

The Origin of Our Western Heritage

By Bethel Church of God

Foreword

Most Americans of Caucasian stock have little knowledge of their ancestry. At the most, they can go back no more than two or three generations. This lack of knowledge is partially responsible for the moral and spiritual decline of our civilization. In addition, the American people are largely unaware of the real reasons for the...

Chapter One: The Apostles – Where Did They Go?

It may seem rather unusual to begin a study of western heritage by introducing a question regarding the Apostles. The omission of the majority of the Apostles in the book of Acts, and where they are found later, provides an important key in the study of our heritage. Knowledgeable Bible students know that the patriarch...

Chapter 2: Colonization in the Ancient World

Regarding the establishment of nations, two factors need to be understood. One is that there have been changes in the location of the races in different places, at different times, in the history of the world. The second factor is that the people who now inhabit the various regions of the earth are not generally...

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

Any work of a historical nature should have a proper time frame in order to be accurate and present a proper perspective. A proper time frame should be based on what information is presently available, both scientific and historical. In the quest for truth there is no place for evolution or occult notions that have...

Chapter 4: A Look At Racial Types

Whether one accepts the theory of evolution or looks at a special creation for the presence of man on the earth, we must look to the remote past for the origin of the several races. Before evolution was accepted, the view regarding the origin of man was that human beings were a special creation of...

Chapter 5: The Captivity and Deportation of Israel

Both the Bible and history record that the ten tribes of Israel-descendants of the Patriarch Jacob-were deported from their land by a series of invasions. Long before this period, however, the tribe of Dan had already disappeared, and Asher and Gad had abandoned their brethren in large numbers. Both Dan and Asher were linked in...

Chapter 6: The Westward Movement

Modern scholars have not appreciated the scope of travel and colonization in the ancient world. Archaeologists, for generations, have held the belief that only navigation techniques introduced into Europe during the fifteenth century made it possible for Europeans to cross the Atlantic (Fell, 1976, 17). Sir Flinders Petrie uncovered gold works in Gaza that were...

Chapter 7: Did Israel Not Leave Palestine?

In spite of the massive amount of material that demonstrates the movement of the Israelites from the land of their captivity to northwestern Europe and the British Isles, thence to America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, one can read statements like this: "How unbelievable it is that millions of Israelites in the course...

Chapter 8: Israel – The Type and Example

It has been said that in America, if you attend a church meeting without fear of harassment, arrest, torture, or death, you are more blessed than three billion people in the world. If you have food in the refrigerator, clothes on your back, a roof overhead, and a place to sleep, you are richer than...

Bibliography

Artamonov, M. I. 1974. *Kimmeriitsy i skify*. [Cimmerians and Scythians] Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo leningradskogo universiteta. Baker, John R. 1981. *Race*. Athens, Georgia: Foundation for Human Understanding. Bancroft, Hubert H. 1883. *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*. Vol. 5, "The Native Races of the Pacific States." San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Co. Baron, David. n.d. The...

Foreword

Most Americans of Caucasian stock have little knowledge of their ancestry. At the most, they can go back no more than two or three generations. This lack of knowledge is partially responsible for the moral and spiritual decline of our civilization. In addition, the American people are largely unaware of the real reasons for the tremendous economic success and world influence the United States enjoys. This article is intended to address these issues. A proper understanding of these truths will help every sound-minded American appreciate what God has really done for America. Above all, it should serve as an impetus, a wake-up call, so to speak, for the responsibility God gave our ancestors many years ago, and which we, as the descendants of those people, have failed to recognize or appreciate. May the thoughtful readers of this work profit from what they read, and come to recognize the individual responsibility they have in revitalizing their knowledge of and relationship with their God, who is the Ruler of the universe.

The reader should be aware of some facts regarding the various dates to which we refer in this work. Various authors cite dates that go back prodigious periods of time. As far as history is concerned dates much beyond 4000 BC should be discounted as excessive. Various ages such as Old Stone Age, Copper Age, and New Stone Age represent cultures, not elongated periods of time. These terms were originally chosen in order to date various tools and implements that have been found in archaeological diggings. The fact is: Various tools and metals that make up certain cultures were used earlier in some regions than in others. Spellings of tribal names such as Keltoi or Celt, Cimmerian, Kimmerioi, or Cimmerii come from Greek and Roman pronunciations. The reader should not become confused by the interchangeable usage of these names, as they are different ways of spelling the names of the same people. Many strange-sounding tribal names do appear, but we have attempted to keep these at a minimum. Only a few of these names are important.

The reader who wishes to check the sources quoted or referenced in this work will find there has been no attempt to distinguish an author's remarks from his original source. In quoting or referring to various authors as the source material, we have not always distinguished the original source cited or to which he referred. The original source material can be checked out, though some of the reference works are difficult to find. Once again, the purpose of this work is to help the reader truly appreciate God and to establish a proper relationship with Him.

Chapter One: The Apostles – Where Did They Go?

It may seem rather unusual to begin a study of western heritage by introducing a question regarding the Apostles. The omission of the majority of the Apostles in the book of Acts, and where they are found later, provides an important key in the study of our heritage.

Knowledgeable Bible students know that the patriarch Jacob had 12 sons. All the descendants of Jacob (whose name was changed to Israel) are known as Israelites. They were the progenitors of the 12 tribes of Israel. As far as Old Testament history is concerned, what is not generally understood is that after the time of King Solomon (1017-978 BC), the 12 tribes of Israel split into two nations. Three of the tribes remained loyal to Rehoboam, Solomon's son, while the others formed their own kingdom north of Jerusalem and chose Jeroboam as their king. From that point of time the two nations were known as the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom of Israel. They were often at war with one another. After three successive invasions by the Assyrians, the kingdom of Israel was vanquished, and the people deported from their land. The fall of the northern kingdom took place around 721-718 BC. At the same time, a large number of Jews were deported. These people never returned to Palestine and historically were lost from sight. Later, the kingdom of Judah was exiled to Babylon, but a number of Jews returned under Ezra and Nehemiah and formed their own nation once again. These are the people to whom Jesus preached. In the gospels they are repeatedly called Jews. What needs to be recognized is this: All Jews are Israelites, but not Israelites are Jews. In much the same way we would say all Californians are Americans, but not all Americans are Californians.

During His ministry Jesus made some striking statements. On one occasion He told His disciples “. . . I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” ([Matt. 15:24](#)). Certainly Jesus knew the difference between Jews and Israelites. He instructed His disciples, “But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” ([Matt. 10:6](#)). His personal ministry was taken up with the Jews in the land of Judah, but a perplexing question arises with respect to the 12 Apostles. Why are the majority mentioned only briefly in the book of Acts when the book itself takes us through the year AD 61? The commission Jesus gave the Apostles included the Jews in Palestine, but could not have excluded millions of both Jews and Israelites scattered abroad. The book of Acts mentions the original Apostles, but after the first chapter only a few are mentioned again. What happened to these original Apostles? Perhaps the Jewish historian, Josephus, gives us a clue. Josephus said in his day there were only two tribes in subjection to the Romans, and that the ten tribes were located beyond the river Euphrates and could not be estimated as they were such an immense multitude (Ant., XI, v, 2). Clearly, Christ's instruction to His Apostles to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel was much broader in scope than the environs of Palestine.

We should discard the notion that the world was uncivilized during the early AD period. During the time of the Apostles, the Roman world was a secure place to dwell. It was under the protection of the Roman army. There was one government from Babylon to Calais, and there were roads leading everywhere. Some of these roads still exist today. They were without parallel until the invention of railroads. The Roman world included a vast amount of territory united by language and transportation. Travel was safe and frequent. On these military roads a Roman citizen could travel from Babylon to London with little

inconvenience. Notice Paul's epistles, for example. He knew people in Rome even though he had not yet visited there. The book of Acts relates that on the day of Pentecost people attended Jerusalem from all quarters, including the land of the Parthians and Medes. There was little travel restriction in that area of the world.

Communication in the Roman world made possible the rapid expansion of the gospel. All evidence indicates that a large portion of the early British people professed Christianity. A fact that is generally overlooked by modern historians (who maintain that Augustine was the first to preach the gospel in England) is that the early British Churches were destroyed by the Angles. Augustine was the first to "convert" the invading Angles to Christianity, after they had killed most of the British Christians (Haberman, 142). The history of the flourishing Celtic Church was buried under the waves of heathen Saxons and Danes, as well as Romish Norman influence. Not until the time of Henry II was this memory recalled (Lewis, 17).

The tradition of Europe repeatedly affirms that Britain was the first country to receive the gospel, the British Church being the most ancient. When Augustine came to convert the pagan Saxons, the British Churches refused to accept him. Their argument was that they could not depart from their ancient customs. The British historian Gildas (AD 516-570) wrote that Christianity was introduced into Britain in AD 38, during the last year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar (Morgan, 63-69). Not until the Council of Pisa (AD 1409) was the pre-eminence of the British Church challenged. The argument during the council was that the churches in France and Spain must yield precedent to the British Church because Joseph of Arimathæa founded it not long after the crucifixion of Christ. The Councils of Constance (1414), Sienna (1424), and Basle (1434) upheld this view. Since the British Church was founded more than 550 years before the time of Augustine, British pre-eminence was taken for granted until 1409. Even as early as the second century AD, Tertullian wrote that the extremities of Spain, parts of Gaul, and the regions of Britain which had never been penetrated by Roman arms had received the religion of Christ. The church historian Eusebius (AD 265-340) said, "The Apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles." The venerable Bede (AD 670-735) wrote, "The Britons preserved the faith which they had received, uncorrupted and entire, in peace and tranquility until the time of the Emperor Diocletian" (quoted in Williams, 19, 54-55; Bede, *History of the English Church and People*, bk. 1, chap., 4).

Cardinal Baronius, the distinguished Catholic scholar and curator of the Vatican library, wrote in his *Ecclesiastical Annals* that Joseph of Arimathæa, along with others, was exiled in AD 36. After preaching the gospel in Marseilles, he and his companions went to England (Jowett, 33). William of Malmesbury wrote that Philip sent Joseph of Arimathæa and his companions to England from France, and that they landed in Glastonbury. This was the report of Freculphus, the French bishop of Lisieux, who was born around AD 800 (Lewis, 146). The Talmud tells us that Joseph of Arimathæa was the younger brother of the father of the virgin Mary, that is, her uncle. Some conjecture that Joseph of Arimathæa was involved in the tin trade with Britain. Britain had been the main source of tin for many centuries (Williams, 17-18). Whatever the facts are, the account of Joseph of Arimathæa as founder of the church at Glastonbury was valuable in proving the claim that the British Church was established in Apostolic times, and as such, was less subject to control by Rome (MacDougall, 14). Joseph of Arimathæa was followed by Simon Zelotes, who was martyred;

then by Aristobulus, the brother of Barnabas; and then by Paul himself (Morgan, 62, and Lewis, 26).

So, all indications are that the belief Christianity was introduced into England by Augustine is false. This was why the disputes over the control of the British Church were settled in favor of the Britons. The same is true in Ireland. The independent people of Ireland denied that the Roman bishops had authority anywhere outside the Roman Empire. There are no extant facts to support the idea that St. Patrick visited or represented Rome. Nowhere in his writings does he refer to Rome. As late as AD 634, the Churches in Ireland and northern England were independent of the churches on the continent that were subject to the bishoprics within the Roman Empire. In 634, the Britons and Scots said, "All the world errs; Rome and Jerusalem err; only the Scotti and the Britons are right." Not until Ireland was partly conquered by Henry II of England (AD 1154-1189) was the Church forced to be subject to Rome (Kephart, 423, 429-430). Its history was steeped in the Apostolic tradition.

Reports of the location of the original Apostles persist in tradition. So, that leads back to our original question: What happened to the 12 Apostles?

From the New Testament account, we see that after his betrayal of Christ, Judas committed suicide. James, the son of Zebedee and brother to John, was martyred around AD 44. These are the only recorded deaths of the original Apostles. Peter was slated for execution and while in prison was miraculously delivered by an angel. After being delivered we read, ". . . And he departed, and went into another place" ([Acts 12:17](#)). Josephus, who lived in the early second century, wrote that in his day there was a large Jewish colony in Babylon (Ant., XV, ii, 2). This certainly explains why Peter's first epistle was written from Babylon ([1 Pet. 5:13](#)).

Scholars of the past have not hesitated to show where the original apostles traveled. Socrates Scholasticus in his Ecclesiastical Historie, states that the Apostles sorted themselves to travel to certain nations (Bible Research Handbook, serial 52d). Eusebius went so far as to say that the apostles divided the inhabited world into zones (McBirnie, 43). He also says that the Apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles. Andrew is traditionally linked to Scotland and is said to have preached there. He remains the patron saint of Scotland to this day (Williams, 13). In addition Andrew has been identified in Scythia, near the Black Sea, as well as in Greece or Macedonia, and Asia Minor. Another tradition places him in the foothills of the Caucasus Mountains where he preached to the Scythians, even as far as the Caspian Sea (McBirnie, 80-84).

Williams mentions a comment by William Cave. According to Cave, Simon Zelotes preached the gospel in Egypt, Cyrene, Africa, Mauritania, and Libya. He then went to Britain and was crucified and buried there (Williams, 13). There is one tradition that is uncertain, which places the tomb of Simon the Zealot in the Cimmerian Bosphorus. Several early writers, however, attest to his visit to Britain, but there is some doubt that he was martyred there (McBirnie, 211-212).

Regarding Matthew, tradition holds that he visited and preached in a number of countries. Irenaeus said that Matthew preached to the Hebrews, which is probably a reference to the Jews in Palestine, as well as the Jews of the Diaspora. Clement of Alexandria said Matthew went to the Ethiopians, that is, the Asiatic Ethiopians located south of the Caspian Sea where the kingdom of Parthia was located. He also went to the Greeks of Macedonia, the

Syrians, and the Persians (McBirnie, 174-177). The Greek historian Metaphrastes attested to the same (Williams, 13).

We have already seen that Peter wrote his first epistle from Babylon. Metaphrastes wrote that Peter not only traveled in the western parts of the Mediterranean, but spent a long time in Britain where he converted many nations to the faith (Williams, 11).

James, the son of Alphæus, is reputed to have been in Spain as well as Britain and was regarded as the first bishop of the Syrian churches (Williams, 13).

Thomas is credited with establishing the first church in Babylon. He then went to Parthia and India. He is said to have arrived in India no later than AD 49. It is reported that he was accompanied by Judas (McBirnie, 146-147). Judas is called Thaddæus in the gospels. Thaddæus has traditionally been linked to Assyria and Mesopotamia (Williams, 13). Also, he is associated with four other Apostles who visited Armenia. These are Bartholomew, Simon the Zealot, Andrew, and Matthias. Thaddæus also preached in Syria, Arabia, and Persia (McBirnie, 198-199, 207).

Bartholomew is said to have worked among the Parthians and the Phrygians of Asia Minor. He visited the Armenians, remaining there 16 years, and traveled into Arabia, southern Persia, and to the borders of India (McBirnie, 130-131).

Earlier, it was mentioned that Philip was associated with Gaul. Bede assigns him there (Lewis, 113). Philip traveled to other places however. He spent 20 years in Scythia. Later, he preached at Hierapolis in Phrygia and is reported to have died there. Those familiar with ancient migrations know that a portion of the Gauls migrated to Galatia, so it would not be unreasonable that Philip would preach among them as well (McBirnie, 123-127). Luke, who was not an Apostle, is said to have taught in Gaul and to have made frequent trips to Britain (Jowett, 172).

Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John, reported that the elderly John died peaceably at Ephesus around AD 100. John had been exiled to the isle of Patmos where he wrote the book of Revelation. Later, the Emperor Nerva revoked the honors of Domitian and permitted all who had been unjustly expelled to return to their homes and have their goods restored. Augustine wrote that John had also preached to the Parthians, which was the territory we now know as eastern Turkey (McBirnie, 109-115). There is also a tradition that John, at some time, preached in Gaul (Williams, 13).

Paul's commission included preaching to the Gentiles, to kings, and to the children of Israel ([Acts 9:15](#)). Paul tells us in the book of Romans that he intended to go into Spain ([Rom. 15:24](#)). The Epistle of Clement and the Muratori Fragment both state that Paul visited Spain (McBirnie, 280-281). But Paul did not limit his journey to Spain. Theodoret, bishop of Cyprus, wrote, "Paul liberated from his first captivity at Rome, preached the gospel to the Britons and others in the West. Our fishermen and publicans not only persuaded the Romans and their tributaries to acknowledge the Crucified and His laws, but the Britons also and the Cymry." Clement of Rome wrote that Paul went to the utmost bounds of the West. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Mello, Eusebuis, and Athanasius all confirm that Paul preached in Britain. In his History of the Apostles, Capellus wrote, "I scarcely know of one author, from the times of the Fathers downwards, who does not maintain that St. Paul, after his liberation, preached in every country in Western Europe, Britain included" (Williams, 44).

In the Turkish archives at Constantinople is a copy of the Acts of the Apostles which contains 29 chapters. While this 29th chapter is, no doubt, spurious, it does lend supporting evidence as to the location of some of the lost ten tribes. In the 29th chapter we read: "And Paul, full of the blessings of Christ, and abounding in the spirit, departed out of Rome, determining to go into Spain; for he had a long time purposed to journey thitherwards, and he was minded to go from thence into Britain. For he had heard in Phoenicia that certain of the children of Israel, about the time of the Assyrian captivity, had escaped by sea to the 'isles afar off' as spoken by the prophet, and called by the Roman's [sic] Britain. And the Lord has commanded the gospel to be preached far hence to the Gentiles, and to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. . ." (Haberman, 141). Tradition tells us Paul was martyred in Rome. Bede, in his Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation, said that in AD 665 Pope Vitalian sent the relics of Peter and Paul to Oswy, King of Britain. The report of this final resting place has been avoided by the Catholic Church (Williams, 11-12).

Chapter 2: Colonization in the Ancient World

Regarding the establishment of nations, two factors need to be understood. One is that there have been changes in the location of the races in different places, at different times, in the history of the world. The second factor is that the people who now inhabit the various regions of the earth are not generally the original people.

What should be realized is there have been vast changes that have brought about the establishment of various civilizations. As we shall see in a later chapter, climatic and weather conditions have certainly been factors. The problem with the modern approach to understanding the great racial migrations of the past is that scholars look at slow-working social changes. The idea that cataclysms produced either by humans or geographical means were responsible for the sudden changes of the past, has been replaced by the idea of slow-moving causes we see about us today. These are causes which act as a constant yet imperceptible force just as profound as the sudden changes of the past (Ripley, 237). A look at Old Stone Age remains indicates that climatic changes and physical conditions made areas of the earth uninhabitable, which could not be permanently settled (Minns, 131).

As far as trade and travel are concerned, the influence of weather changes has been phenomenal. There was continual sea traffic between Scandinavia and Ireland from around 1200 to 1000 BC, which indicates a long period of favorable weather. The weather was dry and storms were infrequent. This resulted in a high civilization during what is called the Bronze Age. However, near the end of the pre-Christian era, the weather changed. There were heavy rains, and in northern Europe excessive cold. There were centuries of great storminess. In France, peat bogs formed on a large scale. Civilization began to recede, and movements of tribes such as the Cimbri and Teutons began to take place. In the Mediterranean region a great pattern of dry weather and drought brought devastation from about AD 150 to 750. The effect was the opposite in Europe. It led to the golden age of the Irish, while the Mediterranean region suffered from intermittent dry weather until the twelfth century. A shift took place in civilization. The result was that French and German cities successively became part of the Roman Empire. By the time the Dark Ages came to a close, the rainfall increased and a cycle of wet and cold returned. It reached its peak in about AD 1350. Ice floes and pestilence swept away the civilization in Iceland and the outposts in Greenland. What should be clear is that the rise and fall of civilizations have been conditioned by prolonged climatic factors. In northern Europe, for example, the dry warm weather pattern was beneficial to civilization as the forests retreated and the soil could be farmed. On the other hand, in the Mediterranean, the hot centuries led to famine and cultural regression. The fact that Europe took the lead with respect to civilization was due largely to the weather (Weyl and Possony, 70-75).

Prolonged rainfall and moisture did affect the history of Europe. There was a golden age of plenty in the south, while wet spells led to disaster in the north. In the fifth century BC, when the Greeks reached the pinnacle of civilization, the impact in central and northern Europe was just the opposite. The level of Lake Constance, for example, rose more than 30 feet and the villages there were abandoned. The cold and rain during this period led to catastrophic results on populations that had been drifting toward a sedentary civilization (Weyl and Possony, 69). For a long period of time settlements in Greenland carried out a

thriving trade with Norway. Then permanent frost and cold came, which still remains to this day. These settlements were abandoned and completely forgotten, disappearing from history until the discovery of America by Columbus (Menzel, 273).

For some unknown reason the climate of the earth became colder around the end of the Bronze Age. Ships traveling west by the northern route found sailing hazardous. Not until the climate warmed again did the Viking period begin (Fell, 1982, 33-34). Changes in vegetation indicate there were three successive periods of climatic change on the northern coast of Europe (Taylor, 62). A North Sea flood drove out a torrent of wandering hordes, from the Danube to the Styrian Alps in Austria, looking for land (Menzel, 68). The indications are that climatic conditions in Greenland were better in the tenth century than they are today. Apples ripened in a good year, and birds and fish were plentiful (N. Davies, 224). The lowering water level in Sweden increased the inhabitable area that favored the establishment of the Svionic power. Farming increased, as did smelting and working bog iron. The result was military superiority for Svionic expansion (Schütte 2:406-409). Climatic changes are believed to be responsible for the location of the summer ranges of herring shoals. They were located just off the coast of Greenland during the Viking period, but during the cold medieval period were located in the North Sea (Fell, 1974, 2). Reasons other than cold led to the abandonment of the Viking Colony in Vinland (believed to be along the northern coast of the United States). There were no firearms at this time and Indian attacks in force made the colony too difficult to hold, as the cost was too great (N. Davies, 231).

The sinking of land is another factor that must be considered in the movements of people. The geography of England, for example, has been greatly altered due to land sinking and coast erosion. The beach on which Julius Caesar landed no longer exists. Ancient settlements along the coast have sunk below the English Channel. Roman and even older remains located below Tilbury Docks have sunk 80 feet (MacKenzie, 70-71). In the East Indian Archipelagos there are indications that many of the islands were connected at one time, and that earlier migrations took place over land bridges into new regions (Haddon, 33).

The oldest seat of civilization was the Middle East, Mesopotamia, Persia, and Asia Minor (Ripley, 442-443). Lower Mesopotamia gave rise to such cities as Sumer, Akkad, Shinar, and Babylon. The great Celtic migration westward into Europe was the result of an invasion of a Nordic stock, known as Sumerians, who took possession of eastern Turkestan. The Celts vacated territory that was filled by these Sumerian people who crossed Iran and then settled in Mesopotamia (Compare [Gen.11:2](#)). The people of Elam, Assyria, Babylonia, and southern Anatolia (Turkey) were all Sumerians from Turkestan (Kephart, 116-117, 167, 144). Somewhere around 2300 BC the Celto-Slavic migration from Central Asia reached Europe, by way of Iran, the Caucasus, and the Danube valley (Kephart, 182). Farming began to spread from the Middle East at an early date. While exhaustion of the soil and overpopulation were factors, climatic changes should not be excluded.

