophecy assures us that Gog is one of the bad guys, and that God will destroy their army.

Ezekiel 38:3 says, “*Thus says the Lord God, Behold, I am against you, O Gog, prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal.*” Ezekiel 38:16 says, “*and you [Gog] will come up against My people Israel **like a cloud to cover the land.***”

It is almost universally believed that this is a Russian invasion of Palestine. It is said that “Rosh” is Russia, Meshech is Moscow, and Tubal is Tobolsk, the historic Russian capital of Siberia.

I have no quarrel with these locations. However, a fact often missed is that this same “Gog” comes not only from the land of Magog and Tubal, but also from Persia, Ethiopia, Put [Libya], Gomer, and Beth-Togarmah (38:5, 6).

In other words, Gog comes from many locations, and they are not necessarily Persians, Ethiopians, Libyans, etc., but people who have been living there.

To me, this describes Zionism itself, because Jews immigrated to Palestine from all of these locations and more “*to cover the land.*” Most of the Israeli population is Ashkenazi from Russia and Eastern Europe. Yet others are Sephardic from the Middle East and North Africa. Still others are the Falashi Jews from Ethiopia.

There are two Gomers of Scripture. Since Ezekiel mentions Gomer as one of the invaders, we need to distinguish between these two Gomers. Ezekiel was obviously speaking of Gomer the son of Japheth (Gen. 10:2 and 3).

² The sons of Japheth were Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tubal and Meshech and Tiras. ³ And the sons of Gomer were Ashkenaz and Riphath and Togarmah.

Because Ezekiel pairs Gomer with Magog, Tubal, Meshech, and Togarmah, it is certain that this is the correct Gomer. So it is safe to say that the prophecy is not about Gomer, the wife of Hosea, who was a prophetic type of the dispersed ten tribes of Israel.

The most significant grouping listed in Ez. 38:6 is the Beth-Togarmah, or “House of Togarmah.” There is solid historic data on the whereabouts of Togarmah, but this is not well known, because it utterly contradicts the preconceived notions of the prophecy teachers. One of the sons of Togarmah in history was Khazar (or Chazar), a nation in southern Russia which converted to Judaism somewhere between 620 and 740 A.D., according to the Jewish Encyclopaedia.

At first, only the king and the nobles converted to Judaism, but within a few generations the vast majority of the common people followed their example. In 960 A.D. a Jewish doctor in Spain heard of a Jewish Kingdom north of the Black Sea. He wrote a letter to the king of the Khazars and sent it by Arab courier. He eventually received a reply from King Joseph of the Khazars, answering his questions:

“Joseph then proceeds to provide a genealogy of his people. Though a fierce Jewish nationalist, proud of wielding the 'Sceptre of Judah,' he cannot, and does not, claim for them Semitic descent; he traces their ancestry not to Shem, but to Noah's third son, Japheth; or more precisely to Japheth's grandson, Togarma, the ancestor

of all Turkish tribes. Joseph asserts boldly, 'that Togarmah had ten sons, and the names of their offspring are as follows: Uigur, Dursu, Avars, Huns, Basili, Tarniakh, Khazars, Zagora, Bulgars, Sabir. We are the sons of Khazar, the seventh'" [The Thirteenth Tribe, Arthur Koestler, p. 72]

History shows the Khazar kingdom to be living in the lands of Gog and Magog.

The ninth-century monk Druthmar of Aquitaine, in his commentary on Matthew 24:14 in *Expositio in Matthaenum Evangelistam*, stated that the *Gazari*, or Khazars, dwelt "in the lands of **Gog and Magog**." . . .

According to Benjamin H. Freedman, himself a Jew and an apparent long-time associate and confidant of presidents and statesmen, in an address presented in 1961 at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., the Khazars were so belligerent and hostile that they were eventually run out of Asia and scattered amongst the nations of Eastern Europe. Heinrich von Neustadt, around 1300, wrote of them as the "terrifying people of Gog and Magog."