One of the principal areas of expansion was by way of the upper and middle Danube and Rhine Rivers along with their tributaries (Chadwick, 19-20). Nordics entering Eastern Europe soon pressed the Slavs northward. Climatic conditions, as well as geography, were largely responsible for the retardation, until relatively late, of the migration of races into northern Europe from Central Asia by way of the Caspian Sea (Kephart, 182). Writers, both ancient and modern, say a great period of unrest took place from 1700-1400 BC when a gradual

drying of Central Asia took place (Fasken, 260). As far as Asia itself is concerned, a Chinese movement forced the Mongols northward, who in turn forced the Eskimos into the far north. These movements were also the reason the northern American Indians immigrated into North America (Kephart, 114). Also, we should consider an Aryan invasion into India, which split the Negro population there into two groups. One moved eastward and settled in the South Pacific Islands, the other westward into central Africa. Africa was not settled from the north, but from the east, south of the lighter-skinned people of North Africa (ibid, 168). This Aryan invasion into India is believed to have taken place some time prior to 1000 BC (McGovern, 34).

The continents were covered with marshes and great forests following the Flood. As a result the ocean was the earliest highway. The first settlements were established as a result of travel along the shorelines (Haberman, 79). In the earliest times Europe was connected with waterways so that goods were shipped from the Baltic to Egypt by way of Italy. A route has been described which went from the Baltic into Italy via the Brenner Pass. Scandinavian merchants were penetrating deep into Russia as early as 1000 BC. As a result of this trade, a high degree of culture developed in Scandinavia (Olson, 57-58). The Danube River was the principal route of penetration into Europe by eastern peoples. Agriculture slowly developed in Europe north of the Alps due to influences from Susa, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. Cultural advance in Switzerland was in a large measure imported from the East (Kephart, 179-180).

Gusten Olson refers to the Universal History. According to him it states the first Scandinavians migrated into Scandinavia from where Noah's ark landed (Olson, 10). These people of Nordic stock appeared along the coasts of the Baltic at the close of the Old Stone Age. Madison Grant says the Nordics originated in the forests and plains of eastern Germany, Poland, and Russia (Grant, 152-153). These blond hunters settled in Denmark, southern Sweden, Norway, and Britain. (The reader should be aware that the various ages [Old Stone Age, New Stone Age, etc.] all fall within the historical period, and none should be regarded as extending beyond 4000 BC). As we shall see in the next chapter, terms such as Old Stone Age, New Stone Age, Bronze Age, etc., should be taken for what they are worth—simply descriptions of varying cultures, not chronological eras of time. Long before the New Stone Age, the Baltic and Iberian people reached Britain over what is believed to be a land bridge, that is now marked by the Dogger Bank. Those who came from the region of the Baltic came in boats. Large tracts of land, the remnants of the North Sea land bridge, have been submerged since about 3000 BC, the result of erosion and land sinking. Pliny, who served in the Roman army, wrote that in the first century AD there were 23 islands between Texel Island, off the coast of Holland, and the Eider River in Schleswig-Holstein. Seven of these islands are now gone. Clement Reid notes we are not dealing with vast amounts of time, but within the same time period as the Egyptian, Babylonian, and Minoan civilizations (MacKenzie, 69-70).

What is clear is this: The races living in Europe since the New Stone Age were preceded by several races from the Old Stone Age, races which occupied wide stretches of Europe (Günther, 111). Nordic peoples drove out these original inhabitants. The Gothic annals claim that the "Gotha" were first led into Scandinavia 62 years after the Tower of Babel under King Eric, who was a contemporary of Saruch (Serug), the great-grandfather of Abraham. Suhm's History of Denmark, page 65, states: "And the Gothic kingdom [Dania or Scythia] was founded 762 years after the flood, when Sarugh [ancestor of Abraham] was 95 years

old.” In the History of Denmark, page 39, section five, we read: “both Denmark and Sweden with surrounding areas were, according to the old chronicles, inhabited from Abraham’s time and started to have kings when David reigned in Israel” (quoted in Olson, 10). Based on a medieval tradition, the people of Trier (Germany) claim that their city is the oldest in Europe, founded by the son of the legendary Assyrian king, Ninus. An old house in Trier has an inscription which reads: “Trier already stood 1,300 years before Rome” (Bihl, 69). One cuneiform inscription states that commercial relations between the Assyrians and northern Europe took place at an early date (Olson, 58-59).

Egyptian and Babylonian colonies in southwest Europe directly influenced the culture of Britain. The earliest traders settled in Britain when the Pharaohs were ruling in Egypt, and both Babylonian and Egyptian cultures found in Spain were trading with Britain. (MacKenzie, 218, 229). The earliest inhabitants of Britain, which have been traced by means of religious monuments, as well as language, came from Akkad, the southern province of Babylonia. Long before the Greeks and Romans spread over Europe, these inhabitants in Britain were the first Aryans (Haberman, 7-8).

The belief of Geoffrey of Monmouth was that the first colonization of Britain came from Troy, and was led by Brutus, the son of Aeneas. This account is found in the Welsh chronicles and it is believed to have occurred at the time Eli was judge over Israel (Turner, 63-64, fn). Raymond Capt tells us that the descendants of Darda (the Dara of [I Chron. 2:6](#)) ruled Troy for several hundred years. But after the destruction of Troy, Aeneas, the last descendant of the royal line of Zerah, settled in Italy and by marriage to the daughter of Latinus, king of the Latins, established the beginning of the Roman Empire. Brutus, the grandson of Aeneas, took a large party of Trojans to “The Great White Island,” the early name for Britain due to the white chalk cliffs. Brutus founded the city of “New Troy,” which the Romans called Londinium, now called London (Capt, 65-66). An even earlier tradition comes from a work called the Psalter of Cashel that states Nin MacPeil first came to Ireland. This is a reference to none other than Belus or Nimrod, the world’s first despot who ruled over the whole of western Asia and possibly Europe (Keating, 113, fn). The fact that the people of Britain had early contacts with the Greeks is seen by a large number of Welsh names, which are very similar to Greek. These ancient “Greeks,” or Danai, are believed to be the descendants of the Israelite tribe of Dan (Stoker, 5). All the evidence indicates that tin has been continuously mined in Cornwall from the Bronze Age until now (Fell, 1983, 52).

Early Sumerians, Dravidians (from India), and Phoenicians possessed large, well-built, well-rigged ships that were far more sea-worthy than those during the time of Columbus. Sumerian tablets reveal that their kings took voyages to the “Land beyond the Western Sea.” They had established colonies and erected monuments there (Verrill, 105). It is not known for certain where the “Land beyond the Western Sea” was located although both Britain and America have been postulated. There were boats in the Mediterranean at a very early date. Egyptians were the earliest in advanced shipbuilding, constructing boats fitted with masts and sails. They had the longest unbroken tradition of sailing and ship building in antiquity, possessing a dazzling array of ships. It would not have been difficult to cross the Atlantic in these boats (Jairazbhoy, 13). As early as 700 BC Phoenician vessels were capable of traveling the high seas, and oceanic voyages are believed to have started in the sixth century BC (N. Davies, 118, 150). So, the popular notion that ships during the time of Columbus were an advancement over earlier ships should be discarded. Even before the

time of Christ, the major inventions used for navigation were in use, inventions that made European shipping dominant during the Renaissance. These inventions had been lost during the Dark Ages. Latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates were employed by the Chinese as early as 100 BC. The astrolabe (a device used to determine latitude) was invented by the ancient Greeks but did not arrive in Europe until the fifteenth century. Trade vessels used in the Indian Ocean were massive. For example, one was used to transport an elephant to the emperor of China. Some of these vessels weighed up to 70 tons (Van Sertima, 55, 61).

Stone monuments erected in various areas around the world trace the extensive movement of peoples in ancient times. These monuments, called dolmens, began in Syria, then went into North Africa, on into Spain, and up into Western Europe (Bible Research Handbook, serial 60c). Massive stones are found all along a vast seacoast, which includes the Mediterranean coast of Africa, and the Atlantic coast of Europe. Megalith means "big stone." Sea routes were the natural way by which the people who built these structures traveled—a race of people that was spread far and wide. It is not at all improbable that great migrations brought these megalithic monuments from Sweden to India and vice versa. History is full of such migrations (MacKenzie, 91-92). The primary use of the dolmen was that of a burial chamber which served as a collective grave, and was used repeatedly. The origin, as we have just seen, was in the eastern Mediterranean and then spread throughout the New Stone Age settlements in the west as a result of trade. They are placed in the second and third centuries BC (Karp, "Who Raised the Megaliths?") The reader should be aware that Karp's dates may be excessively long.) The Bible has numerous references to stone heaps or monuments. The reader should be aware of Jeremiah's instruction to scattered Israel, "Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps. . ." ([Jer. 31:21](#)).

It is well-known that the Phœnicians had extensive colonies. They occupied Spain. When Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, pursued them, he became the king of Spain. The Phœnicians had established trade with the "islands of tin." Most authorities believe that the "islands of tin" refer to some of the British islands, as Aristotle mentions Celtic tin. The Phœnicians went to great lengths to conceal their trade in tin, even stranding their ships if followed. These losses were indemnified out of the public treasury (Turner, 51-52). Around 1000 BC the Egyptians established a settlement in Java. Around 600 BC the Greeks founded Marseilles. Cadiz, in Spain, was founded around 1100 BC. During the reigns of the Roman emperors Claudius and Nero, Roman ships were sailing to Ceylon and Roman currency flooded the East (Fell, 1974, 140-144). Ancient Phœnician records show that thousands of years before the Christian era, voyages were taking place around Africa to India and across the China Sea. So, it should not be difficult to assume that voyages across the Atlantic could have occurred just as easily (Verrill, 9).

Because of calms on the ocean, it could often take a Spanish caravel of the fifteenth century longer to make the trip from Africa to America than the simplest African boat. It is a mistake to equate seaworthiness with size. The fact is: The larger the boat, the more likely it is to be broken up in heavy winds. The notion that small boats could not traverse the ocean is a fallacy (Van Sertima, 63-64). There are many examples of Japanese junks drifting helplessly for months. Between 1783 and 1883, there were 42 examples of such wrecks. These junks were carried to American shores by the Japanese trade current. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, 60 Japanese junks were carried off into the Pacific. Six of these reached the American shoreline between Alaska and the Columbia River. Another six were found

along the Mexican coast. There are many modern examples of tiny craft crossing the oceans (N. Davies, 194, 71).

At a very early date it was known that the earth was a globe. Eratosthenes, the Greek astronomer and geographer, calculated the circumference to be 28,000 miles. Three hundred years later, Ptolemy attempted to correct what he thought was Eratosthenes' overestimation, but his calculations were too small. As a result Columbus, who used Ptolemy's figures, expected to encounter land much earlier than he did (Fell, 1974, 8). Aristotle said in 340 BC: "Beyond the Pillars of Hercules [straits of Gibraltar] is the ocean which flows around the earth. In it are two very large islands, called Britannic [Britain and Ireland]" (quoted in Rutherford, 23, fn). The Spanish philosopher Seneca, tutor of the emperor Nero said, "Spain will soon be linked with the Indies across the Atlantic Ocean" (quoted in Fell, 1983, 138).

Diodorus Siculus gave an account of a Carthaginian settlement in what appears to be either Cuba or South America. According to this account the Phœnicians were driven by a violent wind out into the Atlantic Ocean far beyond the Pillars of Hercules. After many days of sailing west, they discovered an enormous island that was fertile and had navigable rivers. Both the Carthaginians and Tyrrhenians of Italy soon knew of this discovery. A settlement was established there, but the official policies of Carthage forced disbandment and no further development (Fell, 1983, 72-73).

Plutarch refers to a manuscript he found in the ruins of Carthage. It gave sailing directions for a voyage across the Atlantic by way of Iceland. Weather at that time was advantageous for sailing, and this northern route was much more useful than the route later taken by Columbus. Plutarch described Greeks who had settled among the barbarians in the Western Epeiros (the continent that rims the western ocean). These settlements were on the same latitude as the Caspian Sea, which would place them in the vicinity of New England, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia (Fell, 1983, 48-49, 64, 70-72, 88). Sailing in the northern latitudes was not all that uncommon during this period. Thule, which is often mentioned by classical writers, is believed to be the oldest Scandinavian country. Pytheas, an ancient navigator, said Thule was the coast of Norway and was as far north as the 65th parallel (Olson, 54).

It has become apparent is that there is mounting evidence of ancient contact between the continents. Carvings and sculptures of elephants have been found in America, which precludes the idea they were brought here by the Spaniards. Inscriptions of the archaic Sumerian Linear Script, which could not have been faked, have been deciphered here (Verrill, 16). Professional opinion is far from united regarding the various theories on American origins. The crucial question, however, is no longer from where the first migrants to the New World came, but whether there were voyagers before Columbus who joined them later. Where proof is not absolute, the data is open to interpretation. The fact is: Nothing is ever proved to everyone's satisfaction regardless of how clear-cut the evidence may be (N. Davies, 16-19). There is a long-standing tradition among those who believe in trans-Atlantic immigration, that the Indians came from the East. American Indians, if not indigenous to the Americas, came here from the Old World long before traditional or monumental records were established.

In 1930, a French commandant published a thesis that demonstrated the ethnic names of certain Berber groups were the same as those of American Indian tribes, and that these

names are found only among the Berber tribes and nowhere else in the world. The commandant, Jules Cauvet, examined 77 similar tribes on both sides of the Atlantic, and found that 46 of the names appeared to come from Africa, the others from Europe or Asia. Ethnic names are important because they are the last linguistic element to disappear even after the original language is abandoned, forgotten, or absorbed. Two anthropologists have demonstrated that certain peoples living in the Sahara possess American Indian traits. They have similar names and naming methods, and tribal groups are designated by the same titles, the only difference being the prefix or suffix. The women in these particular tribes could easily be mistaken for American Indians (Van Sertima, 252-254).

In the early days of our Republic, our forefathers were men of learning, men that had studied Latin and Roman history. It was commonly believed at the time that ships had crossed the Atlantic and left behind many mementos, such as ancient coins. The Columbus mystique gained in popularity and children were taught that people believed the world was flat until 1492. As a result, these ancient coins were dismissed and all new finds ignored (Fell, 1983, 27). What is interesting is that these coins are found at sites near navigable rivers, or along the coast, or in the neighborhood of natural harbors (ibid, 64). Not until after 1860 did the dogma take hold that the Indians migrated from Asia across the Bering Strait, and that no visitors came from Europe or Africa before the time of Columbus. As late as 1940 the Norse were not even considered to have come to Vinland (ibid, 15). Bancroft is a case in point. His work published in 1883 is completely out-of-date when he states that there was no appearance of the Northmen in America before the tenth century. Yet, he admits that it is probable that communication did take place earlier (Bancroft, 5:134). The Verrills point out that man came to the New World by varying routes-some by the Bering Strait, some across the Pacific, some across the Atlantic. An intermingling of these people led to the American Indian (Verrill, 11). There is now incontrovertible proof that the Norse site at "L'Anse aux Meadows" in Newfoundland demonstrates settlements here and the Viking presence before the time of Columbus (Van Sertima, 77).

In May of 1773, Thomas Bullitt met with the Chalahgawtha sept of the Shawnee Indians. His purpose was to negotiate peace on behalf of Lord Dunmore, the white father of Virginia. Bullitt asked Chief Black Fish, the Shawnee chief, for settlements south of the Ohio River in the country know as Can-tuc-kee. Black Fish told Bullitt:

The Shawnees cannot tell you that you are allowed to settle in the Can-tuc-kee lands. We have never owned that land. It belongs to the ghosts of the murdered Azgens-a white people from the eastern sea. Their bones and ghosts own and occupy every hill and valley of the country. They protect the game there and have more and better right there than any of the Indian tribes, including our own Shawnee nation, because they do not need or use material food themselves and do not like it. Long ago our fathers and our grandfathers killed off the Azgens, but we now fear more the spirits of these people than our fathers and grandfathers feared them when they were flesh. When our food is all gone and our squaws and children starving, we appeal to the ghosts of the white mothers who were killed there, and by saying the right words, we are allowed to kill an elk or deer or bear or buffalo. But, we are never allowed to kill the game wantonly and we are forbidden to settle in the country of Can-tuc-kee. If we did, these ghosts would not rise from their caves and mounds and slay us, but they would set father against son and son against father and neighbor against neighbor and make them kill one another (Eckert, 70-74).

In a footnote Eckert postulates that these Azgens may have been the remnants of Sir Walter Raleigh's lost colony of Roanoke, which disappeared without a trace in 1587.

When the United States was being settled, some unique experiences occurred in various places. In 1660, the Tuscarora Indians captured a Welsh clergyman by the name of Morgan Jones. He later related that his life was saved because he spoke Welsh and some of the Indians understood it. He spent four months with them preaching in the Welsh language. In early colonial times the Tuscaroras were called "White Indians." European contact with American Indians at an early date is clearly seen in the paintings of George Catlin, who lived 30 years among the Mandan Indians. Catlin concluded these Indians were of Welsh origin due to the fairness of their skin, the color of their eyes, and the manner of building their huts in Druidical circles, their domestic habits, and their religion (Spencer, 14). Celts appear to have been in America at an early date. In 1801, a Lieutenant Roberts met an Indian chief at Washington who spoke fluent Welsh, as though he had been raised in Wales. The chief said it was the language of the Asguaws, a tribe located 800 miles north of Philadelphia. The chief knew nothing of Wales, but said his people had a tradition that their ancestors had come to America from a distant country far to the east, which lay over great waters. A Captain Davies related that when he was at a trading post among the Illinois Indians, he was surprised to find several Welshman in his company who could converse readily in Welsh with the Indians. Lord Monboddo, a Scotchman, wrote in the seventeenth century that the Celtic language was spoken by many tribes in Florida (Bancroft, 5: 118-120, 122). There is a postulation that these Indians were the Maiatai, the painted Indians or Picti of the Romans, who were brought to America from the British Isles for the purpose of establishing trade.

One more interesting account comes from Brazil. In 1827, a farmer discovered a flat stone in one of his fields. It was engraved in Greek writing. The inscription read: "During the dominion of Alexander, the son of Philip, King of Macedon, in the sixty-third Olympiad, Ptolemaios." Beneath the stone were two ancient swords, a helmet, and shield. On one of the sword handles was a portrait of Alexander, and on the helmet a design representing Achilles dragging the corpse of Hector around the walls of Troy (Bancroft, 5:123).

Ethnologists note the Asian similarity of American Indian tribes and regard them as a branch of the Mongol race, but as Haddon points out, it is quite feasible to postulate migrations from Europe as well (Haddon, 77). An early Indian culture that flourished in the Great Lakes region shows many signs of Old World influence. Metalworking began in North America earlier than any other place in the New World, and a copper culture in Minnesota and Wisconsin contains artifacts that go back to about 4000 BC (N. Davies, 73). The reader should keep in mind that this date is about 2000 years too early. In the history of mining technology, a baffling mystery remains yet unanswered. Around the northern shore of Lake Superior and the adjacent Ile Royale there are about 5,000 ancient copper workings. Radiocarbon dating places them from 2000 to 1000 BC. This corresponds with the Bronze Age in northern Europe. Conservative estimates place the ore removal at 250,000 tons during that period of time. It is not known where the copper was taken. No copper artifacts have been found in America and the assumption is the ore was shipped overseas (Fell, 1982, 261).

In 1696, the Spaniards made an expedition to an area south of Yucatan. There they found books written with characters that resembled both Hebrew and Chinese (Goetz and Morley, 10). Hebrew shekels have been found in Kentucky and Arkansas dating from the time of the

Jewish revolt in AD 132. Christian relics from the early AD period are found widespread in America. A version of the Ten Commandments is engraved on a rock near Albuquerque, New Mexico, and according to the majority opinion, it is an inscription in the north Canaanite script and old Hebrew language. Another inscription that is similar was found on a stone tablet recovered from a burial mound in Newark, Ohio (Fell, 1983, 190, 167). Near Kanab, Utah, obsidian disks or coins contain symbols that are of the same type as Hittite glyphs. These belong to the archaic so-called Sumerian script employed in Egypt in the pre-dynastic and early dynastic periods (Verrill, 94).

In 1200 BC the Olmec civilization in the Gulf of Mexico came on the scene. With it came the massive organization of labor, a trade network, ceremonial centers with pyramids, colossal sculpture, relief carving, wall painting, orientation of structures, gods and religious symbolism, an obsession with the underworld, representatives of foreign types, hieroglyphic writings and scribes, seals and rings, and the use of iron. According to Jairazbhoy this same culture is found in Peru and is Egyptian in nature. What is implied is that by these massive monuments and ceremonial centers, the Egyptians introduced slavery on a grand scale into the New World. In fact, the Olmec priesthood was highly developed and their pantheon of gods is of Egyptian origin (Jairazbhoy, 87, 30, 9).

During the Olmec period three types of racial stock were found in Mexico-Mongoloid, Negroid, and Semitic. A Chinese facial appearance is seen in sculptures, and there is much evidence to indicate that the Shang people were established in Mexico. The Negroid presence can be explained by the fact that the Egyptians commonly held Negroes as slaves and mercenaries. Huge sculptured Negroid heads found there may have been military governors in this Egyptian colony (Jairazbhoy, 147, 100-102, 112, 18-19). Urns found in Aztec ruins indicate a close connection with Chinese civilization (Kephart, 111).

There is proof that the pre-Incan civilization found in Peru was ready-made and fully developed by Sumerian explorers and colonists around 2500-2000 BC. The idea that ancient men were afraid to navigate the oceans because they thought the earth was flat is nonsense. The Sumerians had pottery spheres that represented the earth, marked with the equator, tropics, and the parallels of latitude (Verrill, 294-295). It is possible that the Mayas, Aztecs, and Peruvians were offshoots of an advanced culture that had been established in the coastal areas of South America. Cultural sites found in South America predate the oldest human remains found in Alaska (ibid, 11).

Various Indian tribes have differing traditions of their origin. The Indians in Chile say their ancestors came from the west. In North America, the Chippewas relate that their ancestors crossed an area where ice and snow continually existed. The Algonquins have a tradition that they were of foreign origin and that a sea voyage took place. The Olmec tradition is that they came from the east (Bancroft, 5:22). Bancroft believes the most logical explanation regarding the New World is that inhabitants from eastern Asia peopled it. Many authors, for example, believe the Tatars peopled the northwestern part of America (Bancroft, 5:30, 54). This does not take into account traditions that place the origin of many tribes in the east, and it does not explain why so many of the American Plains Indians have such "European" facial features and little like those of Asian peoples (Karp, 212). Also, the theory that all the American Indians crossed the Bering Strait does not explain why they did not or could not bring food plants and livestock with them (Verrill, 9).

What should be obvious in all this, is that American Indians were the result of many migrations to America, and that these migrations were made up of both mixed and unmixed Asian peoples (Kephart, 103). Of most importance for the purpose of this chapter is the fact that widespread travel and colonization was frequent all over the world at an early date. Mass migrations, both voluntary and forced, were more common than what is generally thought.

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

Any work of a historical nature should have a proper time frame in order to be accurate and present a proper perspective. A proper time frame should be based on what information is presently available, both scientific and historical. In the quest for truth there is no place for evolution or occult notions that have humanity evolving through countless generations. While many people today do not believe the Bible revelation concerning the origin of man, the theory of evolution is even more unbelievable. Ricki Pavlu tells us science is the knowledge that has come about by the accumulation of facts and natural laws gained by means of experimentation, measurable observation, and precise testing. The moment science steps over these boundaries, it becomes speculative and philosophic. It does so when it jumps from the inorganic to the organic, then from the organic to animal life, and from animal life to the rational and moral. By this jump, science has entered into the discussion of religion and evolutionary humanism (Pavlu, 101-102).

The fact is: Both creation and evolution, as applied to the origin of man, cannot be subjected to the scientific method. Both are based on faith, and as such, are religious in nature. Those who believe in creation believe God created all things. Those who believe in evolution believe in "nature's ability to evolve." No human beings were alive when the world began, so scientific evidence can neither prove nor disprove Creation or evolution. What needs to be realized is that the various theories regarding origins do not belong in the field of science; they belong in religion (quoted in Pavlu, 104-105). So, at the present, both creationism and evolution are simply religious issues. Far more faith is required for the belief in evolution than in Creation, because of its total reliance upon the creative powers of nonliving, nonreasoning matter. Many educated people today recognize evolution for what it is—an atheistic philosophy that interprets facts within its own framework. The evolutionist Horatio Newman acknowledges, "Reluctant as he may be to admit it, honesty compels the evolutionist to admit that there is no absolute proof of organic evolution. The theory of geologic evolution meets with scarcely any opposition today, although its foundations are no more securely based than those of organic evolution" (quoted in Pavlu, 106-107).

The present viewpoint of history, which excludes God, is of recent origin. It does not permit a standard by which to judge chronology. The interpretation of history, as a result, is in a state of chaos. No two scholars seem to agree on anything, and dates differ by wide margins. This is why, as Cyrus Gordon tells us that pioneering work is often accomplished by people who have not been indoctrinated by the professional establishment in charge of history at the universities, institutes, and museums. Professionals who desire smooth careers are indoctrinated along the lines of accepted opinion (Wuthenau, xii). The end result is that the evidence which does not conform to the prevailing scientific opinion will be quickly set aside. As Marek candidly admits, the historian is limited by his own temperament and guided by the spirit of his age (Marek, 119).

The big problem in dating the past by means of geology is that there is no scientific means to determine how fast geological deposits were laid down. Some geologists are not afraid to admit that geology is a very inexact science. The idea that man existed in prehistoric times became popular after the Bible was rejected as a source of ancient history. Prehistory, as such, refers to a vague, hypothetical period of time of which little is known. Donald

MacKenzie bluntly states that the word “prehistory” should be discarded. The fact is: The main events of the so-called “prehistoric” period are certainly known. Relics from the past can be dated accurately enough to say that prehistoric time ceases to be prehistoric (MacKenzie, 212). Prehistoric refers to a time before there was historical documentation, so the whole concept of prehistoric is a supposition. It is an assumption used to support the theory of evolution. The historic period-the last 5,000 years-is verified by records, documents, writings, ruins of ancient cities, and artifacts. The supposed proof that details “facts” about the ancestors of man cannot be proven or documented. Most of these so-called ancestors have been conjured up from highly questionable bone fragments (Pavlu, 87-88).

The theory of evolution teaches that the geologic column contains a succession of organisms with the simple in the bottom layers but progressively more complex toward the top. The problem is, however, that there is no place on earth where the geological column exists in this arrangement. No strata have ever been found which accurately depicts this evolutionary column. David Merrell, an evolutionist, admits: “If it were possible to find a place where deposition of sediments had been continuous since the formation of the earth in its present structure, the strata would form a complete geological column, and the included fossils would furnish a fairly good record of the forms of life that had existed during this period. Although some deposits are thousands of feet thick, no such complete geological column is known” (quoted in Pavlu, 66, emphasis ours). If the geological column does not exist, how do evolutionists prove that one should exist? The answer: Fossils are taken from many locations on the globe and arranged in a hypothetical sequence of complexity-the simple on the bottom and the complex at the top. What this means is that the geological column is used to “prove” the theory of evolution, and the theory of evolution is used to “prove” the geological column. This is a perfect example of circular reasoning (ibid, 66).

Evolutionists are not through yet. They use dating methods that also illustrate circular reasoning. The geological column is dated by the use of index fossils, but the strata in which it is found determines the age of the fossil. The evolutionist R. H. Rastall admits: “It cannot be denied that from a strictly philosophical standpoint geologists are here arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of their remains embedded in the rocks, and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of the organisms that they contain.” (quoted in Pavlu, 67). But, evolutionists reason: “We now know that different kinds of animals and plants succeeded one another in time because life has continuously evolved; and inasmuch as organic evolution is worldwide in its operation, only rocks formed during the same age could bear identical faunas” (quoted in Pavlu, 66-67, emphasis ours). Such assumptions clearly illustrate a religious faith. In following the evolutionary line of reasoning, geologists assign the start of the Old Stone Age (Paleolithic period) to a time period 240,000 years ago, and the start of the New Stone Age (Neolithic period) at 10,000 to 20,000 years ago. Isaac Taylor tells us these calculations are rough estimates and should be taken for what they are worth (Taylor, 57-58).

The fact is: In the different strata countless exceptions to this supposed sequence in the geological column exist. While it is true that many fossils follow a pattern in the deposits (for example, corals, trilobites, and mollusks at the bottom; fish, sharks, amphibians, dinosaurs and reptiles in the middle; and man, elephants, horses, apes, and birds at the top), this is

exactly what we would expect if there had been a worldwide flood. The first to be covered in the sediment would be found at the bottom in the mud (corals, trilobites, mollusks). Next would be those found in the waters (fish, sharks). Then, those found in the transition zone (amphibians), and finally, creatures of the land (men, horses, elephants, apes, birds). Since there is no record of transition from one creature to another, the geological column fails to prove evolution, but the fossil record does prove there was a worldwide flood (Pavlu, 66-69).

Modern science has been unable to prove the age of manlike fossils. Because of the many problems involved in trying to determine the age of these fossils, no suitable methods of dating human evolution have been developed (Hammond, 36-37, emphasis ours). To be able to tell time and assign dates, any kind of clock, whether mechanical, radiological, or geological, must fulfill two assumptions. These are: (1) one must have knowledge of the rate at which the clock runs, and (2) one must know when the clock began, that is, its zero point. Radiocarbon dating is a case in point. To accurately use radiocarbon-dating, we must know the rate of decay as well as the original and present amount of the radioactive material. The problem is, however, with radiocarbon dating the amount of the starting material is unknown. Textbooks fail to mention this fact. Since it has been impossible to discover ground zero, the accuracy of the method cannot be known. Geological dating, using radiocarbon dating, is based on assumptions taken from strata and other calculated guesses (The Spotlight, 1986).

When Dr. Libby developed radiocarbon-dating, he first began by determining the age of the object he was examining. He then checked his conclusion against the archaeologists. They, in turn, corrected some of their opinions on the basis of his findings. Since then his methods have been refined and possible error reduced (Marek, 152). But this has not solved the problem. Radiocarbon-dating is accurate about 4,000 years in the past (Pavlu, 164-165). Edward Deevey tells us that the Scientific American admits that while radiocarbon-dating has fulfilled its original promises, in detail it is full of puzzles, contradictions, and weaknesses. It will be a long time, they admit, before radiocarbon-dating will be as straightforward as an electric dishwasher. The amounts of carbon are so small, they cover only the last few thousand years. Radiocarbon-dating cannot be used as a long-term clock and must be compared with "known dates" (Deevey, 87). The idea many people have is that carbon-dating methods used to date fossils is done separately from correlating the strata. This is not true. Derek Ager, a professor of geology at University College, Swansea, Wales, stated: "Ever since William Smith at the beginning of the nineteenth century, fossils have been and still are the best and most accurate method of dating and correlating the rocks in which they occur. . . . As for having all the credit passed to the physicists and the measurement of isotopic decay, the blood boils! Certainly such studies give dates in terms of millions of years, with huge margins of errors. . . . I can think of no cases of radioactive decay being used to date fossils." (quoted in Gish, 91-92). Quite an admission! Gish observes on the same pages that it is fossils, not radiometric dating methods that are used to date rocks.

So, uranium-lead dating has serious flaws. It is impossible to determine the amount of lead deposited in the original uranium-the original setting of the uranium-lead clock. Uranium can be leached out of the stratum by acid water. It has been admitted that many dates obtained by the uranium-lead method are incorrect, and errors as high as 700 million years

have been detected (Pavlu, 162-163). John Kizer points out that uranium-lead dating can yield different ages of minerals of the same age and the same age for minerals of different ages. Remember, the geologist must first determine how old the rock is before he can make the correction to measure the age. In other words, to determine the age of the mineral we must first know its age. The flaw in the whole method is illogical (Valentine, 20-21). Dates are massaged and adjusted to fit the conventional wisdom (Gish, 173).

Very accurate methods are available for determining the present ratio of uranium-lead, for example, but there is no direct method to determine what was the original ratio of isotopes in the rock when first formed. The fact is: There is no direct method for determining the age of any rock. So, indirect methods are used which are based on assumptions. While these assumptions cannot be verified, they nevertheless "guarantee" that the ages "calculated" will come to millions or even billions of years. The only exception is carbon-14 dating, which is useful in samples limited to a few thousand years (Gish, 51). A major problem with carbon- dating is that there are comparatively few of the most ancient evidences of man that include carbon, with which to make the test. In some major archeological finds there are thousands of stone monuments, tens of thousands of pieces of pottery, many bone fragments and other remains, but not one single trace of charcoal or carbon. Also, it is difficult to determine if charcoal found in ancient remains is of the same age. Charcoal samples may be more recent refuse (Verrill, 12, fn).

Looking at civilizations, the assumption is that what we see today is an advancement from the "primeval savage" state to that of modern man. The fact is: There is no proof that a supposed original state of savagery led to civilization. What science has done is to take the theory of evolution and apply it to the development of man. It is true that man often passes from a savage to a civilized state, but the opposite is just as true. Civilizations decay and deteriorate into degraded forms. Both savagery and civilization oscillate freely, passing back and forth with equal ease. Outside forces can improve a civilization, but when a struggle for existence sets in, savagery often results. The earliest civilizations were substantially civilized and degenerated into savagery only by degrees, due to peculiar circumstances. The Bible indicates that cities were built before tents, and that copper and iron existed during this time period. Both Egypt and Babylon had high civilizations and no early period of barbarism existed (Rawlinson, 1883, 1-14). As Rawlinson informs us, even Sir Charles Lyell admitted there is no distinct geological evidence that so-called inferior races have always preceded those of a higher order (ibid, 2, fn).

Archaeologists label cultures by the use of implements. We have all heard of the Old Stone Age, New Stone Age, Copper Age (Chalcolithic), Bronze Age (so designated because of the use of chipped stone, polished stone, copper, and bronze). While these designations are useful in identifying cultures, the dating methods used have led to all kinds of inaccuracies and confusion. The reason is because the dates of cultures vary widely around the world. Once established, these designations became impossible to discard and the reader should regard their dates with caution (Langer, 2). Archaeologists have set up a chronological sequence of these ages-stone, bronze, iron-but these ages are not the same in every country. Even today some populations are still practically in the Stone Age, while others have recently just passed out of it (Pittard, 28).

The fact is: It is impossible to depict any "age" solely on the basis of archaeology. The whole idea becomes even less valid when we attach a deeper historical meaning to any particular

age. Even in Sweden, for example, varying cultures have existed side by side during what is called the Stone Age. The commonly selected date for the first inhabitants of Sweden has been set at 9000 BC. There are neither discoveries nor experiments to support the notion that cultures existed millions of years in the past (Olson, 5, 7). The advance to civilization has been unequal, some people using stone while others were using bronze or iron. Even during the New Stone Age, people were not mere wandering hunters. They had social organization, industry, a system of trade by both land and sea, and settled in areas where they could procure raw materials for their implements, weapons, and coloring materials (MacKenzie, 86).

At this point the question we need to ask is this: If successions of cultural ages do not exist, how did this concept ever develop? The answer is that in 1816 Christian Jorgenson Thomsen, a Danish authority on ancient coins, was appointed by the king of Denmark to the Royal Commission for the Preservation and Collection of National Antiquities. Thomsen came into possession of a collection of miscellaneous artifacts of all kinds-artifacts of metal and stone which had been found in various burial mounds throughout Denmark. These artifacts had no chronological sequence, so Thomsen simply separated them into three lots-one of stone, another of copper and bronze, and a third of iron. To these Thomsen added pottery, wooden instruments of various kinds, fragments of textiles, and leather garments, according to the artifacts with which they were found. He then looked at writings such as Homer's *The Illiad* and *The Odyssey*, which were believed to have been written around 800 BC, and concluded that bronze was in use before iron, and stone must have been used before either. Later, explanatory labels on the public displays of these artifacts suggested that a Bronze Age had followed a Stone Age, and an Iron Age followed a Bronze. Coins found with Iron Age artifacts indicated a 400 BC period. Therefore, it was concluded that the Bronze Age and Stone Age were older periods. Thomsen's method of categorizing artifacts was gradually accepted and is now the authoritative method of classification. The Iron Age was assigned the 400 BC to AD 800 period, and today the entire basis of modern archaeology comes from this three-age system.

The Bible record shows that the pre-Flood civilization was advanced. Not only was metalworking employed, but musical instruments were also invented. Cities were built. A look at Noah's ark indicates that shipbuilding was not a new innovation. So, how did the notion come about that man evolved from an ape and that the development of culture required millions of years? The answer: In the 1830s Jacques Boucher de Perthes wrote several books to prove that man had existed during the Ice Age. He believed the Ice Age to be a period of one million years. The idea was not accepted until Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species* in 1859. Darwin's book is what stimulated the idea of prehistoric archaeology (World Book Encyclopedia, s.v. "archaeology"). Historian George Rawlinson tells us that without too much difficulty, we can dispel the illusion fostered by those who say our present state of historical knowledge requires an enormous expansion of the accepted chronology. Rawlinson says such expansions are excessive, and there is not sufficient evidence to justify them. Until the present time, the general results of historical inquiry render these expansions highly improbable (Rawlinson, 1883, 16). The so-called Old and New Stone Ages are found within the historical period and more than likely refer to cultures in the pre-Flood world. The Nile district was the most ancient development of a higher civilization, and this took place in the post-Flood world (Peschel, 517).

The modern historical premise rests on the idea that God has not involved Himself in the course of history, nor is He likely to do so in the future. Historians give the impression they have all the answers. Kurt Marek says that while the novice student of history may be impressed by the way historians date events that took place thousands of years ago, an examination of the historical record reveals how scanty, inaccurate, and false these records were, even when originally written. Due to wear and abuse many of these records are in bad physical condition. Marek says the more one studies, the less impressed one is with historical dates. The framework of chronological history is a purely hypothetical structure that leads one inevitably to question every date set forth. Historians do not know the correct date for the real beginning of Egyptian history. Correct dates must be set on the basis of assurance, not assumption, and a proper time scheme must be based on clear written records-records which have a connection with Greek, Persian, and Egyptian events. Events back to 1000 BC are fairly well known. Before that time, however, we must deal with myths and narrative sagas. Modern scholars are forced to reckon errors in the second millennium BC, in decades; for the third millennium errors are reckoned in centuries. Kings lists are only valuable in the sense that they show a succession without any fixed historical date. They can be confusing because lists that should have been placed side by side are sometimes added on after another. In addition, several different kings' lists have been joined together resulting in endless confusion (Marek, 133-139).

Scholars today rank archaeological evidence as the most important factor in determining the past (Taylor, 129). Modern scholars, because of a lack of contemporary inscriptions to support ancient traditions, rejected early British chronicles. But if this idea was valid, it would remove the traditional history of Rome, Greece, and nearly the entire Old Testament, as well as much of the history of the early Christian Church (Waddell 1924, 147).

Archaeologists have found abundant material, but enormous gaps nevertheless exist (Marek, 122). Rarely does one find an easy equation between historically named peoples and those identified by archaeology (Trump, 214). In America, ancient languages have not been studied by archaeologists, and real reform needs to be made in the study of epigraphy-the art of reading ancient inscriptions (Fell 1976, 12-13).

Students versed in the Bible know that Genesis, chapter one, tells of the re-creation of the earth around 4000 BC-this following a catastrophic destruction. The Flood did not occur until 1,656 years after this re-creation or about 2350 BC. George Rawlinson informs us that the Egyptians had no chronological concept and did not consider eras, or enter into computations of time. Chronology is almost nonexistent on Egyptian monuments. Manetho, an Egyptian priest, composed a history of Egypt. He claimed to have used records from archives preserved in Egyptian temples. He gave the impression that Egyptian dynasties were consecutive and form a single continuous series. Based on his work, a time span of 5,358 years would have been required. The truth, according to Rawlinson, is that Manetho rejected the knowledge that many Egyptian dynasties were contemporary. Rather, he insisted they were successive. Rawlinson states that an established Egyptian monarchy began between 2450 and 2250 BC. (Note: According to the Bible record, the first monarchy in Egypt could not have started before 2350 because of the Flood.) Manetho's agenda was to set up a successive arrangement of dynasties, in order to make Egyptian civilization appear to be older than that of Babylon. The two civilizations were relatively contemporary in their origin, and it is quite possible the Old Stone Age of the west was concurrent with early Egyptian civilization (Rawlinson 1887, 22-3 7, 160).

As far as chronology is concerned, the Greeks are another case in point. Aside from the Olympic games, the Greeks had no method of precise time reckoning. They had no historical sense, ignored dates, and lumped events and personages together until Greek history became a mass of wild confusion (Marek, 133). It is with confidence that cuneiform scholars place the beginning of Babylon at about 2300 BC, Assyria at about 1500, and Phœnicia at about the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries BC. The European civilization of which Homer speaks must have commenced at about 1200 to 1300 BC (Rawlinson 1887, 148-149). Historians regard "real history" to have commenced about 550 BC (Trump, 250).

The Bible tells us that after the Flood, the ark came to rest on the mountains of Ararat ([Gen. 8:4](#)). In the Bible, Ararat is not the name of a mountain, and according to what native Armenians say, was never called that by them. Another consideration is that if the descendants of Noah settled near where the ark is alleged to have rested, how could they have approached the plain of Shinar from the east ([Gen. 11:2](#))? While the ark was stationary for a time over the mountains of Ararat, it is possible it drifted a considerable distance to the east before the waters subsided (McClintock and Strong, s.v. "Ararat"). Whatever the truth is, topological conditions, as they exist in Persia today, would have precluded it from being the center of the dispersion of the human race. The reader should keep in mind, however, that conditions in Persia have not always been as they now are. There is a long tradition that the origin of the dispersion of the races was somewhere in Asia. As scholars view it, centers of dispersion could have been along the shores of the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean, with the core components located near the foot of the western Asiatic mountains (Fasken, 24-25). These different ideas mean scholars are by no means sure of the origin of the first civilization in the post-Flood world. Climatic changes, which have played a very important part in the migrations of various races, indicate that much of the Near East at one time was much less arid than it is today. Areas that earlier supported vast populations, and made material wealth and culture readily available, are now largely parched. Only meager and backward people can be sustained there today (Kephart, 179). The earliest known civilization developed north of the Persian Gulf among the Sumerians. So, it was Mesopotamia and the broad valley of the Tigris and Euphrates, that became the cradle of civilization of antiquity (Haddon, 19).

Many years were required for the Flood waters to abate entirely. Early settlers in northern Europe found the land to be wet and uninviting, cold and inhospitable. According to the Swedish authority Olof von Dalin, Sweden for many years was an archipelago amid multitudinous islets. It was for all practical purposes a group of islands. After northern Europe was populated, weather changes made Scandinavia unsuitable for agriculture. Adverse weather conditions developed around 500 BC, and Sweden as well as Finland became drastically depopulated, remaining so for the next 500 years. For centuries, marshy conditions continued in Sweden. At the beginning of the AD period, one of the largest lakes in Sweden was 23 feet higher than it is today. Wrecks of large ships and remnants of others have been found upon mountains and high places, and salt grass was growing far from the seas. Runic stones make note of bridges where no bridges appear to be necessary (Olson, 51-53). Even today, proof that the ice cap is still melting is seen by the fact that Boston harbor has a sea level three feet higher than when the Pilgrims first landed, and over the past 25 years the rate of sea-level rise has been about an inch every ten years (Fell, 1974, 55). The general consensus of opinion is that a great shifting of populations took place shortly before 2000 BC, because of weather changes or climate. This could account for the

shift of the Aryans from the east to the region of Mesopotamia, as Aryan kingdoms were established in the Near East. This is why Aryan proper names are found in Mesopotamian records (McGovern, 32).

We will take a closer look at the various nations in the next chapter, but for the purpose of very early history, we should note what the English Assyriologist, Archibald Henry Sayce, said. Sayce asserted that the sons of Noah were each assigned a separate place of settlement. Japheth was assigned the north, Ham the south, and Shem the center. These three are considered to have settled the three zones of the earth, and the nations inhabiting these areas are their children. The three zones were bounded on the north by the Caspian Sea, the mountains of Armenia, the Black Sea, and the islands of the eastern Mediterranean; on the south by the Indian Ocean and the highlands of Abyssinia; on the east by the Caspian and the mountains of Media and Elam; and on the west by the Libyan desert west of the Nile. Canaan and southwestern Arabia were included in the southern zone along with Egypt and the northern part of the Sudan (Sayce, 42). The sons and grandsons of Japheth (Gomer and Javan) were assigned the "Isles of the Gentiles," which is understood to mean Europe and its adjacent islands. This dispersion must have taken place during the time of the patriarchs, and most likely during the days of Peleg ([Deut. 32:8](#), [Gen. 10:25](#)). These nations retained their names to the time of Moses and long afterward. Javan is regarded as the progenitor of the Greeks, but the name Iones, which is supposed to come from Javan, was applied to several branches of the family and extended into Macedonia and Thrace. But there we find the Celtæ or Cimmerii, not of the family of Japheth. If they were known as natives of the land in part of their own territories, they must be regarded as intruders (E. Davies, 123-124).

Raymond Capt comments on a statement by George Rawlinson. Rawlinson said the children of Shem drove the race of Japheth into the holes and corners of the earth so that they might be the vanguard of Semitic civilization (Capt, 217). What is known is that by the time of Caesar, the Scythians had spread themselves over Europe, forcing out the more ancient nations before them (Turner, 43-44). The Japhetic stock remaining in Europe appears to be the Lapps, and possibly the Basques (Capt, 217). The Lapps who previously inhabited southern Sweden, Denmark, northern Germany, the British Isles, and parts of France had been forced into the northern regions by a long-headed race from the southwest (Olson, 13, and Ripley 462,). Also, a broad-headed people, now represented by the Alpine type in Europe, invaded that region to force out earlier peoples who appear to have been an Africanoid type (Ripley, 470). These were found there much earlier than the tall, Celto-Slavic people (Taylor, 123). What is generally believed today is that Japheth inherited Europe and is therefore the progenitor of the Gauls (E. Davies, 148).

An ancient Hindu book says that Noah allotted Japheth the entire region north of the Himalayas from sea to sea (E. Davies, 77-78). So, while Noah assigned the parts of the earth to his three sons and their descendants, many of them did not keep their boundaries, and one lineage often settled on the lands of another brother (Gamboa, 21, emphasis mine). Strabo, the Greek geographer and historian, who lived at the beginning of the AD period, divided the world into four parts. He placed the Indians in the east, the Ethiopians in the south, the Celts in the west, and the Scythians in the north (Turner, 43-44). By this time the boundaries of the various families of Noah had radically changed. Ptolemy, the great astronomer and geographer, who lived in the second century AD, constructed a map which

showed England as Javan, but said the western isles were inhabited by the descendants of the Hebrew race who were skilled in smelting operations and the working of metals (Haberman, 78). By this statement Ptolemy shows that a people of Hebrew stock, who were both long-headed and broad-headed and of the white race, drove out the original stock that inhabited Europe and the British Isles.