<http://www.apfn.org/thewinds/library/khazars.html>

The American Centre of Khazar Studies has a website with a great deal of information about the Jewish Khazars. Go to: <http://www.khazaria.com/>

When I first came across this information in the mid-1970's, I was as shocked as many of you may be upon hearing this. How could such a big part of history go unnoticed? How is it that so many Jews are familiar with this, but the Christian prophecy teachers know little or nothing about it?

Does it make a difference? Only if we want to properly identify Gog and Magog in Ezekiel 38 and 39. That prophecy does not describe a RUSSIAN invasion of Palestine. It describes a Russian-Jewish invasion, not so much with

uniformed troops, but an invasion by immigration “*as a cloud to cover the land.*”

This is why the invasion comes also from Persia (Iran), Ethiopia, Libya, and other places. It is a coalition of Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews coming from everywhere.



Is it not interesting that the Ashkenazi Jews of Eastern Europe—who comprise a vast majority of today's Jews—name themselves after the grandson of Japheth in Gen. 10:3. Ashkenaz was the brother of Togarmah, and both were sons of Japheth's Gomer. Magog, Tubal, and Meshech were their uncles.

So if we are to interpret Ezekiel 38 and 39 correctly, it is self-evident that we have to identify the characters properly,

and not go merely on the land from which they come. Once again, this is largely a case of mistaken identity. I have no doubt that God has hidden these things from the Church in order to establish His purposes. If the Church knew what was happening, they would not have supported the Zionist movement, and that prophecy may have never happened!

But Isaac was the blind servant. God therefore has blinded the eyes of His people in order to set them free, according to the law (Ex. 21:26).

²⁶ And if a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish; he shall let him go free for his eye's sake.

Isaiah speaks of this blindness in chapter 29,

¹⁰ For the Lord has poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath he covered. ¹¹ And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, . . .

As long as a prophecy teacher functions in blindness, he has less liability for not teaching correctly. More than that, if God has blinded him, he has the right to appeal to the Divine Court, even as Samson did in Judges 16:28.

Hence, we see that Ezekiel 38, 39 does not contradict either Isaiah 29:1-6 or Jeremiah 19. Isaiah 29 calls Jerusalem by the name of “Ariel” which can mean either the “lion of God” or the “fire place of God.” The meaning becomes obvious when you read verses 1 to 6,

All of the prophets are agreed that the Zionist conquest of “the mountains of Israel” will fail. Jeremiah says God will break the city and the people in such a way that it can never be rebuilt again. Isaiah describes a nuclear incident. Ezekiel focuses on the Zionist method of conquest—that is, conquest by immigration. But they all speak of the same end.

GOG, MAGOG AND THE CITY OF LONDON

The Lord Mayor's Show takes place on the 2nd Saturday in November every year, when the new Lord Mayor of the City of London takes office, and makes a ceremonial journey from the City to Westminster. He or she swears their loyalty to the reigning monarch, and then makes their way back for a banquet at Mansion House.



The statues of Gog and Magog in the City of London Guildhall

The current Guildhall was begun in 1411 and completed in 1440, and it is the only non-ecclesiastical stone building in the City to have survived through to the present day. The possible derivation for the word "guildhall" is the Anglo-Saxon "gild", meaning payment, with a "gild-hall" being where citizens would pay their taxes, the centre for collecting money.

The procession starts at Guildhall, and consists of hundreds of floats, horses, people, bands and more, all celebrating hundreds of years of London history. At the head of the parade are two wicker giants, representing Gog and Magog, supposed guardians of the City of London. Two smaller versions of Gog and Magog stand permanently on display inside the Guildhall itself, but the ones that take part in the march to Westminster at the head of the parade are shown on the front page.

So how did Gog and Magog come to be the idols of the City of London? According to legends collated and no doubt embellished by Geoffrey of Monmouth in the 12th century, the mythical King Brutus, first King of Britain, set up his palace on the site where Guildhall now stands. Two giants named Gog and Magog used to live there before Brutus set up home, and upon arrival he defeated them, tamed them, and shackled them outside his palace, to become guardians of his estate.