Chapter 4: A Look At Racial Types

Whether one accepts the theory of evolution or looks at a special creation for the presence of man on the earth, we must look to the remote past for the origin of the several races. Before evolution was accepted, the view regarding the origin of man was that human beings were a special creation of God. It was believed the traits now found within the various races were more plastic than they are today, but were fixed for all time, so that when the peoples departed from their original inheritance, the special features of race had been indelibly stamped (Sayce, 37).

Language similarity among various groups is an indication that at one time these groups must have been united by social ties. The Australian aborigines, the South African Negroes, the Aryan nations, and the American Indians all came from common homes and must have migrated to different locations (Peschel, 29). One school of anthropologists, known as the pluralistic school, believes that the varieties of human beings were created separately in the regions they now possess, and did not come from a single pair of ancestors (ibid, 11). Another view is that the environment is responsible for altering heredity. Along with this is the notion that education and opportunity can also change heredity. These ideas came from the loose thinkers of the French Revolution and their American counterparts (Grant, 14). This is not new. Both Herodotus and Hippocrates attributed the different races to the environment, though Hippocrates went one step further and believed that acquired characteristics could be inherited (Wasserman, 19). A modern example of this kind of reasoning is seen in a remark by Calvin Kephart. In referring to a particular tribe, he said its members were isolated in a region that was subject to a rigorous climate with many snow banks, and without sun most of the year. As a result, their brown complexion was bleached, and they finally evolved into the great white race (Kephart, 166).

What is known is that from antiquity the skin color of various races has been regarded as the primary means of racial identification. Anthropologists have long searched for the cause of these differences. Some believe that climate is the cause, but the distribution of the various races finds no relationship between the color of the skin and the isothermal lines (lines on the weather map which connects points having equal temperatures). Others believe humidity, or humidity with heat, is the cause, but the darkest blacks live near the Sahara Desert while in the Congo the skin color is distinctly lighter. Still another view is that the skin color is determined by the influence of the tropical sun that causes oxygenation on the skin because of exposure to solar rays. The problem with this is that the exposed portions of the body are no darker than those covered, and people who live and work indoors are often darker than those who work outside. Tanning, due to exposure of the sun, is not hereditary. All these theories put forth by anthropologists fail as the sole explanation for the color of the skin. The best human theory is that skin color is due to the combined influences of a number of factors of environment, working through the organic processes of man that cannot be isolated from the others (Ripley, 61-62, 73).

For a considerable period of time the belief was that direct external agencies affected the individual both physically and morally. For example, the Negro was black because the sun had burnt him or his father before him. The Indian was red or brown because of the sun and the wind, along with the smoke in the wigwam. The dark irises in the eyes on some people

were due to the use of coal fires. Irish peasants had large jaws because they ate large quantities of half-boiled potatoes. The problem with the whole theory is that the types of men portrayed in the ancient Egyptian wall paintings of 5,000 years ago (this figure should be about 4,000 years) are identical with the types presently living. Some naturalists hold the view that natural selection in the direction of physical improvement operated strongly in the early stages of society, but civilization has ended or greatly restricted this action (Beddoe, 17-18, 25).

In the area of natural selection, groups who procreate among themselves and who regularly produce offspring, will develop distinctive hereditary traits over a period of time. The result will be a common genetic heritage. Anthropologists regard a race as population whose gene pool is distinct from other populations. In the past the chief obstacle to the mixing of the races has been the barrier imposed by geography. Walter Karp may well be correct when he says that the reproductive isolation of the different human varieties, primarily through geographical barriers, is the key to the formation of race. The reason: Because it permits all the factors that distinguish or allow various populations to exhibit their full effectiveness (Karp, 213).

Duane Gish presents the fundamental question: Did God preserve a sufficient gene pool in the survivors of the Flood in order to bring about the races of today, or was this gene pool created at the time of the Flood? The fact is: No one knows. Whatever the case, the various branches of the human race scattered abroad and isolated themselves. As a result we have the various budding races that gave rise to the peoples inhabiting the earth today. Members of a particular species, who disperse into small groups, often find themselves isolated both geographically and reproductively. Any such group will carry only a small portion of the total gene pool found in the original stock. Inbreeding will occur and genetic traits will surface which are ordinarily suppressed in larger populations. This is because of the dilution caused by intermarriage of the entire population. As dispersal takes place, small groups often fail to possess necessary skills, and in time they lose what skills they did possess. Because of a lack of competition from other tribes they may abandon the production of weapons, and if enough food is present, even agriculture. Ideas and skills are no longer interchanged with neighboring tribes. The result is that progress is retarded and a primitive condition sets in. Civilization can develop rapidly in heavily populated areas, but remain primitive in unsettled regions. Early fossil men were labeled "uncivilized" for this reason. The fact is that Neanderthal man possessed a higher culture than some primitive people that exist today. When genetics are considered, evolution has no satisfactory explanation for the origin of the races. Theodosius Dobzhansky admits, "It is almost incredible that a century after Darwin, the problem of the origin of racial differences in the human species remains about as baffling as it was in his time" (quoted by Gish, 214).

Walter Karp is correct when he says the differing races today are the result of groups of Homo sapiens settling in different regions, becoming isolated by major geographical barriers, and then adapting to their particular environment. Attempts, so far, to classify races according to their blood type have been disappointing (Karp, 219). Because of a vast array of differing blood groups, it has been nearly impossible to employ this method in determining any clear-cut ethnic categories. Blood types now seem capable of rapidly mutating much more than previously believed possible, and if subject to recent changes, cannot reveal much about distant generations (N. Davies, 44).

It is interesting to know that Caucasians, in general, have lived in environments characterized by cool, dry air. This indicates that narrow noses have a selective advantage under those conditions. High, narrow nasal openings moisturize air better than low, broad nasal passages. In cloudy, dimly lit northern latitudes, people with less skin coloring have an advantage because dark skin filters out too much of the ultraviolet rays, resulting in vitamin D deficiencies. Karp believes this is the reason for the high incidence of fair skin, blue eyes, and blond hair found in northern Europe. It appears that broad, flat noses are more advantageous in hot environments. With respect to the color of skin, the more intense the solar radiation, the darker, on the average, the population will be. Also, the color of the skin varies according to the latitude. Mongoloid peoples in Southeast Asia are darker than those in northern China. In Central America, Indians in the north are lighter than those in the south (Karp, 216). These above list Karp's reasons for the skin color of the races, but others have different ideas. For example, some believe that the tendency toward blondness is the result of living in higher elevations. But this is contradicted by the fact that many brunettes also live in higher elevations. Even the location of populations from east to west denies any climatic influence.

The idea that races and skin color are the result of environment should be recognized for what it is—adaptation found in the theory of evolution. Ripley gives us an illustration of this view. He says the Teutonic race is a variety of the long-headed type of northern Europe—its blondness and size the result of environment, artificial selection, and isolation in Scandinavia (Ripley, 467). “Artificial selection” and isolation can certainly be factors, but environment is purely an evolutionary hypothesis. What should be recognized is that the races, in general, were found where God intended them to be, and their racial characteristics and features were best suited for those locations. However, we need to be aware that in the modern world of today, travel, transportation, immigration, etc. are greatly altering the fundamental make-up of many nations.

Creationists believe skin color results from a natural sorting out of pre-existing genetic traits, and that this occurred at the time the races were formulated. Some believe that the Negroid race is the result of a curse God placed on Cain, or the curse placed on Ham. The Bible does not record the color of skin of either Cain or Ham. It has been suggested that the Negroid race became black as a result of adaptation to the ultraviolet light from the tropical sun. However, this does not explain why people who are equally black are not found in tropical areas, South America for example. The view is held that blacks tended to migrate into those areas where black skin offered protection from intense sunlight, while fair-skinned Scandinavians migrated to those areas where the sun would have a less harmful effect (Gish, 214-215). While this view may be true in part, it fails to consider what the Bible says about the location of the races. It tells us that God divided to the nations their inheritance when he separated the sons of Adam ([Deut. 32:8](#)).

It cannot be denied that the Negro adapted very well to the heat-loss requirements of the tropics. Because of the length of fingers, hands, and forearms, he has an unusually large amount of skin surface in proportion to his body mass. This surface comprises about 20 percent of the sweating potential. This advantage in the tropics is offset by the disadvantage in cold climates. During the Korean War, the frostbite incidence among American Negro troops was seven times the average of white soldiers. During conditions of cold, studies show the rate of energy production among Negroes falls off more rapidly than among other

ethnic groups. When Caucasians are placed in hot temperatures, the bodily processes go into a cooling-off mode, and little blood gets to the brain. White people do not do well in hot weather. Blood circulation in the tropics is often channeled along emergency routes to serve the sweat glands at the extremities, rather than going to the brain (Weyl and Possony, 49-50).

Too cold a climate has disadvantages for those living in such regions. Due to the harsh climate in the Arctic, Lapps, Siberian Eskimos, and others have stagnated (Kephart, 98). By the same token Negroes who live in too hot a climate have not been able to advance civilization very well. This dormancy can certainly be attributed to the enervating effects of the tropical zone. The Vandals, for example, were slowly demoralized. They disintegrated and were finally conquered by the Byzantines. Their descendants can be counted among the blond Berbers, among whom blue or gray eyes can still be found (ibid, 453).

We have previously commented on head shape. One of the most important characteristics that distinguish one people from another is the shape of the skull. This comparison is often called the cephalic index. Certain varieties of people are long-headed (dolichocephalic); others are broad-headed (brachycephalic). These terms relate to the proportion of the length of the skull to its width. The skull shape is one of the most distinguishing and permanent characteristics, and remains constant generation after generation (Sayce, 14-15). In fact, this is one of the best tests of race known. Skulls are rated according to the cephalic index, that is, the width of the head above the ears expressed in the percentage of its length from forehead to back. As the skull becomes proportionally broader, when viewed from above, the cephalic index increases. Figures are given for the various ratings of either broad or long, with a middle range called mesocephalic (Ripley, 37).

When we look at the three racial types in Europe, there are four characteristics that identify them. These are the skull shape, eye color, hair color, and stature. These three racial types are the Nordic, Mediterranean, and Alpine. The Scandinavians are the tall, long-headed people of northern Europe, and belong to the Nordic type. The Welsh, Irish, Corsicans, and Spanish Basques represent the Mediterranean type. They are also long-headed, but shorter in stature. The Alpines are the broad-headed people of Europe. These include the tall, northern Celts, among whom are some Danes, Slavs, and some of the Irish. Shorter, broad-headed Alpines include some of the French and Swiss (Taylor, 213-214). Northern Europe is the center for the dispersion of the long-headed type, or Nordic stock, and contains more blond people than any other part of Europe. As far back as archaeology can go, we are told these long-headed types are identical with the populations living today (Ripley, 120). So, the cephalic index is the best method to determine European population types (Grant, 16). The long-headed Teutonic type is often labeled Germanic, Cymric, or Nordic. The broad headed Alpine type is labeled Celto-Slavic, and Sarmatian. The long-headed Mediterranean type is commonly called Iberian. The term Celt is applied to the broad-headed, darkish population of the Alpine highlands, but philologists apply the term to all who speak the Celtic language (Ripley, 121, 126). The Alpine type is predominant in most Slavic-speaking countries, except in Russia where a very large stratum of Nordic stock is found everywhere (Grant, 59-60, 154).

The current terms used to identify the white race are Caucasian, Indo-European, and Aryan, though some of the brown peoples are included in these. The dominant type anthropologists connect with Indo-European is the Nordic (Speiser, 5-6), characterized by

blue or light-gray eyes, hair that is flaxen, tawny, reddish, or sandy. Examples of these people were the Goths, Danes, Norsemen, and Saxons (Ripley, 122). All blue, gray, or green eyes in the world today came originally from the Nordic race of northern Europe, and blond hair comes from them alone (Grant, 21-22).

The civilization originating in the southern part of Mesopotamia, is regarded as one of the oldest. New evidence demonstrates that the Sumerians were Aryans in physical type, that is, the long-headed Nordic type with fair complexions and blue eyes. One of the early branches of the Sumerians was the sea-going Morites or Amorites, who left many "prehistoric" inscriptions in the British Isles. The ancient Greeks, Etruscans, and patrician Romans, were of Sumerian origin as evidenced by their writing, language, and religion. Both the Trojans and Ionian Greeks are demonstrated to be of Sumerian origin (Waddell, n.d., 8). Ephraim Speiser tells us that one of the answers for the origin of the Amorites is that just before the first dynasty of Babylon, there was a west Semitic center just east of the Tigris (Speiser, 153). Abraham migrated from Ur of the Chaldees around 2,000 BC, thus making the Sumerians ancestors of the Hebrews. In this ancient region Sumerians of European appearance have been found. For example, Sir Leonard Woolley noted that the Sumerians came from the east. The study of their bones and skulls shows they resembled Caucasians and were a branch of the Indo-European stock, (Parker, 64). (The reader may recall that the Bible tells us the peoples who migrated into the Mesopotamian valley came from the east). Pictorial representations of ancient Sumerians show the same features as those of the later Hebrews (Kephart, 150). According to L. A. Waddell, the Sumerian language is demonstrated to be the parent language of the whole Indo-European language group, especially modern English (Waddell, n.d., 471). Many authorities would probably dispute the language connection. But Carlton Coon in his work, *Races of Europe*, notes the similarity of the skulls and facial forms between the Sumerians and living Englishmen, and Sir Leonard Woolley identified the Sumerians with fair Europeans (Parker, 67).

Roland Dixon, professor of anthropology at Harvard, regarded the people of Palestine and nearby countries during the second and third millennia BC as primarily Mediterranean and Caspian (Nordic) types. Dixon said the Hebrews probably retained the physical characteristics with which they came into Palestine without any changes. They were long-headed, but there was the possibility of some round-headed types as well (quoted by Fasken, 20-21). All indications are that the Philistines were racially related to the Achæan Greeks and were a large-statured Nordic people who ruled over a Mediterranean lower class (Günther, 129).

The oldest record of a drawing that illustrates racial types was found in the tomb of the Theban prince Rekh-ma-Ra, and was made about a century before the birth of Moses. The drawing divided mankind into four races—the black Negro, the olive-skinned Syrian, the red-skinned Egyptian, and the white-skinned Libyan. The races depicted on this drawing of 4,000 years ago are still today what they were then (Sayce, 20-21, 24). The identification of the lost ten tribes of Israel can be greatly assisted by an examination of the anthropological data relating to the physical types to which Israel belonged. Contemporary monumental evidence shows that the people of the ten tribes were of the purest Semitic stock. Assyrian obelisks contain bas-reliefs that illustrate tribute-bearers. Among these tribute-bearers are Israelites. These Israelites look like the typical Jew of today. They have all the outward traits by which we distinguish pure-blooded Jews. Also, illustrations of prisoners taken by the

Egyptian conqueror Shishak are depicted with the features of Amorites. These prisoners had been the Jewish subjects of king Rehoboam (Sayce, 76-77). (The reader may recall that anthropologists regard the Amorites, as well as the Hebrews, as branches of the Sumerian people.)

Sir Gardner Wilkinson did a reconstruction of the features of the ancient Israelites. The features were very similar to the people of northern Europe, especially the Nordic type. Professors Huxley, Haddon, and Carr-Saunders compared the racial types of the ancient Israelites to that of the modern Jews. The distinct Semitic characteristic found in both was that of long-headedness. The characteristics that have been regarded as typical of the Jews come from the traits of non-Jewish people with whom the Jews have mixed. The Jewish nose of today is Armenoid. The broad-headedness is Idumean (Parker, 50, 45, 28-30). The true Semite belongs to the white race and is long-headed. Jews in central Europe show about 15 percent blond, 25 percent brunet, the rest being intermediate. Broad headedness is found almost exclusively among brunets (Sayce, 78). Broad-headedness among the Jews is the result of mixed marriages (Ripley, 390, 393). The original Jewish types are long-headed (Pittard, 351). Racial characteristics were so deeply imbedded that by the time the races arrived in Europe, they had remained constant (Beddoe, 37-38). The present populations of central and western Europe are descended from prehistoric people (that is, before 700 BC) and in part from migrations that took place in the historic period (Pittard, 79).

The English population of today must be regarded as Nordic due to the tall stature, fair hair, and long headedness. The Scottish highlanders are among the tallest men in existence. They have always been formidable fighters, and even the Romans were unable to penetrate their mountain strongholds (Pittard, 188, 190-191). While it has been stated that the English are a "truly multiracial society," what is not realized is that their ancestors-Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Normans, Belgics, and Celts-all belonged to the Nordic race. The English are far from being "one of the most mongrel strains of the human race" (Baker, 267).

For a considerable period of time the Nordic strain was predominant even in Greece. As late as the fourth century AD, the Jewish physician and philosopher, Adamantius, said the Nordic type in the population of Greece was still evident (Günther, 157). Out of a population of 90,000 freemen, the high-brain capacity of the ancient Greeks produced no less than 14 first-rank geniuses in a single century (Grant, 97). The Spartans were known to be blonde and the Nordic spirit had completely penetrated them, but by the time of Plato de-Nordization and degeneration had set in deeply. In the middle of the fifth century BC, Pindar called his countrymen "the blond Danaï" (Günther, 166, 161). Until the middle of the sixth century BC, the Persians were predominately Nordic, fair and ruddy like the Greeks, but by the middle of the fourth century many Persians had become mixed with Arabic blood (Günther, 142, 150). The descendants of Arabs who migrated into the area during the Muslim period inhabit Persia today. These were people who moved into territories that had been abandoned by a white race. The Arabic peoples are not racially identical with the Persians, who vanished (Hannay, 315). It is Hannay's belief that the Persians are the modern Prussians.

In northern Scandinavia some of the descendants of the Tatar tribes are found in the interior parts of Finland. These include the Fenni, Esti, and Lapps, who had been pushed out of Sweden when it was occupied by the Goths and Svear. Tatar tribes were once located in central and western Europe, but were pushed north by the Cimmerians (Capt, 177). Pure

Lapps are very short, with a light skin that has brown tones (Günther, 95, 98). The movement of the various peoples mentioned in this chapter will have a great bearing on what we shall learn in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: The Captivity and Deportation of Israel

Both the Bible and history record that the ten tribes of Israel—descendants of the Patriarch Jacob—were deported from their land by a series of invasions. Long before this period, however, the tribe of Dan had already disappeared, and Asher and Gad had abandoned their brethren in large numbers. Both Dan and Asher were linked in sea trade and in the establishment of settlements with their coastal neighbors. As early as the twelfth century BC, Irish historians trace part of the tribe of Dan to Ireland—200 years after the Exodus (Capt, 64). The Irish historian Keating related that the Danaan, who had been in Greece, settled in Ireland and Denmark because they did not want to fall into the hands of the Assyrians. The ancient name for the Danes was Dansk or Donsk (Rutherford, 38). During Trojan times Danites lived in the vicinity of Troy but crossed the Dardanelles after the fall of Troy. They migrated in a northwesterly direction giving their name to such rivers as the Danube, Donetz, Daniester, Daniepr, Don, and Eridanus. They eventually settled in Norway, but were driven out by Odin and the Asir. Settling in Scania, they became known as the Danes (Hannay, 58). Bible students are aware of the Danite practice of migrating and naming locations after their forefather Dan ([Judges 18:29](#)).

The Danites were criticized for failing to come to the aid of their brethren when Jabin attacked Israel. They remained in their ships instead ([Judges 5:17](#)). They were closely allied with the Phoenicians in maritime ventures, and after the time of Baasha, king of Israel, do not appear to have remained in the land in large numbers. The account of the captivity in [2 Kings 15:29](#) does not mention the Danites, or their towns or territories. The indication is they had already left. At an early date Phoenician trade was occurring between Palestine and the British Isles. We can assume the Danites were familiar with the western Mediterranean and beyond, including the British Isles. In the ninth century AD, the Jewish writer Eldud wrote that in the days of Jeroboam the tribe of Dan was unwilling to shed the blood of their brothers and left the country. It has never been disputed that a tribe by the name of Tuatha De Danaan settled in Ireland. Tuatha De Danaan means “tribeship of Dan” (Hannay, 34-35, 105, 47-48).

Excerpts from ancient Assyrian and Babylonian records describe how Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, subjugated Menahem, king of Israel, and took the territories of Naphtali, Galilee, and Gilead. In the process he carried away many of the people. Tiglath-Pileser was a military usurper, known as Pul in the Bible. According to these excerpts, Tiglath-Pileser also deposed Pekah and put Hoshea in his place (Bible Research Handbook, serials 10 and 27). However, the Bible states that Pekah was assassinated by Hoshea ([2 Kings. 15:30](#)). So, if the excerpts are correct, after the assassination, the Assyrian king allowed Hoshea to be tributary to him. The Assyrians had an interest in deporting captured peoples. They wanted to protect their northern frontier from the kingdom of Ararat, so the deported Israelites were placed in these areas (Capt, 49). One Assyrian inscription states that Tiglath-Pileser captured the Bit-Humria (house of Omri) and the land of Naphtali (Olson, 65). The Bible relates that Shalmaneser, who ruled after Tiglath-Pileser, besieged Samaria and took it captive after three years (2 Kings 17). The Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser lists the tribute paid by Jehu, the

son of Khumir (Omri), along with the tribute paid by a number of other subjected rulers (Bible Research Handbook, serial 22b). It is generally believed that the Jehu, mentioned on the obelisk, was Jehu the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi ([2 Kings 9:2](#)). The Jehu mentioned in [2 Kings 9:2](#) was born about 150 years earlier than the one who paid tribute to Shalmaneser. More than likely the Jehu who paid the tribute had been appointed governor by the Assyrians after Israel had been subjugated.

The Assyrian policy of deportation continued in the reign of Sargon. Inscriptions of Sargon give the number of people deported from the city of Samaria as 27,280 (Bible Research Handbook, serial 24). This is quite a small figure when compared with the total number of Israelites deported by Tiglath-Pileser and Shalmaneser. The Bible tells us they were placed by the River Gozan and in the cities that the Assyrians had recently taken from the Medes ([2 Kings 17:6](#)).

The ten tribes in the northern kingdom were not the only ones deported. About 15 years later, Sennacherib, the son of Sargon, came against the southern kingdom of Judah. He took all the fenced cities of Judah ([2 Kings 18:13](#)), but at that time was not able to take Jerusalem. God intervened and delivered Jerusalem and king Hezekiah by a great miracle ([2 Kings 19:35-36](#)). The attack by Sennacherib against Judah is recorded on the Taylor Prism, now in the British Museum. It states: “. . . I came up against him, and by force of arms and by the might of my power I took forty-six of his strong fenced cities; and of the smaller towns which were scattered about I took and plundered a countless number. And from these places I captured and carried off as spoil 200,150 people, old and young, male and female, together with horses and mares, asses and camels, oxen and sheep, a countless multitude. . . .” (Rawlinson, 1887a, 2:161). The Babylonians took Judah captive about 120 years later, but large numbers of Jews had already been deported long before that time. Jews and Benjamites taken captive at various times were placed in three different areas: (1) Some taken by the Syrians during the reign of Ahaz ([2 Chron. 28:5](#)) were placed in Kir, a region near the Caucasus; (2) the number carried by Sennacherib into Assyria was 200,150; (3) the remainder taken to Babylon during the reign of Zedekiah. A relatively small number were taken to Babylon, most of these earlier captives placed in the same regions as the people of the northern kingdom (Bible Research Handbook, serial 32c).