By the 15th century the story had sufficiently grown that Gog and Magog were considered guardians of the City of London, and took up their place in the annual Lord Mayor's parade. And ever since Londoners have adopted them to their hearts as protectors of the City.

The Bible has a bit to say about Gog and Magog, but none of it casts them in the positive light that the City of London sees them in. They are mentioned in three passages in scripture:

Genesis 10:2, a reference to Magog in the table of nations.

Ezekiel chapters 38 and 39, an end times prophecy describing God as being against Gog, chief prince of the land of Magog.

Revelation 20:7-9, **And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, ⁸ And shall**

go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog, and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. ⁹And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them.

Why have figures closely associated with Satan, and who oppose Jesus at the final battle of Armageddon, been adopted as the guardians of the “City of London”? Firstly we must understand what the “City of London,”—known as the “City”— is and how it came about. The “City” became a sovereign state circa 1694 in the time of King William III of Orange. Although the Rothschilds did not become associated with the Bank until 1812, the Bank of England has always played a prominent role in not only European, but American history also. Like other enterprises with which they have been connected, the Bank has been a centre of international intrigue and espionage since its founding in 1694, and had originated in a revolution as William III, Prince of Orange, drove King James II from the throne. One of the most important acts of William’s reign was his granting of the charter of the Bank of England to the banker William Patterson. Through this, the power over England’s money system fell into private hands.

“To the majority of people the words “Crown” and “City” in reference to London refer to the Queen or the capital of England.

This is not the truth. The “City” is in fact a privately owned Corporation – or Sovereign State – occupying an irregular rectangle of 677 acres and located right in the heart of the 610 square mile ‘Greater London’ area. The population of ‘The City’ is listed at just over four thousand, whereas the population of ‘Greater London’ (32 boroughs) is approximately seven and a half million.

“The Crown” is a committee of twelve to fourteen men who rule the independent sovereign state known as London or ‘The City.’ ‘The City’ is not part of England. It is not subject to the Sovereign. It is not under the rule of the British parliament. Like the Vatican in Rome, it is a separate, independent state.

Henk Ruysenaars’ article on July 10th 2006 drew attention to the book “Descent into Slavery” by Des Griffin in which the real meaning of the term “City of London” is explained. The following is an excerpt from that article.

“The City”, which is often called “the wealthiest square mile on earth,” has its own Lord Mayor. Here are grouped together Britain’s great financial and commercial institutions: it houses the branch offices of 385 wealthy foreign banks, 70 US banks, all dominated by the privately-owned (Rothschild controlled) Bank of England. It also houses Lloyd’s of London, the London Stock Exchange, and the offices of most of the leading international trading concerns. Here, also, is located Fleet Street, the heart and core of the newspaper and publishing worlds.

The Lord Mayor, who is elected for a one year stint, is the monarch in the City. As Aubrey Menen says in “London”, Time-Life, 1976, p. 16:

“The relation of this monarch of the City to the monarch of the realm [Queen] is curious and tells much.”

It certainly is and certainly does!

When the Queen of England goes to visit the City she is met by the Lord Mayor at Temple Bar, the symbolic gate of the City. She asks for permission to enter his private, sovereign State. During such State visits “the Lord Mayor in his robes and chain, and his entourage in medieval costume, outshines the royal party, which can dress up no further than service uniforms.” The Lord Mayor leads the queen into his city.

Tax journalist Nicholas Shaxson said, "Whenever the Queen makes a State entry to the City, she meets a red cord

raised by City police at Temple Bar, and then engages in a colourful ceremony involving the Lord Mayor, his Sword, assorted Aldermen and Sheriffs, and a character called the Remembrancer. In this ceremony, the Lord Mayor recognises The Queen's authority, but the relationship is complex: as the corporation itself says: "The right of the City to run its own affairs was gradually won as concessions were gained from the Crown."



This painting by Alexander Talbot Rice pictures Queen Elizabeth II doing obeisance to the Mayor of the “City” by touching his Sword of Authority before entering his domain.

I will write on this more fully in a future edition and relate how the Jews through the House of Rothschild took control of the British Empire and her Crown Colonies through usurious financial means not only in Britain but also the United States of America and most of the nations of the world.

GOD'S ISRAEL PEOPLE UNDER HIS PROTECTION



Psalms 17:8-9

⁸ Keep me as the apple of the eye, *hide me under the shadow of thy wings*, ⁹ From the wicked that oppress me, *from my deadly enemies, who compass me about.*

Psalms 36:7

⁷ How excellent *is thy lovingkindness, O God!* therefore the children of men put their trust *under the shadow of thy wings.*

Psalms 57:1

¹ Be merciful unto me, O God, be merciful unto me: for my soul trusteth in thee: yea, *in the shadow of thy wings* will I make my refuge, until *these* calamities be overpast.

Psalms 61:4

⁴ I will abide in thy tabernacle for ever: I will *trust in the covert of thy wings*. Selah.

Psalms 63:7

⁷ Because thou hast been my help, therefore *in the shadow of thy wings* will I rejoice.

Psalms 91:4

⁴ *He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings* shalt thou trust: his truth *shall be thy* shield and buckler.

Blessed be the LORD God of Israel!

¹ Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy, and for thy truth's sake.

⁹ O Israel, trust thou in the LORD: he is their help and their shield.

¹¹ Ye that fear the LORD, trust in the LORD: he is their help and their shield.

¹² The LORD hath been mindful of us: he will bless us; he will bless the house of Israel.

¹³ He will bless them that fear the LORD, both small and great.

¹⁸ But we will bless the Lord from this time forth and for evermore. Praise the Lord.

Psalm 115

OUR NEGLECTED HERITAGE

by Gladys Taylor (CONTINUED)

THE MYTH OF SAVAGERY

“By the peace among our peoples let men know we serve the Lord.”

RUDYARD KIPLING

It is strange how persistent are popular fallacies, even when there is abundant evidence to refute them. The theory of the ‘painted savages’ of early Britain is of this order. It arises from the Roman habit of designating all who were not Roman citizens as ‘barbarians’. Yet it is by the honesty of some of Rome’s own historians, like Tacitus, Dion Cassius and even the epigrammatist Martial, that the barbarity of the so-called ‘barbarians’ is often disproved.

Even so, such is the typical Briton’s desire to avoid being pompous and self-important, that we actually hug the term barbarian to our breasts and propagate the myth of our own savagery.

This book is not concerned to prolong the debate upon this point—others have written very effectively on the subject—its purpose is rather to present different aspects of our history which may be related together, as they are in the writer’s mind, in such a manner as to form a pattern of Divine purpose for these Britannic Islands and their daughter nations overseas. Our concern is that others may be permitted no

longer to obliterate from British minds the purposeful achievements of our race.

To this end we must begin with an open mind, uninfluenced by the myth of British savagery, approaching this great story of our past with the realization that the Briton ever was, as he is now, no time-server to despots, but independent in vision, eager to explore, concerned for truth and liberty and anxious to pass on to others the blessings that he has received.

While so many are eager to wave the flags of selfish nationalism, or pompous dictatorship, let us lift high the cross of Christ, the emblem of our national flag, the ancient symbol of our faith and chivalry.



It is not the strange idea of fantastic theorists, but established fact to all who take an interest in archaeology, that the inhabitants of the British Isles migrated, section by section over a long period, from their place of origin in central Asia.

This fact is attested by our Indo-European language, by the migratory movement indicated in the erection of stone circles and cromlechs along the route and by the evidences of our culture, spreading from east to west in successive waves, each one showing signs of the advancement of new ideas but related by its craftsmanship to the wave which preceded it.

The surprising aspect is the persistence with which this westward trek took place, century after century, from about 2000 B.C., as though a magnet were literally drawing the tribes of the Levant and central Asia into Europe by an irresistible impulse. Although tribes were sometimes pushed westward by the advance of aggressive foes, the migratory movement appears to have been mainly voluntary, as though the attraction

of Ultima Thule, or the Blessed Isles beyond the Pillars of Hercules, were a very real magnetism.