In 1861, a column excavated at Kurkh on the Tigris recorded the victories of Shalmaneser III over ten kings. Among the names was Ahab, the Israelite. The Bible does not list an Ahab during this time period, but what is significant is that this column is the last record of the Assyrians using the name Israel in any form when referring to the northern kingdom. Subsequently, all references to the northern kingdom use the name Ghomri or Khumri-the Assyrian pronunciation for Omri. The name Khumri is found in the annals of Tiglath-Pileser III, which indicates it was in usage before the time of Shalmaneser. Shalmaneser's column records: “The cities of Gilead and Abel-beth-maachah on the borders of the land of Khumri, and the widespread land of Hazael to its whole extent, I brought within the territory of Assyria.” Upon Shalmaneser's death, Sargon II assumed the throne of Assyria. He was the king who conquered Israel. He mentions the Khumri and calls himself the conquerer of Bit-Khumri-the house of Omri (Capt, 99).

In 1847, Sir Henry Layard discovered over 23,000 cuneiform tablets in the ruins of the great royal library of the Assyrian kings. Cuneiform is an arrow-headed type of writing. About a dozen of these tablets came from the seventh-century BC and referred to the captive

Israelites. At the time translators failed to recognize these references to be the Israelites because they were called Gamera, or Gimera. The Assyrians used this appellation for Israel, which was derived from Khumri.

The Jewish historian Josephus tells us that the Israelites were placed in Media-Persia (Ant., IX, xiii-xiv). This area we know today as northwest Persia. The book of Ezra records that Ezra sent messengers to Iddo, the chief of the place called Casiphia “that they should bring unto us ministers for the house of our God” ([Ezra 8:17](#)). Henderson’s “Russian Researches” names Casiphia as a country bordering the Caspian Sea (Gawler, 6). The prevailing view today is that the “Lost Ten Tribes of Israel” were mixed with the peoples in the land of their captivity and are, therefore, “cast away.” One thing is certain: They did not return to their homeland in Palestine, and even the majority of Jews never returned from the Babylonian captivity. Fewer than 50,000 Jews returned under Ezra and Nehemiah.

The book of 2 Kings states that Israel was carried away to Halah, and in Habor, by the river Gozan in the cities of the Medes ([2 Kings 17:6](#)). Where are these places called Halah, and Habor by the river Gozan? Authorities generally agree as to the location of Habor (Khabor, Hara), but argue over whether or not Gozan is a river or a country. The accepted view regarding Halah is that it is identified with the modern Khabour on the river Aborrhas, which empties into the Euphrates south of Carchemish. However, some Bible reference sources tell us that Halah was the Hallahuh, an Assyrian city and district northeast of Nineveh, and that other proposed locations are far less likely. The work entitled Russia in Central Asia in 1889, by G. N. Curzon, has a map that lists a river named Kizil Uzen for part of its course and Safid Rud for the remainder of its course. Both these names stand for “White River.” Spuner’s Historical Atlas names this river as Gozan. This ancient Gozan is identical with the Kizil Uzen. Since the Gozan river is mentioned in conjunction with the Medes, the Scripture must be referring to the Kizil Uzen. Another river in the vicinity is known as the Abhar Chai, which is Turkish for Abhar River, as well as a town nearby named Abhar. The Septuagint calls this river Abor. Other versions of the Bible refer to it as Habor and Khavor. Near the upper courses of a small tributary that empties into the Kizil Uzen is a town by the name of Haran. Some maps list it as Hour. Stieler’s Hand Atlas calls it Haru, and it corresponds to the ancient Hara or Ara. It was in these locations of the Elburz Mountains, not in Mesopotamia, that the Assyrians placed the Israelites.

It was mentioned above that the district where Ezra sought help for the Temple at Jerusalem was Casiphia. It was in the region of the Caucasus (Hannay, 112-115). When Israel was taken captive, the Medes did not possess Mesopotamia. The Israelites were placed in the cities of the Medes, as the Assyrians had also conquered these. This area was close to the southwest edge of the Caspian Sea and northeast of Mesopotamia. Heinrich Ewald wrote that these places were north of Nineveh and south of Lake Van. He said that the Gozan is still known by the name of Ozen, that it rises south of the lake of Ourmia and forms approximately the northern boundary of Media. One town in the area was called Rages (afterward shortened to Rai). It is mentioned in the book of Tobit, and its ruins are not far from the Persian city of Teheran. Another city north of Nineveh was Elkosh which is believed to have been the home of the prophet Nahum. Ewald tells us that we can easily understand the locations where the deportations were mostly directed, but other Israelites may have been sent elsewhere. It seems probable, Ewald says, that one assigned place was Hamath (Ewald, 42). (The interested reader may wish to consult the Bible Research Handbook,

serials 29b and 29c, for a number of authoritative maps and sources that place Halah, Hara, and Gozan in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea.)

At this point, let us compare a few names. Large numbers of Israelites had been placed in the area south of Lake Urmia, which was adjacent to Media. It was called the land of Gamir. Sargon had previously depopulated this area by removing the people of Mannai who lived there to the west. Letter 112 in the Assyrian archives identifies the people of Gamir as Gamera and further recognizes them as Cimmerians. The Israelites occupied portions of the land of the Medes and Mannai, but remained distinct from them (Capt, 115-116). These names-Gamera and Cimmerians-should be kept in mind. About 707 BC, a people going by the name of Gimera or Gamera are recorded living among the Mannai in a territory close to Media. This is where the Israelites had been placed about 15 years earlier. Another people to suddenly appear in the land of Mannai were the Iskuza. Modern historians tell us that the Iskuza were called Skuthai by the Greeks and Sacæ by the Persians. The Greek historian Herodotus tells us the Persians called the Sacæ "Scythians." A trilingual inscription found in the tomb of Darius lists three separate groups of Sakkas (Sacæ). In each case the Babylonian text in this inscription has the name Gimiri for the Persian Sakka. Since the Persians called the Iskuza by the name of Sakkas, the inescapable conclusion is that the Iskuza, Sakka, and Gimiri are the same people (ibid, 122-123, 140).

The ancient capital of Media was Ecbatana. Located on a caravan road between Babylon and Ecbatana is an impressive escarpment. Carved on it is a memorial 100 feet in height and 150 feet in length. It is known as the Behistun Rock and was engraved by the order of Darius the Great about 515 BC. The writing on this stone is trilingual-Babylonian, Elamite, and Persian. Sir Henry Rawlinson successfully deciphered the Persian script. The rock listed 23 nations over which Darius ruled. Among those were the Sakka. The Babylonian script on the rock lists them as Gimiri. What this demonstrates is that the people the Babylonians called the Gimiri were called Sakkas by both the Persians and Elamites. Another inscription written on a gold tablet placed the Sakkas beyond Sogdiana (in central Asia just north of Afghanistan and now known as the Uzbek Republic of Russia). This demonstrates that migrations of some of the Sakka had already taken place before the time of Darius, and that these people had gone to the eastern edge of the Persian Empire (Capt, 139-140). Sir Henry Rawlinson regarded the Gimiri or Cimmerians and the Sacæ as the same people and said they were Israelites. Rawlinson's statement is as follows: "We have reasonable grounds for regarding the Girniri, or Cimmerians, who first appeared on the confines of Assyria and Media in the seventh century (BC), and the Sacæ of the Behistun Rock, nearly two centuries later, as identical with Israel" (quoted in Hannay, 286). It is Hannay's view that the mass of the so-called Hebrew race consisted of Israelites, or house of Isaac, sometimes the house of Omri (Beth Omri). The Assyrian equivalent was Bit-Khumri, or Ghumri, or Humri. The Babylonian equivalent was Gimera (Hannay, 19).

The transformation of the name Gimiri into Kimmerioi/Cimmerii is well-known (Hannay, 288). Another name that has been connected with the Cimmerii is the Umman-Manda, a name the Babylonians and Assyrians gave the Cimmerii. It was Sayce's opinion that the Manda of Ecbatana were the Scythians of classical history (Fasken, 58-59). Kephart tells us that the name Manda was applied to the Cimmerian nation of Scythia (Kephart, 274, 342). (The reader may recall that the Persians called the Sacæ "Scythians.")

The first instance of Scythian tribes appearing in Europe can be placed in the seventh century BC, when they crossed the Araxes River and passed out of Asia. The Araxes is the ancient name of the Aras River in Armenia. The area around the Araxes River is where the Israelites were last known before departing for Europe (Rutherford, 21). They had abandoned their settlements near the Gozan and moved just north of the Araxes due to a series of uprisings around 710 BC in the general area of Urartu (Van)-the name of the ancient kingdom of Ararat. They were known as the Sak-Geloths, the name meaning the captives of Beth-Sak (Beth-Omri, Bit-Khumri) and referred to themselves as Sak-Geloths-the captives of Sak (Hannay, 269-271, 307-308). A later form of the word Sak was Sagh. Diodorus Siculus wrote that the Scythians originally came from the region of the Araxes, had multiplied into a great people and had extended their territory. In the fifth century BC Herodotus placed the Scythians in southern Russia, stating that their territory extended for 500 miles (Rutherford, 9). Around 600 BC the Khumri migrated farther west from their location north of the Araxes. It is believed that an attack upon Sakland by the Assyrians, who had made an alliance with the kings of Urartu (Van), precipitated their exodus. This was about the time the Assyrian Empire was crumbling before the Babylonians.

Chapter 6: The Westward Movement

Modern scholars have not appreciated the scope of travel and colonization in the ancient world. Archaeologists, for generations, have held the belief that only navigation techniques introduced into Europe during the fifteenth century made it possible for Europeans to cross the Atlantic (Fell, 1976, 17). Sir Flinders Petrie uncovered gold works in Gaza that were made in Ireland. Trade between Palestine and the British Isles had been established as early as 1600 BC. (Bible Research Handbook, serial 49c). Shortly after the Flood, or before 2000 BC, something of the riches of Western Europe was known. The early cultures there were motivated by the search for certain forms of material wealth. It appears Western Europe was exploited for its riches for at least 1,000 years. But early colonies in Spain were abandoned due to the intrusion of a bronze-using people from central Europe (MacKenzie, 99, 102, 106).

Chapter two of this work demonstrated that the Phœnicians were well-known seafarers and traders. The term Phœnician applied to a confederation made up of the Israelite tribes of Dan, Asher, probably Zebulun, as well as Phœnicians proper, and other Canaanites (Hannay, 21). Both Solomon and Hiram of Tyre maintained eastern and western navies ([1 Kings 10:11, 22](#), [2 Chron. 8:18; 9:10, 21](#)). Extensive Canaanite settlements were maintained in North Africa, southwest Europe, and along the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean (Hannay, 24). The Byzantine historian, Procopius of Caesarea, said that in his day there was at Tigisis (Tangiers) two columns of white stone with the following inscription: "We are they who fled before the face of Joshua, the robber, the son of Nun" (Bible Research Handbook, serial 9). Spanish and British colonies carried on regular trade in tin and lead with the ships of Tarshish. Ancient writers held that Tarshish was located at the mouth of the Guadalquivir in Andalusia. The Bible indicates that extensive mining and trading in gold was extant in early times. Solomon received 12,066 talents of gold annually ([2 Chron. 9:13](#)). An ancient inscription, found in Spain, commemorated an official of King Solomon by the name of Adoniram, sent to collect tribute (Hannay, 26-27). What is interesting is that the Phœnician historian, Sanchoniathon, who is believed to have lived before the Trojan War, recorded that the ancestor of the Phœnicians was Kronos, that is Saturn, whom the Phœnicians called Israel. Kronos (Israel) had a son named Ieoud, that is Judah (Bible Research Handbook, serial 41a). This statement makes sense when we realize that the tribes of Dan, Asher, and Zebulun were an integral part of the Phœnician league.

No language was more widely known and spoken throughout antiquity than Phœnician, with the exception of Greek and Latin. The decline of the Phœnician language corresponded to the rise of Aramaic, which appeared in the eighth century BC and coincides with the deportation of the Beth-Sak or Khumri by the Assyrians (Hannay, 6). The oldest colony in Spain-Gades (Cadiz)-is regarded to have been founded in 1100 BC, and likely reached its zenith during the reign of Solomon; Carthage was founded in 813 BC, when the golden age of Phœnicia had passed. The golden age of Phœnicia disintegrated and collapsed with the disappearance of the Beth-Sak. During the time of Solomon and Hiram the Hebrews achieved their highest and most brilliant expression. The Phœnician confederacy with the Beth-Sak was made up of explorers, mariners, colonists, miners, and merchants (Hannay, 45-46, 20, 28-34).

British ores were shipped to Spain and Carthage, but after the Greek mariner Pytheas visited Britain, an overland route to Marseilles was established. Mining shifted to Cornwall after surface supplies ran out elsewhere. The Celts had an exclusive monopoly on trade with Britain, having acquired shipbuilding skills and navigation from the east. The mounting evidence is that many years before Rome was built, Britain had inherited a high degree of metalworking and technical skills from ancient civilizations. Celtic culture was veined with Aegean and Asiatic influences, and a gold coinage system was established before the Roman occupation (MacKenzie, 223). The indication of ancient travel is seen by the fact that coins from Carthage have been found in Kansas, Connecticut, Arkansas, and Alabama. These coins came by routes known by Plutarch, the Greek biographer and essayist, and served as currency for distant colonies or gifts to hospitable Indian chiefs (Fell, 1983, 3).

By the middle of the second millennium BC, settlements had begun in Scotland. They were located in the Hebrides, Orkneys, Shetland Islands, and the North Sea areas of Inverness. Within the first quarter of the second century BC, immigrants from between the Elbe and Rhine rivers were establishing themselves in eastern England and Scotland (Wainwright, 54-55). Jews deported out of Judea by Nebuchadnezzar had established themselves north of the Caucasus, and in Spain. Hellenized communities, along with synagogues, were found in the Balkans and along the shores of the Black Sea (Bible Research Handbook, serial 58b). The fact is: The achievements of the Bronze Age people have been greatly underrated. Ancient shipwrights made sound vessels, which were sailed across the ocean. Nordic seamen employed northern routes to America, while Mediterranean mariners were traveling routes that were later used by Columbus. A long warm period during the middle of the Bronze Age made the northern route to America quite comfortable, but later when the climate cooled, the northern route became ice-bound and traveling became too dangerous. Not until about AD 700 did the weather improve sufficiently for the Vikings to employ the northern route. During the cold period the routes were closed and forgotten until Columbus awakened interest again. During the Bronze Age Europeans were literate and educated. Teutonic and Celtic inscriptions attest to that fact in alphabets which have survived to this day. However, Latin replaced them as a result of Roman dominance (Fell, 1982, 288-289, 11).

The first people to arrive in Britain spoke Hebrew, a fact demonstrated by ancient Hebrew inscriptions found in many places in Britain and Ireland. Adam Rutherford shows that from a book by Jacob Tomlin, entitled, "A Comparative Vocabulary of Forty-Eight Languages, Comprising One Hundred and Forty-Six Common English Words, with Their Cognates in Other Languages Showing Their Affinities with the English and Hebrew," the early literature of Britain was largely a modified Hebrew. The Welsh language, even today, closely resembles Hebrew. According to Rutherford, it is difficult to adduce a single article or form of construction in Hebrew grammar, but that the same can be found in Welsh. Many whole sentences of the two languages have exactly the same words. Rutherford notes that Dr. Davies, the author of a Welsh grammar book, says almost every page of the Welsh translation of the Bible is replete with Hebraisms in the time, sense, and spirit of the original. The Welsh is so close to Hebrew that the same syntax might serve both (Rutherford, 40). Historians place the arrival of the Hebrews in Ireland prior to the Exodus (ibid, 32-33, fn).

Food shortages and overpopulation are the main reasons people migrate. Large-scale migrations take place when a large area becomes arid. It is true that social, political, or religious factors have led to migrations, but the main reason is geographical conditions. The evidence now shows that various regions of the earth have undergone slow climatic changes. A profound effect on both the history of Asia and Europe occurred when central Asia became very dry (Haddon, 1-5). Central Asia has not always been what it is today. At one time it was inhabited largely by a virile white race—the Soghs and Persians—progenitors of the enlightened and progressive nations of Europe (Hannay, 428-429). The protracted drought in central Asia was the principal cause of the destruction of the Roman Empire. One nomadic horde after another hurled itself against the sedentary regions of the west (Weyl and Possony, 65). A number of loan words from the southeast are found in northern European languages. These words came by way of a trade route through the Dnieper to the Black Sea (Taylor, 143). The Danube basin itself had been the center of industry and art for the Celtic Iron Age culture. There is an association between Nordic skulls and Iron Age artifacts, as grave diggings show (Baker, 248). So now it is widely accepted that extensive migrations from Asia into Europe took place between the seventh century BC and AD 400 (Bible Research Handbook, serial 70a).

With the exception of a few languages such as Finnic, Basque, Magyar, and Turkish, it is now accepted that all the languages of Europe are derived from a common source (Ripley, 477). The German linguist, Franz Bopp, proved the existence of a group of languages called Indo-European because they included most of the languages of Europe, India, and central and western Asia. The similarities in vocabulary and form are astonishing. Take for example the English word father, the German Vater, French père, Spanish padre, Latin pater, Greek πατήρ, Old Irish athir, Gothic fadar, Sanskrit pitar, and Tocharian pacar (an extinct central Asian language). The older the language, the closer is the agreement. Regardless of how they differ today, related or cognate languages come from a common source. The original home of the Indo-Europeans is believed to have been between south Russia and central Europe (Marek, 77). Every geographer will probably agree that the home of the Indo-Europeans was on both slopes of the Caucasus (Peshel, 507). The fact is: Whatever the location, the present people of western Europe owe their language and much of their culture to groups who migrated from central Asia. Ancient sources note that the Indo-European language originated with the Nordics (Speiser, 10).

The prevalent view has been that central Asia was the home of Mongoloid peoples, but skeletal remains show that the people who originally lived in this area belonged to the white race (McGovern, 28). Nordics became a populous nation in central Asia, especially in western Turkestan (Kephart, 167). Turkestan is the region between Iran and Siberia, now divided between Russia, China, and Afghanistan. In Scandinavia archaic objects came from southeastern Europe, along the northern coast of the Black Sea, from the middle and lower Danube, and from Corinthia in Greece (Olson, 61). Asia was the chief location for the main development and differentiation of man, not Europe (Grant, 11). An explosive expansion of what is called the Kurgan culture (a burial-mound culture) took place from the Ukraine into the Caucasus, Asia Minor, the Balkans, and central and northern Europe. It is not difficult to understand why such names as Cimmerii, Cymrian, Cimbri, and Cymry, as well as Danaan, Danube, Danzig, and Denmark, have been found across Europe, Wales, and Ireland, all originating from the Ukraine and Aegean regions. These were all the names of the ancient invaders from southwestern Asia (Kephart, 371). Professor Linus Brunner, noted similarities

between Europe and the east when, in 1981, he stated that the newly discovered Rhaetic language of ancient Switzerland contained a Semitic vocabulary (Fell, 1982, 290). Another example is that of the Milesian Scots. The penalty for willful murder and contract violations compared to that of the ancient Hebrews is quite marked (Kephart, 388). According to L. A. Waddell, about 50 percent of the most common English words are discovered to be Sumerian (Waddell, 1983, xi).

The Scandinavian Sagas tell us that all the sayings in the tongue of the Northmen began when men from central Asia settled in the north (du Chaillu, 20). While it is thought that the ancient Scandinavian alphabet, called the runes or futhork, is of Latin origin, the evidence is that it was used far to the northeast of Rome where Roman influence did not reach. More than likely the runes are a corruption of an old Greek alphabet used along the northwest coast of the Black Sea (Bradley, 18). The date for the runes can be placed as early as the second or third centuries AD. From examples of Etruscan, Greek, and early Roman scripts, it is not difficult to see that the earlier runes resemble archaic Greek and Etruscan rather than Latin (du Chaillu, 154-155, 188-189). Hannay is even more specific. He says the futhorks used by the various tribes of Europe are traceable to the early Hebrew alphabet used by the Saghs (Hannay, 306).

The Assyrians were noted for resettling denuded territories with peoples who were regarded as loyal or unable to revolt. Exiled peoples mentioned in the apocryphal book of Judith as the "sons of Chelod" were likely settled in much of the territory north of Assyria. During the reign of Sargon II, numerous rebellions took place that worked to the advantage of the Beth-Sak, enabling them to establish independence north of the Araxes River (Hannay, 266-267, 108). This set the stage for what was to come. Both Armenian and Georgian historians record that after the destruction of the first Temple, Nebuchadnezzar transported numbers of Jewish captives not only to Babylon, but also to Armenia and the Caucasus. By the end of the fourth century BC, some Armenian cities had large Jewish populations (McBirnie, 34). An interesting tombstone found in Russia had this inscription in the precaptivity script: "May his rest be in Eden at the time of the Salvation of Israel-in the year 702 of the years of our exile" (Rutherford, 9). Beddoe points out that Jews coming from Babylonia and Persia were in Russia by the first century AD, and that as they moved northward the type represented among them is derived from the various peoples with whom they mingled-Assyrian, Armenian, Iranian, and Caucasian (Beddoe, 134). There is some truth to the belief that a large portion of the Jews living in Poland came by a direct route from the east. The theory that a migration into the north directly from Palestine and north of the Black and Caspian seas is certainly valid, judging from the racial types (Ripley, 377). Even a doubter like David Baron admits that there is not the slightest doubt that many of the settlements of the Dispersion during the time of Christ were people who never returned from both the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities. He adds that these people were not only Jews, but descendants of the 12 tribes scattered abroad (Baron, 32). In a letter dated November 8, 1918, Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz, responding to a letter by a Captain Merton Smith, said that the ten tribes had been absorbed among the nations of the world, and that the modern Jews are comprised only of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and a certain number of the Levites (Bible Research Handbook, serial 7).

The Assyrian equivalent for Omri was Khumri, also rendered Ghumri or Humri. The kingdom of Israel was called the Bit-Khumri, possibly because the seat of power for the northern

kingdom was located in Samaria. Sir Henry Rawlinson points out that the Jehu on the Assyrian inscriptions was not the Jehu who was the son of Omri. But since Omri was regarded as the founder of the kingdom of Samaria, the country was called the Beth-Omri (Hannay, 53). What is the origin, however, of such names as Celts, Galatai, and Gauls? Hannay believes these names came from the territories that had been populated by peoples deported by the Assyrians. Many of these people initiated a successful revolt against the Assyrians, enabling the Bit-Khumri to escape beyond the Araxes River. As the Bit-Khumri moved westward, they expelled the Gimirra from "Cimmerian Land" and settled in a place called Arsareth (Hannay, 124-125, 173). The apocryphal book of [2 Esdras 13:39-45](#), describes an emigration from Media by the captive Israelites to a place called Arsareth, a journey of a year and a half. Arsareth is placed at the western edge of the Ukraine, and northeast Rumania. Hannay describes the route that was taken. He lists several reasons the Sak-Geloths (Bit-Khumri) abandoned Asia for Europe: (1) Reports that a mass of barbarians from the east were heading west; (2) the threat of the rising power of Babylon; (3) trade contacts with the west with promising opportunities; and (4) news of a treacherous massacre of Sakian troops by the so-called friendly Medes (Hannay, 338).