Throughout the long history of European settlement, one fact stands out in high relief. The blond, long-headed peoples, whom we will describe for convenience as Nordic (though they comprise also those known as *Keltoi*, *Cimmerii* and many known as Scythians and Goths), came into frequent conflict with the rising, and ultimately dominant, power of the Roman Empire.

These nations, who had arrived in western Europe at different periods under various family names, bore other marks of resemblance apart from their physical likeness. All were distinguished by a love of freedom which was almost fanatical. Each nation treasured its own code of laws, was ruled by an ancient royal family whose genealogy was carefully recorded, and would permit no interference with religious freedom, whether before or after they received the Christian faith.

A RACE WITH A WANDERLUST

“Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far.” (Isaiah 49:1)

About two thousand years before the birth of Christ, a migratory movement began, out of Asia and across Europe, which left behind evidences of a culture whose artefacts are being discovered, for the first time in any quantity, during the present century, much having been excavated since 1945.

Many tribal names have been used for these people who were lovers of the arts and lived a highly organized life. Different races could have been involved in such a vast migratory movement, but any great degree of racial mixture during the early migrations seems unlikely, in view of the sameness of habits and craftsmanship over the whole area of their movement, from Asia to Britain. Moreover, the languages

brought with them, though developing later along separate lines, in the course of centuries, contain so many of the same roots as to show a common origin.

The popular assumption that it is impossible for peoples living in western Europe to have originated in central Asia is belied by all the evidences of archaeology. These migrating people brought civilization into Europe for the first time. Their era was to be named the Bronze Age because of their use of metals, a skill which was to show great development in the course of centuries with the eventual use of iron and steel, though they would always be recognized most readily by their craftsmanship in the precious metals of silver and gold.

In his book *The Prehistory of European Society*, Professor V. Gordon Childe produces and emphasizes an argument which is important from our point of view. In an attempt to answer the pertinent question as to why European nations advanced while other races were standing still, he points continually to the civilization of central Asia as the only possible source from which such industry could arise. Referring to the skilled metal work which is so prominent in European artefacts, he says, "In the Nile valley and the Tigris-Euphrates delta alone could be created the economic and political organization necessary to get a metallurgical industry started. And there that first step in the 'progress' that has differentiated the Old World from the new was actually taken five thousand years ago."

This basic fact, the founding of European society upon an Asiatic basis, should be considered in relation to every subject from ethnology to philology, but we would follow up Professor Childe's argument by asking why the Tigris-Euphrates delta should supply the impetus for civilized development. At no time in its history could it be said that this region possessed more of the necessary raw materials than could be found in other parts of the earth. The same fact

applies to the Nile valley where, in the Old Kingdom period, a superior race of rulers brought ordered life from further east. In fact, considering the geographical conditions, it may well be that scarcity of materials could have driven the founders of civilization to seek pastures new.

We would suggest that it was not the place, but the race that inhabited central Asia in the early ages, which promoted human development. The Biblical account of the influence of the patriarchs descended from Seth and Shem gives a more logical picture than can be obtained from any theory of haphazard anthropological development.

The tribal names by which these skilled craftsmen were known in different countries of their sojourning refer back to their ancestry. They are often significant in their meanings, but it is in a general rather than a tribal sense that we are dealing with them at this point.

Surveying them from the ultimate region of their migration, O. Davies, in his book *The Archaeology of Ulster*, presents them in these words: "These people were archers and sheep farmers, who had come from central Europe; they are known for their characteristic pottery, beaker shaped jars of fine ware, decorated usually zonally, with delicate incised patterns. They built ritual circles of up right posts or stones, the most famous being the great monuments of Stonehenge and Avebury. They are usually buried in small cists within circular barrows. Two groups arrived at about the same date, the A-beakers from Holland to central England, the B-beakers from farther south to south-east England. A third group occupied Brittany."