From about 705 BC, the Saghs (Sakai) began to colonize central Asia from their territory north of the Araxes, called Sakland or Sakesani. Various names they used were the Parthi of Ansik, Bactrians, Sakai, Æglai, Sogdians, and Yu-chi. Around 600 BC they gained power over western Asia, which they maintained for about 20 years. During this time they expelled the Gimirra (Cimmerians) from the western Ukraine. Between 598 and 544 BC they became known as the Skolotoi-the Greek rendering for Sak-Geloths. Their country was called Skuthia. The Persian name for these Saghs was Sakai (Hannay, 259). The area of Bactria, now known as modern Turkestan, was occupied by the Nordic Sacæ, who were closely related to the Massagetæ-a name that later surfaces in Europe. Like the ancient Persians, these people were blond and long-headed. The Chinese called them "the green-eyed devils," and by the Tatar name of Wu-suns, or the tall ones (Grant, 223, 225). By the time of Alexander the Great, some of the Sakai were located on the confines of India. Ancient Bactria remained a Nordic country long after the time of Alexander, and did not receive the name Turkestan until the seventh century AD. The evidence is accumulating that central Asia contained a large Nordic population in the centuries preceding the Christina era (Fasken, 32).

The "s-k" sound found Sacæ, Saka, etc., has been around for a considerable period of time. The Hebrew pronunciation for Isaac is given as "Yis-khawk," in the Bible Research Handbook, which states it is possible the "sakah" sound came from "Yis-khawk" (serial 55a). Hannay says that the name Sak is derived from the Hebrew Isaac (p. 301), though this view is disdained in some circles in spite of the fact that a number of writers agree with him. J. C. Gawler, for example, says the word Sakai is translatable as "Isaacites." Herodotus, the Greek historian, said the Persians called the Scythians Sakai. Other writers refer to the Sakai as Sakans, Saccassani, Saccassuni, and Saxones. Gawler mentions a work by a man named Wilson, who said inscriptions from Nineveh mention a rebellious people by the Esakska, who called themselves "Beth Isaac" in their own country. He also mentions that Strabo, the Greek geographer, said that Saccasena was a district in Armenia and that the Sakai had gained possession of a more fertile area in Armenia and called it after their own name (Gawler, 6). Ptolemy referred to the Sacæ as Saxones, and the historian Albinus said the Saxons were descended from the ancient Sacæ from Asia (Rutherford, 11). The idea that the

Sacæ were descended from barbarous Mongolian peoples is now generally discarded (Bible Research Handbook, serial 55a).

Sak-Geloths (Saghs) colonized toward the east, so the only Saghs with whom the Persians came into contact were the Skuthai (Scythians). While the bulk of the Saghs migrated west, the eastern branch remained in the area for some time. (Hannay, 387-388). The colonization began around 705 BC where, in the north and east, they were known as the "People of Asha." Their sacred books were known as the Edd-ha and survived in Scandinavia as the Edda (ibid, 331). In the ancient Hindu sagas, the gods and heroes were always "the Blonde." The Hindu Vedas (sacred writings) show traces of a winter solstice festival, which is certainly seen in northern Europe. These writings also speak of intrusive tribes who are described as "tall," "white," "blonde," and "fair-nosed," while the original people in the area are described as "small," "black," and without a nose or "noseless." The Hindu word for caste means "color," and the Brahmins who have kept themselves racially pure are fair-skinned, and blond or ruddy like Europeans (Günther, 134-135, 140). In China the Saghs acquired the name Yu-chi or Yuti. They appear pink and white of complexion as Tatar bowmen. The Chinese expelled them from China, and one group that migrated west dispossessed the Sak, that is the Sakas. In Europe the Yu-chi turn up as Yota. They had been living in Sogdiana, which corresponds to the modern area of Uzbek. The Han Annals relate that the "Sok" spread themselves over a large area and established a succession of states (Hannay, 400-404, 422, 427). The Sacæ were the Nordic people who traveled farthest to the east (Günther, 132).

Alexander the Great fought against the Ambri and Sigambri in India, and was successful in defeating them. Authorities were so taken aback when the same names later appeared in Europe, they believed there had been some mistake. Another tribe-the Silei-was attacked by Alexander on the river Jaxartes, located in the present area of Kazakhstan in central Asia. They appear later in Europe as the Salli, and the Sicambri are found with them. Herodotus stated that the Persians gave the name Skuthai to the Sakai. When Darius attacked the Scythians in Europe, he did so with the excuse that the Skolotoi, who lived in Asia, had ravaged it.

Keep in mind the name Scythian was applied to all nomadic wanderers, the word Skolotoi being the Greek word for Sak-Geloth or Sagh. While often regarded as barbarians, the real barbarians who came out of the northeast went under the general name Tatars, but more specifically were Mongols, Turks, and others from the same general location. The fact is: Ancient Europeans were not barbarians. They spoke in dialects of the Indo-European tongue and could write. The languages they used were as comprehensible as the principal tongues of modern Europe (Fell, 1982, 289). The Greeks held the view that people who did not dwell in cities were barbarian (N. Davies, 82). The Greeks referred to all people who inhabited the steppes of southern Russia and northern Turkestan as Scythians (McGovern, 35-36). What is significant is that Herodotus identified the Sacæ with the Scyths (Minns, 71), which means they were included in the general appellation. Herodotus also said that the Persians called all the Scythians Sacæ (Fasken, 28). But this designation is reasonably early, since many tribes were later included in the general name. The Scythians of whom Herodotus wrote called themselves Skolotoi and were regarded as Scythians only by their neighbors. They were intruders who had come from an independent Tatory (Latham, 209). Tatory is an indefinite historical region in Asia and Europe extending from the Sea of Japan to the

Dneiper River. There is no evidence the Skolotoi were ever ejected from Europe or extinguished as a people. What is known is that the names of peoples in portions of Europe did change, and the history of the populations in Europe from the fourth century BC to the fifth century AD is in the main a history of the Scyths (ibid, 209, 212).

The Scythians called themselves Skolotoi, some of the better-known variants being Skuthes, Skuthai, Saca, and Sacæ. The meaning of the appellation Scythian varies according to the time period in which it was used. It was first applied to the peoples living between the Carpathian Mountains and the Caspian Sea, but later to almost all peoples living east of that area. Thus, both European and Asiatic peoples received the name. Some were Nordic and long-headed, others Mongoloid and round-headed (Bible Research Handbook, serial 55c). Even to Herodotus the name Scythian had no racial meaning, as he appears to have regarded it as a political designation. Other classical authors regarded it as geographical. To most Greeks, a Scythian was a northern barbarian from the east of Europe, and the Galates (Gauls) barbarians from the west. So, Greek usage throws little light upon the original people to whom it was applied. Some authors applied it to 50 nations, many who were strangers to it (E. Davies, 133). According to Sir Henry Rawlinson, "From the mere term Scyth, therefore, we cannot conclude anything as to the ethnic character of a people" (quoted by Hannay, 300).

During the time of Herodotus (484-425 BC), Scythia proper was described as the land between the Don and Danube Rivers, though some were people living there were not regarded as Scythians (Gawler, 4). East of the Araxes River was where they first gained notice as a state progressively rising to power. Diodorus Siculus said the Scythians at first possessed a narrow region of the Araxes but gradually became numerous and powerful. The Sacæ, Massagetæ, and Arimaspiioi (usually regarded as Huns) were some of their offshoots. The Scythians eventually moved westward and invaded the land of the Cimmerians (Turner, 96-98). According to the Greeks, the earliest inhabitants of southern Russia were the Cimmerians; in the Assyrian records they are called Gimirri. After leaving Turkestan, the Scythians pursued the Cimmerians as far as the northern shores of the Black Sea. They were then attacked by Cyaxares, but defeated him. The Scythians ravaged and ruled western Asia for the next 28 years and were the probable cause of the fall of the Assyrian empire (Kephart, 328). Scythians who later became known as Goths used a language that connected Hebrew and Old English (Rutherford, 41).

Josephus said the Greeks designated Scythia by the name of Magogia (Ant., bk. I, 6). This obviously refers to the territory that once belonged to the descendants of Magog. (The reader may recall that the children of Shem drove the children of Japheth into the corners and recesses of the earth.) Geoffrey Keating's idea that the Scythians were from the race of Magog is just as misleading. The appellation "Scythian" was applied to at least 50 nations, and the descendants of Magog could have been included in the term, though not limited to it. Eusebius of Caesarea said that from the Flood to the building of the Tower of Babel, Scythism prevailed on the earth. Since Scythian meant "nomad," or "wanderer," this was the type of civilization prior to the time of Nimrod. He was the one that gathered the people into cities. Even Keating admits that the term "Scythian" cannot have a precise meaning as indicative of any peculiar race or breed of human beings (Keating, 105, 150, 151 fn).

Hippocrates was the one who originated the idea that the Scythians were Mongols. He was trying to prove the influence of environment upon races, and there is a question of whether

or not he twisted the facts to fit his theory. He supposed that Scythia had a cold climate the entire year. He believed cold made one reddish-brown in color, the color white people become when being in the open. This color, however, is not any kind of yellow comparable to the Mongols. Tatars, for example, who lived in the same general area as the Mongols are far from reddish. Kublai Khan had a white complexion, and most of the people associated with him had blue eyes and red hair. The Chinese, themselves, described five tribes of the Hiung-nu (Huns) as fair (Minns, 45).

Minns tells us that ornaments found in Scythian tombs are very similar to the beast-style dagger associated with the early middle ages. Also, grave findings contained a dagger and sheath of Assyrian style (Minns, 167, 171). The general movement of the tribes at this time was from south to north. Many customs among the Finns are similar to Scythian customs (ibid, 106). For example, still found in the Finnish language are words such as "Soma-land," "Sma-land," "Some," "Soami," "Suima," "Suoma," which mean "a lake," or "marshy land." These words are found in the ancient Scythian language. The Finns still calls themselves Suomi, though other nations call them Finns, Wends, or Winds (Olson, 53-54). We are told the Scythians did not domesticate swine because of a religious or social taboo. A well-known style used by women in medieval times was the tall conical headdress with a trailing veil. This style goes right back to the Scythians (Minns, 62). Both George Rawlinson and his brother Sir Henry believed that the Scythians were related to the people of northern Europe (Bible Research Handbook, serial 70b). Scythians and Gother populated Nordic settlements (Olson, 64). Early Scythian tombs contain long-headed skulls, though the later ones have many broad-headed ones. The logical explanation is that as the Sarmatians (Slavs) moved north they used Scythian tombs (Minns, 47, 42).

Because of the arid climate and Chinese expansion, the Russian steppes became the desired location for the dispossessed people of central Asia. After the Scythians had located there, a Sarmatian intrusion occurred. As the Scythians were pushed westward, they divided into two branches-the northern and southern branches. The larger of the two migrated toward the northwest. Strabo, the Greek geographer, who lived shortly before the Christian era, wrote that the Scythians lived in the regions toward the north and the ocean, that is, on the Baltic or North Sea, north of the Sarmatians. Pliny, the Roman scholar, mentions islands in the "Northern Ocean" off the coast of Scythia (Capt, 167-170).

One school of anthropologists holds the view that the present races of Europe are descendants of the original races of the New Stone Age, who have lived in the area since the beginning of time. A number of scholars disagree and hold the view that the present people of northwestern Europe are the descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel. What is interesting, though, is that Greek historians were at a loss to explain the origin and sudden appearance of a race they called the Skolotoi or Skuthai (Olson, 67). Around 600-598 BC the Sak-Geloths (Saghs) moved into southeastern Europe, settling near the present Rumania. The seat of their power was at Arsareth. The Romans called them Scuthia or Scuthæ. These Saghs remained in the area of Keiv until AD 220. At that time they divided into two streams-the European and the Germanic. The European Scythians carried such names as Asen, Asir, Asgard, and Asaland. The Germanic Scythians became known as the Saxons, Ængli, Frisii, and Yota (Hannay, 301, 261). In India, the warrior caste at some point of time changed its religion (Olson, 109). These Saghs, who came into the India, adopted the doctrine of Asha-that is, the doctrine of "righteousness" or "purity" and became known as the "People of

Asha," their country collectively called Asia (Hannay, 196). Eventually they were forced to migrate toward the north and northwest. Various groups of them settled in different areas, but one group-the Asa-moved along the northern coast of the Black Sea and eventually settled in Scandinavia (ibid, 109). These were the people who established Asgard. During the time of Augustus Caesar until AD 220, Scythian life was centered around Asgard and its environs. Knowledge of the Scythians is based on what was known about their outlying districts and southern boundaries only. As a result, modern historians have confused the Skolotoi with the Asen and Tatars (Hannay, 449, 346).

When Asgard flourished Odin ruled as the chief of the Asen. He had great possessions in his former homeland-Turkestan-that had been the home of the Saghs for many centuries. Odin was later deified by the descendants of his pagan subjects and became a god. A Roman threat in AD 210, forced the Asen to abandon Asaland, and they moved to Scandinavia. According to Hannay, eight of the tribes of Israel were present at the time of their captivity and these were the ones who reunited with the European Scyths in Asaland under the name Asen. (Hannay may be correct when he points out that the bulk of the maritime tribes had already departed from the land of Israel prior to the Assyrian onslaught.) When Odin arrived in Scandinavia, he was forced to make a compact with the Gota due to their strength. Sweden was the Scandinavian country where the Asir settled among the Gota; there they eventually became known as the Northmen. Later Odin invaded Norway and drove out the Donsk (Danai or northern Danites). These dispossessed Danites settled in Denmark and became known as the Danes. In the *Vetus Chronicon Holsatiæ*, the Danes and Jutes, who united with these Donsk, are said to be the descendants of the Israelite tribe of Dan. The impelling force that eventually drove the Goths out of Scandinavia was the arrival of more Saghs from Airyan (Hannay's name for central Asia). The Goths then began their southward march toward the Danube and the Roman frontier (Hannay, 452, 457, 459-464, 184, 454). The Romans had become increasingly intolerant toward the region of the Black Sea, and this tension precipitated the migration to the north by the Scythians. One of the tribes that migrated during this time was the Neuri, who were of Scythian stock, and had traveled a year and a half to reach Arsareth. They are of particular interest because their year began in March, and their Sabbath was on Saturday. The languages of the old Finns, Lapps, and Estonians agree with the Hebrew to a large extent. In the 1700s some believed the Finns and Lapps to be remnants of the tribes carried away by Shalmaneser. One work, for example, demonstrated that 200 words in the Lappish language resembled Hebrew. Also, many Finn villages bear the same names as various places in Persia (Olson, 63-64). In the north, the Asen merged with the Frisii, Saxones, Ængli, and Yota to become known as the Northmen. These Asen magnified the Saxon name and gave rise to the Saxon pirates so feared by the Roman colonies. They settled throughout the Baltic and Jutland. This merging of tribes with the Asen eventually led to the loss of nominal distinctions for all of them. They permanently settled in England (Hannay, 262, 445). The Romans called the Anglo-Saxons, who came to England, Germans. They had come from the region of the Elbe and from the southern end of Jutland. When the Saxons called for reinforcements during their conquest of England, "messengers were sent to Scythia" (Capt, 173, 175).

Ptolemy (second century AD) was the first to mention the Saxons. He said they were a people who lived on the north side of the Elbe River. At this time they were not significant, and at least six other tribes lived in the same general area. It can be inferred that they

descended from the Sakai (Sacæ), an important branch of the Scythian nation. Strabo (63 BC-AD 24) placed them east of the Caspian Sea, and they made many incursions into the land of the Cimmerians, seizing important sections of land. The name Sakasian is derived from them, and Ptolemy says the name Saxones is derived from Sakai. Also, around the Black Sea there was a people called the Saxoi (Turner, 101).

A general movement from the southeast into Europe had been occurring off and on for centuries (Kephart, 115-116). This included the Phrygians to Troy and Asia Minor, the Hellenes to Greece, the Romans to Italy, and the Celts to France and Spain. All countries where the Indo-European tongue was spoken had a Nordic ruling class (Günther, 122-123). The languages now prevailing in Europe show that there were three distinct and successive waves of peoples who entered Europe from Asia. The oldest ones are found in the west. The first was the Cimmerians, followed by the Scythians, and finally the Sarmatians (Slavs). These three stocks make up the source of the native populations in Europe today. Celtic, Gothic, and Slavonic languages represent the Cimmerians; the Celtic source includes Welsh, Gaelic, Irish, Cornish, Armorican (Brittany), and Manx; the Scythian by Anglo-Saxon, Franco-German, Middle Gothic, Old Icelandic, Modern German, Swabian, Swiss, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Orkneyan, English, and Lowland Scotch; the Slavonic by modern Slavonic as it appears in Russia and Poland. One reason it was believed that the Scythians were Mongoloid is because Herodotus said there was a European and also an Asiatic Scythia beyond the Caspian Sea (Turner, 25-26, 93).

The nations that overthrew the Roman Empire came from central Asia. This mass of people included the Goths, Suevi (Germanic tribes), Vandals, Burgundians, and Angles and Saxons. The main reason they swept into Europe seems to be their fear of the Huns. Whatever the reason, what is known is that their migration into Europe coincided with the appearance of the Huns. The west Goths, for example, came into the boundaries of the Roman Empire after suffering a devastating defeat by the Huns (McGovern, 12). Other factors contributed to this intrusion, such as the westward sweep of the Parthians, and the rush of Saghs and others toward the west. Medes, Parthians, most of the dominant Persians, and other trans-Tigris peoples also flooded into Europe (Hannay, 261). Both Pliny and Herodotus were aware that the region of the Caucasus held enormous numbers of people, as the Caucasus pass was the only break between the Black and Caspian seas (Ripley, 438). The Chinese describe wholesale population changes that took place between 275 BC and AD 150 (Minns, 110). The tradition of the fair-haired, blue-eyed Nordics, known by the Chinese as the Wu-sun or Usun, was that their early homeland was in Sogdiana (the present Uzbekistan and Bukhara) and vicinity (Kephart, 230).

Like a domino effect, as Sarmatian pressure forced the Scythians toward the west, the Cimmerians were forced into the more remote regions of Europe where they became known as the Celts and Gauls (Capt, 141). Homer mentioned the Cimmerians of Europe in *The Odyssey*. Posidonius, the Greek historian, applied the name to all the hordes of people coming out of northern Europe (Schütte, 1:11). Arrian, Diodorus, and Plutarch all regarded the Keltoi to be Cimmerians, and classical authors located them in the western regions of Europe (Turner, 420-421). When pressed by the Saghs, the Cimmerians divided into two groups—one group into Western Europe by way of the Danube basin, the other into Asia Minor (Hannay, 349). The western Cimmerians were identified with “the first race of the Kymry,” and came into Britain from “the country of the summer, where Constantinople now

is." They occupied northern France under the name Belgæ and invaded the British Isles as the Brythons. Only by the legions of Caesar were they checked in their conquest of Gaul. Their Teutonic successors included the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, Helvetians, Alemanni, Saxons, Franks, Lombards, Danes, and Northmen—all Nordics from the Teutonic group of peoples (Grant, 157, 131). All of them claimed to have descended from Odin (Kephart, 454). Plutarch said these people were first called Cimmerians, and later not inappropriately Cimbri. The Greeks gave them the name Celt, the Romans the name Gauls (Capt, 141). The Skolotoi absorbed large numbers of them, and only a residue remained in Asia Minor during the time of the Apostle Paul (Hannay, 352). Shortly before 578 BC, the Celts first appeared in Europe (Hannay, 281) and by the end of the third century BC, they had filled the whole of central Europe and northern Italy (Capt, 145). So, they were in Europe some time before the arrival of the Cimmerians (ibid, 142-143).

Germanic stock should be included in the general term "Cimmerian." The name, like Scythian, appears to have been applied to all the peoples occupying or moving into Europe during this time. Anthropologists designated the tall, blond people of northern France and Belgium as Gauls, but the broad-headed people of middle and southwestern France as Celts. Caesar, however, insisted that the Celts and Gauls were the same (Ripley, 127). Numerous historians and early writers held that the Cimbri and Cimmerii (English Cimmerian and Greek Kimmeri) were the same people. A work entitled, *Literature of the Kymry*, identified the Kimmerioi of Homer with the ancient Cimbri of Germany as the same race. Also, archaeologists agree that the Cimmerii and Gimiri are the same people (Rutherford, 24). (Keep in mind, Sir Henry Rawlinson identified the Gimiri or Cimmerians with the Sacae on the Behistun Stone and said they were Israelites.)

The Cimmerians who entered Europe adopted the Celtic language. The reason was that they were a shattered nation, fragmented, with no central leadership, and tended to cooperate with the Celts (Kephart, 374). What developed in Europe was a large number of Celtic-speaking peoples of differing ethnic origins (Hannay, 125). For some reason the Celts in France wished to consider themselves closely related to the Celts in Germany. They went to great lengths to dye their hair blond (Baker, 256-257). France consists of a number of different peoples. In the north it is primarily Germanic due to Frankish settlements made during the AD 240-496 period. The center of France consists of Celts and peoples of a Phœno-Canaanite type. In the south it is comprised of Iberian (Spanish) types (Hannay, 134). Switzerland, the ancient land of Helvetia, now called in the German tongue *Schweiz*, is made up of Suevi from Swabia (Bavaria). According to tradition, the Swiss were driven out of Sweden due to a famine (Menzel, 134). One other important fact about France is that according to Justin, Alexander the Great defeated the Ambri and Sigambri on the Punjab in India. The Silei were associated with them. Many years later we find the Romans calling a people in Europe by the name of Sali—still in company with the Sicambri (Hannay, 443-444). The Sicambri are well known as German Franks (Menzel, 6).

Ayran is a racial term first used by the Arii as a tribal name in Persia. It signifies "noble stock." The Arii were a powerful branch of the Goths. The Sanskrit form is Ayra, the root word for Ayran, which applied to the Nordic conquerors of western India (Kephart, 72). Later it was applied to all Nordic types. The general consensus of opinion now is that the home of the Indo-Europeans was in southern Russia. The culture that designates them is called Kurgan-Kurgan being the Russian word for "burial mound." They made good use of

bronze weapons, the horse, and the wheel in their conquest of various areas of Europe (Lehman, 88-89). The earliest appearance of Aryan-speaking Nordics was when Sanskrit was introduced into India. Their conquests were far and wide-Cimmerians pouring through the passes of the Caucasus into Media; Achæans and Phrygians conquering Greece and the Aegean coast of Asia Minor. Around 100 BC these Nordics entered Italy. Soon afterward they crossed into Gaul via the Low Countries. They spread into Britain as the Goidels. As Gauls, they conquered France and Spain (Grant, 155-156). Iron began to supplant bronze in northern Europe in the second and third centuries AD (Ripley, 510). Then, an expansion of the Nordic race took place all over Europe (Pittard, 78). These Teutons drove the Alpine peoples from the open plains into the uplands and mountains where their descendants remain to this day (Ripley, 237).

These tribes, made up a combination of such peoples as the Sacæ, were described as Nordic in appearance-fair or ruddy-haired. One tribe-the Alans-was described as "almost all tall and handsome, with hair almost yellow, and a fierce look" (Günther, 131). These people were all alike in physical type. A Swede can hardly be distinguished from a Dane, or a native of Schleswig-Holstein or Friesland (in northern Germany). They were all described as "tall, tawny-haired, fiercely blue-eyed barbarians" (Ripley, 311). Silius Italicus described the Britons as a people with golden hair. Vitruvius, apparently referring to the same people, said they had huge limbs, grey eyes, and long, straight, red hair. Tacitus mentioned the red hair and huge limbs of the Caledonians (the Scots). The Belgic Gauls are described in much the same way. Strabo said the Germans resembled the Gauls, but were taller, more yellow-haired, and more savage (Taylor, 77). These swarms of people could not have come from a small country (du Chaillu, 12, 15). About a century after the time of Ptolemy, Eutropius said that the Saxons were united with the Franks and, because of their piracy, had become formidable enemies of the Romans (Turner, 121).

Teutonic people from east of the Rhine River were pressing the Celts, but this intrusion stopped during the time of Julius Caesar and lasted until the fall of the Roman Empire (Haddon, 43). The Teutonic race is made up of two main branches-the Scandinavian and Germanic. Suhm's History traces the Teutonic peoples from the Don River, through Russia and Finland to Sweden (Olson, 68). Sweden, for example, consists of 87% long-headed and 13% broad-headed types. The broadheads are confined to Lapland. More than half the population of Sweden has people with light eyes and blond hair. Sweden today is one of the few countries in which the same racial type has existed from the beginning. It is unique for its unity of race, language, religion, and social ideals (Grant, 151). (The reader should keep in mind Grant's work was published in 1916, before the wonders of "socialism" took over in Sweden.) Scandinavia is the home of the Teutonic race in its maximum purity, made up of the same kinds of people as the Lithuanians and Finns across the Baltic (Ripley, 205-206). Another Teutonic people were the Burgundians-a tall, blond people- who settled in France. They were celebrated for their great height, a characteristic still found in some of the French today. Only a vestige of their language remains in Flemish (Ripley, 143-144, 157). Skeletal remains clearly show the Burgundians to be of Nordic stock (Pittard, 81).

During the so-called Bronze Age, Germany was a wild forest inhabited by Teutons (Fell, 1974, 392). Not much is known about the German tribes until about 100 BC, when they aggressively came against the Romans (Ripley, 229-230). Various tribes later regarded as German were originally known under separate names, but now it is impossible to distinguish

them. At one time German tribes were included among the Scythians, at another time among the Sarmatians and Tatars (Menzel, 5-6). There may be a connection between the Eudusianoï on the Black Sea and the Eudusii, who migrated to southern Germany (Schütte, 2:297). The Suevi who remained in upper Germany were given the name Alemanni (Menzel, 4, 8, 13-14). But who were the Suevi? According to Hannay, they were the Asir or Scyths, who in the third century AD conquered sections of Germany. They crossed over into Scandinavia and mixed with the people of their own blood called the Yota or Gota. The Gota were not Goths. The Scandinavian settlement was called Lessor Swithiod, distinguishing it from Greater Swithiod that was located in central Asia. The name Sweden simply means "the country of the Swi (Swe, Svi) people," shortened to Swiar or Sviar. The Latin name Suiones was derived from Swiar (Hannay, 181-182). The historic Odin was followed by the Svear, called Suiones by Tacitus. They drove both the Goths and Lapps out of Scandinavia; the Goths retired to the south, the Lapps to the Arctic Circle (Rutherford, 96). The name Alemanni disappeared after the Middle Ages (Schütte, 2: 91). What needs to be realized is that the racial map of Germany completely changed during the time of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman invasions of England. By the tenth century, the populations east of the Elbe River, which Tacitus called German in his day, were totally Sarmatian (Latham, 194). The Sarmatians or Slavs now comprise the bulk of the populations of Eastern Europe (Hannay, 188-189). Even present-day Greece is basically Slavonic, having been occupied by Slavs in the eighth century AD, who learned the Greek language (Taylor, 209). Racially, the Slavic speaking peoples are broad-headed and their hair and eyes mostly light in color, though darker than the Teutons (Ripley, 345-346). It is now difficult to designate any portion of Germany as Nordic (Morant, 126-127), though northern Germany is classified with the northern peoples of Europe found from Finland to the British Isles (Pittard, 172). The Roman attempt to extend the frontier across the Rhine was only temporarily successful, but the Chatti were subdued in the region of the Weser River (Ency. Brit., 11th ed. s.v. "Germany")

The name Chatti (Khatti) is important. In 612 BC the Medes and Babylonians sacked Nineveh, and the Assyrians disappeared from history (Trump, 238). Recently, however, British archaeologists have found traces of Assyrian culture north of Iraq. These excavations prove the Assyrians did not die out. After the invasion they developed small, closed communities and began to spread out, though they were unable to gain any control due to their small numbers (Izvestia, May 3, 1987). Where did the Assyrians go? For one thing, Pliny lists the Assyriani among the tribes located in the vicinity of the Crimea (Pliny, IV, xii, 85). Ruins in Asia Minor show there was a third great power, along with the Greeks and Romans, that had existed for more than 2,000 years. Thutmose III had been forced to pay tribute to a certain people of the Hittites. The Assyrians often spoke of the "Land of Hatti" or "Khatti." After victorious battles in "Hatti Land," the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser swallowed up the land of Hatti (Marek, 26-27). The Land of Hatti included much of Asia Minor. Later Assyrians have been described as Hittites who had adopted the civilization of Babylon (Bible Research Handbook, serial 22a). During the time of the Romans, the Hatti were in Germany. The ancient language of the Hittites is so much like modern German that both a German on the north coast of Germany and a Pennsylvania Dutchman could have understood a Hittite's cry for thirst. Hittite clay tablets found at the ruins of their ancient capital were in a borrowed Assyrian script (Marek, 93-94). Among other places, the people of Hatti are the principal inhabitants of modern Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Kassel, and Hesse-Homburg. As noted in the above paragraph, a people called the Catti or Chatti were subdued by the Roman general,

Druses (Hannay, 221-225). We know them better as the Hessians who were British mercenaries during the American Revolution. After the war many of them remained in America and were absorbed into the culture.

A fearful struggle took place between the Germans and Romans, which lasted nearly 500 years. This struggle extended along the shores of the Black Sea, and up the course of the Danube and Rhine rivers as far as the Baltic Sea. The Germans were first checked and forced to turn east, but fierce nations continued to pour in from the north. Opposition against these peoples was of no avail as Goths, Alani, Vandals, Burgundians, Longobardi, Alemanni, Franks, Angli, and Saxons spread like a deluge over the Roman Empire (Menzel, 62, 10-11). The church father Jerome said the whole country between the Alps and Pyrenees, and between the Rhine and the ocean, had been laid waste by hordes of Quadi, Vandals, Sarmatians, Alans, Gepids, Herules, Saxons, Burgundians, Alemanni, even Pannonians, and that Assur (the Bible name for Assyria) was joined with them (Jerome, vol. VI, letter cxxiii). What is truly remarkable is that in 162 BC, the Roman Empire was simultaneously attacked on the Rhine and Danube by the Germans, and in Asia by the Parthians (Menzel, 105). The wandering period for these tribes is set between 120 BC and AD 600, although the last Nordic wave was the Normans, which lasted until AD 1100 (Günther, 203).

We have encountered the name "Parthia." Who were the Parthians? They were a Scythian group that moved southward out of Turkestan around 247 BC, and took control of the Persian plateau. Classical authors say they were a branch of the Dahæ, a branch of the Massagetæ. They took the name Parthian from the name of the province they had conquered (McGovern, 7-8, 67-68). We have already seen the Massagetæ were closely related to the Sacæ. The Parthians were subject to the Persians during the reign of Darius. The people who came into contact with them regarded them as Scyths, and said their name meant "exiles." Diodorus, the Sicilian historian, wrote that the Parthians passed from the dominion of the Assyrians to the Medes, and from the Medes to the Persians (Rawlinson, 1887b, 16, 19, 26). The original people who lived in the territory they conquered were known as Parthians, but were not the same as the Imperial Parthians, who were Sakian and bore the name Parni or Aparni. These Parni imposed themselves upon the original people and became the dominant race (Hannay, 394, 414). These Parthians were the descendants of conquering nomads (Minns, 61). Armenia was annexed by them and renamed Sakesani, which was Sakland (Hannay, 423). That they were Saghs should be obvious. Their language was a strange mixture of Scythian and Median. Often Semitic words were compounded in ways that were not Semitic or had Persian terminals. This is what we would expect if they were northern Israelites. Josephus said the Parthians were so familiar with Hebrew that he had a large number of readers among them. He also stated that after the decline of the Greeks, Parthian coins had Semitic legends and some of them read from right to left, the common Hebrew practice (quoted by Hannay, 397-398).

At the time Parthia was second only to Rome, the exodus from Asia to Europe took place. This movement involved the principal white races that had been living between central Asia and Europe. They poured through the Caucasus, settling both in central and northern Europe, and included both the long-headed and broad-headed types. This included numerous Jews who had never returned to Palestine. In 112 BC, Pærisades, king of the Bosphorus in the Crimea, called on the king of Pontus to help him stop the nomadic incursions pouring past his kingdom from east to west. About this general time period the

Saghs in central Asia are not mentioned again, while at the same time vast numbers of people were pouring into Europe. They were admitted into the community of the Skolotoi and acquired the name Asir, their capital at Asgard. When Herodotus visited Scythia in 450 BC, he did not hear such names as Asir and Asgard. We can assume that when the Saghs escaped Assyrian domination, these names were still unknown (Hannay, 430-433). That the Parthians crossed over into Russia is demonstrated by the fact that several groups of people in southern Russia were called Parthians (Latham, 216).

The racial make-up of the Huns has been difficult to understand. They were a combination of many different types of people that in AD 391, the European Goths were joined with them. The name Hun was given to at least four different peoples whose identity is not known for certain. One of the tribes associated with them was the Nephthalite Huns, also called White Huns. The Modern Universal History, volume 13, page 206, states that some critics believe the Nephthalite Huns were descended from the Israelite tribe of Naphthali taken captive by Tiglath-Pileser and carried to the frontiers of Persia. Archaeology, according to Olson, confirms their migration into Scandinavia. The Saga of Olof Tryggvason relates the changes that took place in the north as a result of the influx from "the eastern parts of the world." This view is important when we see the Danish historian, Grammaticus Saxo referring to Asgard as "Byzantium." Many tribes were closely associated with the Huns including the Gepidæ, Alans, Lombards, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Vandals, and Rugians (Olson, 103, 109, 111-113). The Byzantine historian, Procopius, said that Attila the Hun attacked the Roman Empire with a great army of Massagetæ and other Scythians-the Massagetæ they now call the Huns (Procopius, 41, 105). We already know the Massagetæ were Saghs, so if this statement is correct, the name Huns was applied to them. Many writers, however, believe the Huns were Turks due to their warlike and vigorous temper (Ency. Brit., 11th ed. s.v. "Hun").

As far as the Goths are concerned, they had previously settled on the plateau of Iran, then in northwest India, Sogdiana, and the northwest corner of China. The arid conditions of central Asia precipitated their departure from the region. Edward Gibbon said the name Goth is the Latin version of the Greek name for Scythia (Fasken, 89). Eventually, they pushed their way west until they reached the Baltic. After driving out the original people, they settled in this region (Olson, 13). Their Asiatic origin is seen in their familiarity with the Sanskrit and Persian languages. It is believed the link between Sanskrit and Gothic is found in the modern Teutonic dialects (Hannay, 181). Jordanes, the Gothic historian, identified them with the Getæ and Scythians. Keep in mind, the name Scythian referred to all the tribes that lived east of the Vistula and Danube Rivers, and north of the Black Sea (Mierow, 16). Herodotus regarded them as an offshoot of the Massagetæ. When they were finally driven out of Italy, they went north and were lost from the pages of history (Rutherford, 16-18). Gudmund Schütte says the Prussians absorbed them (Schütte, 2:22-23). The Goths were described as tall and handsome, with white skin and fair hair (Taylor, 109). The Goths are regarded to be the descendants of Gether, the son of Aram (Olson, 11), the son of Shem ([Gen. 10:22-23](#)). This would make them Semitic in race.

The movement of peoples into the British Isles was briefly mentioned in Chapter Two of this work. Early traditions and writings give us insight. Take Ireland, for example. The Encyclopaedia Britannica, eleventh edition, under the subject "Ireland," tells us that Ireland remained outside the pale of the ancient Roman world, and a state of society which was

peculiarly favorable to the preservation of national folk-lore survived in the island until the sixteenth century. A number of works give us valuable information. Ptolemy listed sixteen peoples found in Ireland, several of which can be identified. The Milesians are said to have come from Scythia, after sojourning some time in Egypt. What is significant is that only in recent years have the Irish legendary origins been subjected to serious criticism, and even then the criticisms confine themselves essentially to the genealogies. There is a tradition that Hu Gadarn led a contingent of Hebrews into Britain at about 1800 BC (Williams, 27). Some believe Hu Gadarn is the Celtic name for Joshua, and if so, the date given, according to Bible chronology, is about 400 years too early. The Encyclopaedia Britannica gives a number of names of various tribes that settled in Ireland. Four centuries of Roman occupation made no permanent change in the racial stock of England. The Celts who filtered into Britain from Gaul appear to have come from the area of the Danube. The Celts and Belgæ who settled in Britain were Nordic and their skulls scarcely differ from those of the Anglo-Saxons who followed (Baker, 257).

According to the French anthropologist, Paul Broca, there were never any true Celts in Britain. The British never called themselves Celts, nor did any of the ancient writers. The true Celts, Broca says, are the people of central France who speak the Celtic language. It has already been pointed out that the real Celts of race have only a linguistic connection to the Celts of language. Broca says the true Celts of history are the Auvergnats, and what is called the Celtic speech was the original speech of the Belgic Gauls (Taylor, 110-113, 224). The fact is: The Irish are as Nordic as the English, the great bulk of them being of Danish, Norse, Anglo-Norman, and earlier pre-Teutonic elements (Grant, 59). The Irish were the ones who perpetuated the name Celt, but the Scots, known as Celts, were called Gaels. Hector Bœtius, in his History of Scotland, says the Gaels were in Egypt at the time Moses ruled the children of Israel (Keating, 152, 178 fn). The Romans were careless in attaching the names Celt, Galatai, and Gauls to all the people of western and northern Europe. Until the first century BC, the Germanic tribes were designated Celts (Hannay, 139-140).

The Cimmerii or Cymry came into Britain from the area of the Black Sea after traveling toward the northwest and through the Low Countries, then across the North Sea (Rutherford, 25). Paul B. du Chaillu gives us this interesting statement: "A careful perusal of the Eddas and Sagas will enable us, with the help of ancient Greek and Latin writers, and without any serious break in the chain of events, to make out a fairly continuous history which throws considerable light on the progenitors of the English-speaking people, their migrations northward from their old home on the shores of the Black Sea . . ." (du Chaillu, 6). Rutherford says the Cimmerians, that is the Welsh or Cymry, were descendants of the tribe of Simeon, known to the Romans as the Simeni, the Latin form for Simeonites (Rutherford, 28). The Welsh do not call themselves Welsh, but go by the name Cymry (Wainwright, 1). The pre-Christian civilization found in northern Gaul, Britain, and Ireland, came from Skolotic Cimmerians from the Ukraine after they had made contact with western Asiatic and Grecian civilizations. These Skolotic settlements in Britain began about 290 BC and continued for the next two centuries (Kephart, 375, 377).

Large numbers of Nordics entered Britain following the AD period. Let us take a look at the Massagetæ again. Herodotus traced the name back to the region of the Araxes. Migrations took them east and north of the Caspian Sea. They grew larger, and segments of them took on tribal names. Eventually the name Massagetæ fell into disuse. Two of the main branches

were the Æglæ and Angæ. As they moved westward the two names merged into Englai or Anglæ. The Romans called them the Angli, but we know them as the Angles or Engles (Rutherford, 14-15). About the middle of the fifth century AD, seafaring Jutes landed in England to fight against the Scots and Britons of the north who were penetrating southward after the Roman departure. In the fight the Jutes summoned their brothers from northwest Europe to come to their aid. The Jutes themselves saw the advantage of settling in England. A general conquest of England began by the Jutes, Frisians, Saxons, and Angles from Jutland, Schleswig, Frisia and Holstein (Kephart, 450). The Danes came about AD 850, and the Norwegians a little later, settling in the northern and western coasts of Scotland. The Normans were the last of the Germanic types to enter England (Ripley, 312-317).

Roman accounts do not give much information regarding their conquest of England. Nor do they give much help as to how settlement by the Northmen took place. One thing is clear, however. There were Saxon settlements on the island during the Roman occupation. After the Romans departed, disunity set in and Britain broke up into a number of smaller states. This is what set the stage for the takeover by the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes (Hannay, 379). What is unique about Britain is that the skull type is practically uniform from one end of England to the other. The idea that conquered peoples were exterminated is simply not true. What took place was an amalgamation of various types, but all belonged to the Nordic branch of the Aryan race (Kephart, 462). In the light of what information is available on the movements of peoples from the Middle East to northwestern Europe and the British Isles, the hypothesis that the British are the representatives of the ancient Beth-Sak is hardly open to doubt (Hannay, 216).

Chapter 7: Did Israel Not Leave Palestine?

In spite of the massive amount of material that demonstrates the movement of the Israelites from the land of their captivity to northwestern Europe and the British Isles, thence to America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, one can read statements like this: "How unbelievable it is that millions of Israelites in the course of only a few centuries could completely lose their identity and become known to the world as Scythians" (Darms, 139). A look at the Afro-American community can quickly answer this argument. How many Negroes know the tribal affiliation of their ancestors, or their original language? If millions of Negroes can lose their national identity as quickly as they did in modern times, why should we think it strange that Israel could lose its identity in ancient times? The only reason the Jews never lost their national identity is because they continued to observe the sign God gave them—the weekly Sabbath ([Ezek. 20:12](#)). History tells us that when nations change their language, they change their names even more easily (Minns, 40). Language can be a test of racial contact, but not necessarily for migration. Yet, language can be helpful to determine the affinities and movements of peoples (Haddon, 10-11).

One should discard the notion that race and language are synonymous. Language is not a test of race. The same race may speak different languages, and different races may speak the same language. Languages are easily borrowed from one people to another.

Archaeological speculation has been cursed by the attempt to base racial conclusions on language—that is, to say those who speak the same language are all from the same race. It is necessary to realize that race and language are two entirely different studies (Sayce, 13). If the guide to racial distinctions is based on language, the classification of peoples and cultures may be entirely misleading. Evidence of physical characteristics was lacking in the past so attempts were made to identify people by cultural evidence. This is no longer true. Physical types today identify people, and names such as Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean are used which carry no linguistic connotation (Morant, 140).

When one race was more civilized than another and was politically and numerically superior, it was able to impose its language upon the other. When two nations brought together are equally advanced, the one with the most numerous population will prevail. On the other hand, when a small body of invaders with a higher civilization converges with a lower one, the higher culture will prevail. At one time Aryan languages were found being used in vast areas by peoples who were not Aryan. The fact is: Change in language takes place easier than change in physical type. To repeat, language is not a test of race, and more often than not is entirely misleading. Languages are extremely changeable, and countries have altered their language while the race remained the same. Language appears to be almost independent of racial factors (Taylor, 210-211, 197, 204).

On the other hand, language should not be entirely discounted. In certain cases a common language raises the presumption that the people who speak it are from a common ancestry (Sayce, 32). Language and the geographical location of people change, but not race (Jowett, 38). Take the Roman Empire, for example. All races living under the rule of the Romans had to obey one law and learn the language of the imperial city. By the time the Roman Empire disintegrated, Latin was the common language everywhere. Teutonic invaders soon learned the languages of the subject populations, and today the result is the modern languages of

France, Spain, and Italy. The Northmen who came to Normandy and southern Italy soon forgot their own languages. In Britain, however, the subject populations learned the language of the Saxons, the Scandinavian invaders, and later, that of the Normans. A dialect of the Aramæan tribes of Syria and northern Arabia supplanted Hebrew, Phœnician, Assyrian, and Babylonian. Arabic, in turn, supplanted Aramaic after the Mohammedan conquest. The fact is: Language is not a test of race; rather, it is a test of social contact (Sayce, 30-31). Therefore, it is unwise to draw conclusions regarding races from the evidence of language alone (Wainwright, 14). To assume the lost ten tribes of Israel could not lose their language in the space of a few hundred years is contrary to the known facts regarding language and race.

A commonly accepted argument is that Israel could not have migrated to Europe because Josephus tells us that the Scythians are descended from Japheth, and that the Greeks called the sons of Japheth "Scythians" (Darms, 143-144). Statements supposedly reinforce the argument that the Celtic family had its origin in Gomer, the son of Japheth, and that the Cimmerians and Cimbri are descended from the Celtic family (ibid, 134). Furthermore, every ancient historian who connects European genealogies with those of the Bible, shows that the northwestern Europeans are descended from Japheth. And, that Josephus said the sons of Japheth settled all the areas of Europe-from the Black Sea to the Atlantic. There is, therefore, no history of the ancient world that shows the Europeans were Israelites (Justice, 77).

Is this true?

The statement by Josephus concerning the sons of Japheth, refers to nations that received their names from their first inhabitants. So, the statement that the children of Japheth had settled from the Black Sea to the Atlantic Ocean, whatever Josephus meant by this remark, refers to those who first lived in these areas. He does not say those inhabitants were living there in his day, nor should this be construed to mean in modern times. We have already seen that the sons of Shem drove the children of Japheth into the holes and corners of the earth, far away from their original inheritance. Other peoples have long possessed all the territories the sons of Japheth originally possessed. Furthermore, the appellation "Scythian" was assigned to at least 50 nations. Many of these people are not described as Japhetic, though the term Scythian could have been applied to some of them. Scythian simply meant "nomad," or "wanderer," and referred to those people who adhered to this lifestyle. Historians today generally avoid applying the name Scythian to members of the yellow race. Also, the appellation "Celt" was broadly applied to all the peoples inhabiting Western Europe. The Celtic peoples are not described as Japhetic. Scholars failed to differentiate between the Cimmerians and Celts, mixing the two (Hannay, 119-120). While some Mongol stock may have been included in the appellation Celt, the bulk was Nordic and Alpine stock. Hannay believed the Celts were composed of peoples who at one time had been held captive by the Assyrians in the region of Lake Van (ibid, 125).

Historians, as a whole, prefer to remain in the mainstream of thought and to rely on other historians. Their hypotheses are often built upon previous works, but with a new twist of their own. The idea that all the progeny of northwestern Europe are descended from Japheth came from early Catholic historians who were attempting to connect early European genealogies with the Bible. Keating is a case in point. In the pedigree of Miledh or Milesius of Spain, who brought the Milesian Scots to Britain, Keating jumps the track at

Azariah or Easru, the great-grandson of Judah and switches it to Gaedal or Glas, the great-great-grandson of Magog. Thus, he makes the genealogy Japhetic rather than Semitic (Keating, 183). Professor Rawlinson advanced the idea that "Cimmerian" was derived from "Gomerian," though it was not original with him. Josephus first advanced it, and many scholars followed him into the error. Most of them read an unintended meaning into his statement. Raymond Capt mentions a British scholar who said: "It is quite a wrong supposition that the Cymbrians should have been so called from Gomer; indeed, it is questionable whether any nation has adopted a patronymic name which can be proved to have been derived from its first individual founder" (Capt, 218). Did Catholic scholars deliberately conceal the true identity of the British people under the subterfuge they are the descendants of Japheth? Lionel Lewis strongly hints so. He implies the primary reason appears to be that Catholic scholars were unwilling to admit a British Catholic foundation older than that of Rome (Lewis, 41).