The writer brings these same people eventually to Ulster, dates them as coming "in a series of waves from about 1250 B.C. or perhaps earlier." He gives a further interesting point, "The men of this region were also connoisseurs of horse flesh and fought from chariots."

Let us consider more closely some of the points touched upon in these quotations. This is seen to be a widespread migratory movement, the Beaker folk come in waves as circumstances urge them onward, but they obviously come in great numbers, intent upon making their homes in the extreme west, probably in order to live their pastoral lives unmolested by their former enemies.

Mr. Davies speaks of those who entered Britain “at the beginning of the second millennium B.C.”, as having “occupied Hungary, Bohemia and the middle Danube basin,” as well as those from Brittany who were no doubt some of the Mediterranean seafarers.

The advance guard of this movement could not be described as a migration of Israel, since part of it took place before the people of Israel came into being, but that the people concerned were of the same race is indicated by a mass of evidence showing them to be long headed, racially blond and possessing a great similarity of culture.

William Stukeley dated the building of the great stone circle at Avebury as 1859 B.C.; Sir Norman Lockyer gave the building of Stonehenge as 1700 B.C. Stukeley pinpointed his date more precisely, in its historical setting, as about the time that Sarah died. These dates are sufficiently accurate for our purposes. Recent radio-carbon tests, made with wood found at Stonehenge, give the date as about 2000 B.C. This latest scientific method, based upon the breakdown of organic matter, is only suitable for geological epochs, as no guarantee is given that the date will be precise within 200 years of the event, but it is interesting to find that its rough estimate gives us the era when the immediate descendants of Heber lived in central Asia.

At that time the other races were aggressively consolidating their power, basing their systems upon cruel forms of idolatry and superstition. It is easily understood that other

Hebrews, apart from Abraham, would choose to seek pastures new. They were pastoral people who cultivated the soil and kept flocks and herds, unlike the predatory hunting tribes around them.

It was at this time that the Hyksos kings, after ruling Egypt for a period, departed (circa 1830 B.C.). These people were described by Manetho, the early historian of Egypt, who drew up the table of dynasties and was an orthodox follower of the gods of Egypt. He spoke of the Hyksos as coming “from the east, in a strange manner, men of an ignoble race, who had the confidence to invade our country, and easily subdued it by their power, without a battle.” They are also mentioned by Josephus in his *Against Apion* (I : 14).

Looking more closely at Manetho’s words, it is obvious that the people who were capable of bringing Egypt under their rule by a mysterious ‘power’ which was not military might, could hardly be described as ‘ignoble’. We know, from Egyptian sculpture, that the indigenous population of Egypt were of a slightly negroid type, as though of mixed blood, and the conclusion is obvious, that the Hyksos families from Asia must have been a superior people both mentally and culturally. But Manetho’s opinion of them was based upon the words of Egyptian priests. They hated the earlier pyramid builders, who must have been the advance guard of this movement in Egypt.

Herodotus, who also received his information from Egyptian priests, tells us that Cheops and Chephren, builders of the two greatest pyramids, closed the Egyptian temples and dismissed the priests, but the temples were opened again by Mykerinus, the third king of the family.

Many portrait sculptures have been found depicting Mykerinus and his queen. The Old Kingdom art was of excellent quality and clearly portrays these kings who came from the east. They are tall and long-headed, unlike the native Egyptians of the same period. It can hardly be coincidence that

the features of the queen depicted with Mykerinus are broad and slightly negroid, suggesting that she may have been drawn from the indigenous population. One naturally wonders whether she appealed to her husband to restore the old gods and open their temples, thus bringing to an end a period in which idolatry was banned. The legendary calamities which befell Mykerinus, in spite of his 'piety', would seem to be visitations from God, for his retrograde step plunged Egypt into many centuries of most evil idolatrous practices.

Manetho tells us that the Hyksos "left Egypt to the number of not less than 240,000" with all their families and effects, and that they went to Judea. They may have done so, or he could have been confusing their departure with that of Israel. If so, something must have related them to Israel in his mind. Was it that they were members of the same race of Shem and shared the same mono theistic faith?

Much that we know concerning the Hyksos shows their likeness to Israel. Their name indicates that they were shepherds. The Egyptians, like the Babylonian nations who were warlike hunters and worshippers of cruel gods, looked down upon those who followed peaceful crafts and husbandry. None were more despised by them than keepers of sheep. We can trace the migrating Hebrews by that sign independently of any others, but the breeding of horses and the use of chariots are perhaps the most significant of all as we follow them through their migrations.

The reference to the Beaker folk as 'connoisseurs of horse flesh' sets the pattern for the whole migratory movement through the Bronze and Iron ages. The many references to the Scythian horses, during Alexander's invasion of Asia, combined with the fact that the Scythians were so frequently on the move that their enemies seldom caught up with them, shows that the greatest migratory movement took place on horseback, or with the use of wheeled vehicles. Harold Lamb,

in his book, *Alexander the Great*, basing his description of Alexander's campaigns on the copious records of contemporary writers, tells us of the fighting at Gaugamela, where the Scythians used 'scores of chariots equipped with scythe blades', the same type of chariot as that used by Boadicea in her battles against the invading Romans, a strange fact if there were no connection between Scythians and Britons.

The most recent archaeological findings have taught us much concerning the Scythians whose culture impresses us even more on closer acquaintance. The widespread belief that all except Greeks and Romans were *barbaroi* and uncivilized has blinded many people to the fact that the whole concourse of westward-moving peoples, Keltoi, Kimmerii and the elusive Scythians—or Skuths—in their finely constructed covered wagons, were so highly civilized that the ambitious Romans needed to be constantly on the alert if they were to bring any of them into subjection.

Although the Kelto-Skuths were good fighters we have no reason to believe that they were aggressors. Their campaigns were conducted most notably in defence of their homes and their brethren. One group of Celtic tribes, under the leadership of Brennus, captured Rome in 390 B.C., having invaded Italy in the defence of the Italian Cymri. The account given by Herodotus (Book IV) of the encounter between Idanthyrsus, the Scythian king, and his would-be conqueror Darius suggests that the Scythians, though no mean fighters when resistance was demanded, were unwilling to engage in war unless it was forced upon them by their enemies. In fact, it was the threat of slavery that finally roused their anger. Although the writings of Herodotus are a strange mixture of quotation from written records and local hearsay, the general historical picture is fairly sound and modern archaeology has proved many of his statements to be true.

The migrating Hebrews, wherever they are found, though usually tainted by the paganism of neighbouring nations, always show some custom or almost forgotten religious rite that is a memory of their early history. The Scythians are no exception. Herodotus tells us that they never sacrifice swine, “nor indeed is it their wont to breed them in any part of their country.” They may have forgotten why they were to regard the pig as ‘unclean’, but the custom remained.

The Roman histories make frequent references to the Celts and Cymry (Keltoi and Kimmerii to the Greeks) whose centre of civilization was in the Alpine regions of central Europe, embracing Switzerland, Bavaria and Austria, spreading out in settlements of considerable strength into France, northward to the English Channel and into these islands. In fact, there is no part of Europe where the particular art forms that we recognize as Celtic are not to be found. Some very rich finds have been uncovered by archaeologists in Germany and Switzerland during the last twenty years.

The skilful use of precious metals is seen throughout the whole of the first millennium B.C. The rich finds made at La Tène, in Switzerland, gave the name to this particular style of craftsmanship. It reached its peak about 500 B.C., the period when Mulmutius the lawgiver was reigning in Britain, he who traced his descent, through Brutus the Trojan, to Aeneas and Priam King of Troy. Shakespeare describes him in these words,

“Say then to Caesar,
Our ancestor was that Mulmutius which
Ordnained our laws, whose use the sword of Caesar
Hath too much mangled; whose repair and franchise
Shall, by the power we hold, be our good deed,
Though Rome be therefore angry.
Mulmutius made our laws,
Who was the first of Britain which did put
His brows within a golden crown, and called himself a king.”
Cymbeline, Act 3: Scene I