Another argument is advanced by Charles Kent. He says the Israelites could not have migrated into Europe because with the fall of Samaria they not only lost their identity as a nation, but the character of the people was completely changed due to the foreign population introduced into the land. He says the Assyrian policy of eliminating national spirit by the assimilation and merging of different races proved to be extremely successful in the case of Israel, and that the Israelites who survived the Assyrian wars were allowed to remain in their homes. The result, Kent says, was that they mixed with foreign peoples. So the wild theory concerning the "lost ten tribes of Israel" is entirely without foundation (Kent, 105-107). Kent's view does not agree with the Bible.

The Bible states:

Therefore the LORD was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only . . . the LORD removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day. And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof ([2 Kings 17:18, 23-24](#)).

Jeremiah (643-585 BC) is regarded as the author of the books of Kings. His statement in 2 Kings above was written about 130 years after Israel had been carried away into captivity. It is a summary statement of what took place in the land. Some Israelites were still present during the reign of the Jewish king Josiah (637-607 BC), or about 100 years after Israel was carried away. While a remnant of Israelites had come under the dominion of Jewish kings and remained in the land ([2 Chron. 34:1-9](#)), by the time of Jeremiah all were removed. The Israelites in the northern kingdom did not lose their identity because they mingled with foreigners. They lost their identity because they were deported, lost their language, and were called by another name.

Both history and archaeology, which predates history, show an unbroken picture of tribes appearing, and disappearing, crossing and recrossing, assimilating, dividing, colonizing, conquering, or being absorbed (Ripley, 107). So, what happened to Israel was not unusual. Many ancient nations have vanished, not only in name, but also in race. What is significant is that at the time Europe became a seething wilderness of peoples coming from the east, they had the same names as the vanishing Asiatic races. The principal racial stocks of Europe

are identified with the principal races of Asian antiquity (Hannay, 223). While nations were generally named according to their geography, often tribes took names from patriarchs or heroes. This was particularly true when a tribe branched off from a larger nation (Kephart, 352).

From about the second century AD, with the massive movements of Germanic peoples pouring into the Roman provinces, countless minor tribes disappeared and were replaced by larger nations such as the Franks, Alemanni, Saxons, and Goths. The tribes on the lower Rhine became known as the Catti and Sicambri, names we have seen earlier in this work. On the Baltic, tribes were known by such names as Frisii, Chauci, and Angli. Many other tribal names appear on the scene. Smaller communities were uniting and becoming larger nations. Some raised themselves to considerable power. At the same time many tribes were exterminated due to internecine wars or during some migration. Some joined with nations to which they did not originally belong. Others separated, such as the Lombards, who detached themselves from the Suevi and united with the Saxons (Menzel, 104, 10). Modern political boundaries are a superficial creation, and nationality bears no constant or necessary relation to race. Half of France, for example, is composed of Teutonic stock, which is racially Germanic (Ripley, 32).

In order to succeed, a migration must be domestic, not military. A wholesale attempt to colonize must include men, women, and children. The reason Roman conquests had little effect on altering races was because they were military. A conqueror can succeed only by great intelligence and continual reinforcements. The Teutons who entered England were successful because they came there by the thousands (Ripley, 30-31). Migrating is not an easy accomplishment. Not only must the migrants fight through enemy territory, but also they must drive the people from the new territory claimed. On occasions, though, nations would permit migrating tribes to pass through their territory if they continued beyond the borders (Kephart, 446).

A permanent witness that a people who spoke a particular language passed through an area is seen in place names. A place name lasts much longer than the spoken language within a particular locality. Since it cannot migrate, it serves as a monument that marks the earlier confines of the language. While newcomers may alter the old name to suit their particular likes, the distinctive quality of age gives it permanence. This is the reason every migration has a trail of place names which indicates previous occupants. Nowhere is the evidence more vivid than in Europe. Each wave of Teutonic invaders can be traced with certainty by this means (Ripley, 26, 312). (The reader will recall this practice by the Israelitish tribe of Dan.)

We have previously commented on overpopulation as a motivation for migration. This was the primary reason, along with famine, for the German migrations in Europe, though the Germans had warlike tendencies and a thirst for adventure (Menzel, 19). Overpopulation was the main reason the Vikings left Scandinavia (Olson, 117). This began the Viking Age, which lasted from the second century AD to about the middle of the twelfth century without interruption (du Chaillu, 26). Often shepherd tribes are forced to leave because of prolonged drought. They usually attack their agricultural neighbors, thus setting the nomadic tribes in motion (Grant, 224-225). When Roman domination came to an end, large-scale migrations of various tribes brought about vast cultural changes (Crossland, 6-7).

Charles Kent's argument that Israel lost its identity because it remained in the land of Palestine and was merged with foreigners does not hold water when we consider what history reveals concerning races and languages. Kent's argument is entirely too simplistic to be believable, and it does not consider the facts of history.

David Baron makes the accusation that the so-called historical proofs used to support the British-Israel theory are derived from heathen myths and fables, as well as faulty philology which traces the word "British" to "Berith-ish" and "Saxon" to "Isaac's-son" (Baron, 10). Previous chapters in this work have demonstrated historical proofs that are anything but heathen myths and fables. Philological attempts to trace "British" to "Berith-ish" (i.e. Covenant man) and "Saxon" from "Isaac's-son" may be less tenable, but are essentially only twigs on the tree. Baron adds that some of these pagan writers believed that the object of worship in the Holy of Holies was the head of an ass, and that they believed other absurdities as well. This is his attempt to lump all pagan writers and historians as unreliable, without taking into consideration the subject of their writings. The question we need to ask is this: Do we reject all the events in Greek and Roman history because the historians who recorded these events were pagan? While it is true that no tribe is altogether without tradition-some founded on facts, others on imagination-whatever the origin, traditions are of little value unless supported by written records. Often the fable has a historical record embedded in it that has changed to a childish form and is, therefore, of no historical value (Bancroft, 5:146, 137). On the other hand, hypercriticism often overshoots the mark and rejects all traditions as false when in reality they may be exaggerated truths by which further investigation affords collateral evidence of historical events (Keating, 186, fn). The Annals of Ulster are a good example of reliable information because they assumed their present form in the late fifteenth century which follow with remarkable fidelity earlier, often contemporary material on which they were based (Wainwright, 15-16). It is only in recent times that the Irish legends have been subjected to serious criticism (Ency. Brit., 11th ed., s.v. "Ireland").

The reality is that in some cases the rejection of tradition can have adverse effects. An example is Greek history. The uncertainty of poetical reports, which were the only ancient histories the Greeks possessed, led philosophers to reject Greek history altogether, and to frame new theories of their own for the original state of mankind. The Greeks had no authentic history of primitive mankind, so philosophers concluded that progress had continued for an indefinite length of time. This hypothesis was popular in ancient times and is still with us today. We call it the theory of evolution (E. Davies, 3-5).

Today, historians stress the scientific character of their work. As a result they have conveyed the impression that their works are scientific, literally. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The only branch of historical writing that is scientific is source criticism. Source criticism involves the examination of chronicles, reports, deeds, charters, letters, and traditions. All are carefully scrutinized. Scientific methods are used to determine the origin, genuineness, and value of this material. But here is the rub. The selection of source material used in any work is strictly a matter of the personal discretion of each critic. What is selected depends on the critic's concept of the time period he is investigating. In brief, the historian is limited by his own temperament and guided by the spirit of his age. Early source critics ignored the subjective nature of their work because they were enamored by the "scientific approach." They attempted to reconstruct the growth and decay of nations with

separate pieces of data in much the same way one would make chemical compounds by joining separate elements. The result was that all the great historians of the world were discarded, men such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Tacitus, and Suetonius. Otto Spengler described it for what it was. His words were: "Historical writing is fiction." He recognized the interpretive function of the historian (Marek, 119-120).

Some Greek legends came from events that actually occurred and contain a kernel of truth. The Greeks did not begin to employ writing as a means of preserving history until 776 BC, which was during the first Olympiad. Even so, the heroic age must not be entirely passed over. Traditions of a people are worthy of record, and this is especially true of the Greeks. The Illiad, for example, is a historical novel and does record actual events (Trump, 189-190). The very outside limit of early history goes back only 4,000 years (Wasserman, intro., 14). So, far as ancient history is concerned, tradition and general belief, as far as broad facts are concerned, are what we must consider (Morgan, 63). The idea that we cannot rely on pagan historians overlooks the basis for the original account. Many of the ancient accounts contain important kernels of truth, and while details may be confused, they do add a dimension to what is already known, and should not be rejected on the basis of Baron's argument.

There are two questions concerning the northern kingdom that can certainly be answered: (1) Were the ten tribes lost? And, (2) are not the names of Israel and Judah two names for the same nation? Those who oppose the belief that the ten tribes lost their identity say the whole hypothesis is based on the assumption the tribes never returned and that they no longer exist. One writer refers to [2 Chronicles 30:1](#) to "prove" the tribes never left the land because Hezekiah invited people of Ephraim and Manasseh to attend the Passover after Israel had supposedly been taken captive. The northern kingdom was vanquished from 721-718 BC. The first year of Hezekiah's reign was in 723 BC, two years before the deportation of the northern kingdom began. Israel was removed from the land by three successive deportations. The final removal did not take place until some time later. This issue was also addressed on page 71 of this work. By the time of Jeremiah, or about 130 years after the deportations began, all from the northern kingdom had been removed ([2 Kings 17: 18, 23-24](#)). The entire argument is invalid. Regarding the second question above, do the names of Israel and Judah refer to the same people? The answer was given on page one of this work. The fact is: In the political sense Israel and Judah are never used as the same, though we see in both Ezra and Nehemiah that the people of Judah are called as Israel. And indeed they are. They are descendants of Israel through their father Judah, but in the Bible we never see the children of the northern kingdom ever referred to as Jews. The fact is: All Jews are Israelites, but not all Israelites are Jews.

What do knowledgeable Jews themselves say regarding lost Israel? The following quotes are from James Mountain's book entitled, *The Triumph of British-Israel* (pp. 106-107). While we do not subscribe to many of the beliefs of the British-Israel movement, these quotes are a valuable source of information regarding the views of informed Jews.

If the Ten Tribes have disappeared, the literal fulfillment of the prophecies would be impossible. If they have not disappeared, obviously, they must exist under a different name (The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12:249).

The Ten Tribes of Israel were irretrievably lost; and a deep and impenetrable silence clings round their dispersion. The thick folds of the veil have never been lifted (The History and Literature of the Israelites, by C. and A. D. Rothschild, 1:489).

The career of the Jews can be traced without difficulty . . . until the present day. Of that of the Israelites, however, nothing authentic is known after their departure from their fatherland to Halah and Habor . . . and the cities of the Medes. With the beginning of their captivity, they seem to have passed from all human knowledge (The Jewish Quarterly Review, July 1903).

By this return of the captives-from Babylon-the Israelitish nation was not restored, since the Ten Tribes . . . were yet left in banishment; and to this day the researches of travellers and wise men have not been able to trace their fate (The Jewish Religion, by Isaac Leiser, 1:256).

The Israelites, who were subjugated by the Assyrian power, disappear from the page of history as suddenly and completely as though the land of their captivity had swallowed them up The Scriptures speak of a future restoration of Israel, which is clearly to include both Judah and Ephraim. The problem then is reduced to its simplest form. The Ten Tribes are certainly in existence. All that has to be done is to discover which people represent them (The Jewish Chronicle, May 2, 1879).

We are longing to find our lost brethren who for two thousand years have baffled all our efforts to discover their whereabouts, and are at this day a riddle even to the greatest of our illustrious Rabbis (comment by Rabbi Gershom).

The author of Chronicles-a contemporary of Ezra-says that the captives of Israel are “up to this day” in the lands of their transportation The hope of the return of the Ten Tribes has never ceased among the Jews in exile (comment by A. Neubauer in The Jewish Quarterly Review).

These views contradict the opinions of most modern theologians. Anyone who has done much study into the subject, will quickly find that support for both pro and con arguments is based on the interpretation of prophecy. Many of these prophecies are vague, but there are some that are very specific with respect to time and need no interpretation. For example, [Jeremiah 3:18](#) and [Hosea 1:11](#) are often quoted to prove Israel returned with Judah after the Babylonian captivity. A look at these texts reveals both are vague with respect to time, though the former implies an event after the return of Christ. But look at [Hosea 3:5](#). It is very specific. It reads: “Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days” (Emphasis ours). This is clearly a reference to the last days; it refers to the return of Christ and the resurrection of King David. When the Jews returned to Palestine during the time of Ezra, they did not seek King David. He had died many years earlier, so this text pinpoints “the latter days.” This is a prophecy that will take place after the return of Christ.

[Ezekiel 37:15-17](#) is often quoted to “prove” the schism between the house of Israel and the house of Judah was to be brief. “The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying, Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand.” Notice the time setting, particularly verses 24 and 25. “And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children,

and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever." Again, this text is a reference to the "last days," a prophecy that will be fulfilled after the return of Christ. David will be resurrected at that time ([1 Cor. 15:22-23](#)).

According to the Bible, somewhat over 42,000 Jews returned to Palestine after the Babylonian captivity ([Ezra 2:64](#)). When Sennacherib attacked Judah, he took 46 fenced cities and deported 200,150 Jews. This number represented only a portion of the population, because Jerusalem had thousands of refugees within its walls. The city was not taken. The number deported from the northern kingdom must have run into the millions, since the Jews were only one tribe. To assume those who came back under Ezra is the fulfillment of the prophecies regarding the restoration of Israel, is wishful thinking. [Ezra 6:17](#) describes a dedication for the house of God, which included offering 12 sacrificial goats representing the 12 tribes. The assumption is that all 12 tribes must have been present. This was a sin offering. The Temple was intended for all the covenant people, whose return to the Lord and to the land of Palestine, according to the prophets was anticipated. Not even all the Jews were present, as vast numbers of them had been deported along with the northern kingdom when it was overthrown.

New Testament texts are also employed to "prove" the Israelites from the northern kingdom returned at the time of Ezra. Since Anna of the tribe of Asher ([Luke 2:36](#)) is mentioned, it is assumed the term "Jew" and "Israelite" are synonymous. Since the book of Ezra mentions "Jews" eight times, and "Israel" 40 times, the two must be the same people. Similarly, the book of Nehemiah mentions "Jews" 11 times and "Israel" 22 times. According to Paul Benware, it is a fallacy to assume that the term "Jew" stands for the bodily descendants of the tribe of Judah, since in both biblical and secular usage the term has a far broader meaning (Benware, 83). Anton Darms insists that after the return from Babylon the term "Jew" and "Israel" are used interchangeably. He cites various concordances, Bible dictionaries, and encyclopedias to prove his argument (Darms, 29-30). The problem, of course, is the failure to recognize that all Jews are Israelites, but not all Israelites are Jews. References in both Ezra and Nehemiah are in keeping with this fact. The same is true in [Acts 2:22, 36](#). Nowhere does the Bible use the term "the 12 tribes of Judah."

Josephus supposedly "proves" that Jews are not distinct from Israel. This is because Josephus uses the term "Jew" to apply to all ten tribes from the beginning of their history (Ant., IX, xiv; VI, ii, 2 and iii, 5; VII, iv, 1; Apion I, xiii and II, ii). Therefore, his statement that only two tribes were in subjection to the Romans has no significance since all these people were Jews. What is overlooked is that Josephus said that the appellation "Jew" was not applied to the Jews until after the Babylonian captivity, and that it was also applied to the land (Ant., XI, v, 7). He knew perfectly well the distinction, but in his works uses the term "Jew" because this was the common practice of the day. He specifically said that only two tribes were in subjection to the Romans and did not refer to them as Jews, but rather as the "people of Israel." He knew the difference. The fact is: The Bible makes the distinction clear in [2 Kings 16:5-6](#). In about 740 BC, the Jews were at war with the house of Israel and are here called Jews for the first time. We read: "Then Rezin king of Syria and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel came up to Jerusalem to war: and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him. At that time Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria, and drave the Jews from Elath: and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." Even Anton Darms admits the difference. He says the book of Ezekiel proves that Israel was still in the

land of the Medes at the close of the Babylonian period, and had not migrated elsewhere (Darms, 142). Actually, portions of Israel had already moved across the Araxes by that time. David Baron also admits, "There is not the least possibility of doubt that many of the settlements of the Diaspora [Dispersion] in the time of our Lord-both north, south, and west, as well as east of Palestine-were made up of those who had never returned to the land of their fathers since the time of the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles, and who were not only descendants of Judah, as Anglo-Israelism ignorantly presupposes, but of all the twelve tribes scattered abroad" (Baron, 32).

[Acts 26:6-7](#) is sometimes quoted to demonstrate that Israel was not lost and was found among the Jews. Paul states: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: Unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." The inference is that the Jews represent the 12 tribes and are urgently serving God day and night. The fact is: The Jews were doing anything but serving God. Paul tells us: "For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men" ([1 Thess. 2:14-15](#)). The entire book of Acts, as well as the Gospels, demonstrate the rebellion and obstinacy of the Jews against the Truth. A much better rendering of [Acts 26:6-7](#) is found in the Williams Translation. It reads: "And now it is for the hope of the promise made by God to our forefathers that I stand here on trial, which promise our twelve tribes, by devotedly worshipping day and night, hope to see fulfilled in them." What Paul said was that the 12 tribes could hope to attain to the promises made by God when all Israel should be "intently serving God." Paul's statement was intended for the future; it is not a reference to what the Jews were doing at that time.

Other texts employed to "prove" Israel was not lost include [James 1:1](#) and [Matthew 10:23](#). James mentions the 12 tribes that are scattered abroad. This has been interpreted as "the 12 tribes of the Jews." The Jews are not the 12 tribes. They are one tribe only-the tribe of Judah, though at the time the ten tribes of the north broke away from the house of David, the tribes of Benjamin, Levi, and some Israelites, in limited numbers, joined themselves to the house of Judah. Politically they became known as the house of Judah, and were distinct from the house of Israel. Both vast numbers of Israelites and a number of Jews had been scattered in the deportations under the Assyrian and Babylonian kings. These were the people to whom James was writing. They were found in the territory of the ancient Persian Empire, central Asia, throughout the occidental world, including Asia Minor and the Mediterranean region. James says that many of them were warlike ([Jas. 4:1-3](#)). In [Matthew 10:23](#), Jesus said: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Most theologians interpret this text to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. In reality, the text is a reference to the second coming of Christ. It is a prophecy for a work that will be done in the last days, just before the return of Christ. It demonstrates that very near the end of this age the house of Israel would be scattered around the world, and that not even all these people would hear the true gospel before the return of Christ.

The various arguments presented above are called "the amalgamation theory." As we have seen, it advocates that the Israelites and Jews fused and came together in representative

numbers sufficient enough to become one nation (Mountain, 22). The idea is that a very small remnant of Jews, along with a very few Israelites, returned to Palestine, thus making them representative of all the promises given by God to Israel. They fail to comprehend that the promises could apply to Israel in the last days before the return of Jesus Christ. What is clear is that the two houses-the house of Judah and the house of Israel-will remain separate until the return of Christ, but this separation has no bearing on the fulfillment on God's promises to the descendants of Abraham. The amalgamation theory was advanced because of the difficulty in locating the ten tribes after their deportation. This was the most "reasonable conclusion" that could be reached (ibid, 22-23). The Bible tells us that a limited number of families was resident within the borders of Judah before the captivity ([1 Kings 12:17](#), [1 Chron. 9:3](#)). This included some Simeonites ([Josh. 19:1-9](#)), and probably accounts for Anna of the tribe of Asher ([Luke 2:36-38](#)). At times religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem took place ([2 Chron. 11:16-17](#); [15:9-15](#); [30:1-27](#); [34:9](#)), though there is no indication these pilgrims chose to remain in Judah. The last portion of [2 Chronicles 34:9](#) should read: ". . . and of all the remnant of Israel, and of all Judah and Benjamin; and the inhabitants of Jerusalem." Also, the word "multitude" in [2 Chronicles 30:18](#) should read "many."

Anton Darms says that British-Israelites seek to propagate their beliefs by teaching that Great Britain is the "stone kingdom" mentioned in [Daniel 2:35](#)(Darms, 11). This charge is not without basis because British-Israelites often apply this text to the British Empire. The fact is: This verse has been taken out of context; it applies to the Millennium after the return of Christ. It is a reference to the Kingdom of God, not the British Empire. On the other hand, some say that if the Israelites are located in northwestern Europe and the British Isles, they are under a curse. This is because only when they are in Palestine are they blessed. This notion doesn't make much sense when we look at what is happening in the Holy Land today. There is constant bloodshed between the Arabs and Jews, and peace seems beyond the grasp of all the parties involved. Many who have gone to Palestine leave after a few years, disillusioned. Religious tension exists among the Jews themselves-secular opposed to conservative. The state of Israel is heavily subsidized by the United States government, and receives liberal contributions from Jews who reside in America. In the sense of being blessed, the "promised land" is anything but that, though it is probably much better than living in Russia.

It is said by some that there is no Bible reference for Israel to become a multitude of nations in "the latter days." Furthermore, during the Old Testament period, Israel became as multitudinous as the "stars of heaven," and that the promise to be like the "stars of heaven" is spiritual in nature and was fulfilled by [Galatians 3:29](#). Also, that the promises given to Jacob regarding the lands applied only to the lands Jacob rested on when the promise was given, and that securing "the gate of his enemies" is figurative, idiomatic, and means that Israel took over the cities of their enemies. In addition, there was no more to the birthright than two tribal portions, and that "body of peoples" and "assemblage of people" was all Jacob's descendants would become. All these promises were supposedly fulfilled during the Old Testament period and the only place David's throne has any legitimacy is on Mount Zion in Jerusalem. Nations meant no more than little kingdoms in the land of Canaan, and kings meant no more than rulers over cities. Israel is spoken of as "nations" because it was made up of different tribes. They add that anyone who assigns material blessings to the birthright and spiritual blessings to the scepter is manifesting artificiality. In brief, all the promises applied to Israel were meant for the Old Testament period only.

Evidently, some people have not read their Bibles, or refuse to take it at face value.

Take [Genesis 49:1, 22-26](#), for example. Notice, it is a prophecy for the last days. We read:

And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall: The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him: But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:) Even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb: The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren.

Joseph is the eponym for the two birthright tribes-Ephraim and Manasseh. What we read here is a prophecy for the last days, just before the return of Christ. This describes an extremely wealthy and powerful nation, not at all what appears in the Old Testament. The wealth and power described above far exceeds the resources and land acquired in ancient Israel ([Micah 4:1, 6](#)). Several verses in the context place the time setting in the last days. [Micah 5:1, 8-10](#) is another important text. Again, We read in verses 8-9: "And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep: who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver. Thine hand shall be lifted up upon thine adversaries, and all thine enemies shall be cut off." This shows the military power and prestige Israel would possess shortly before the return of Christ. In the light of these texts, how can we believe [Galatians 3:29](#) was the fulfillment. [Galatians 3:29](#) refers to the scepter promise-the promise of salvation through Jesus Christ, which is found in [Genesis 22:18](#). It is not a promise of material blessings. The promise of great material wealth is found in [Genesis 22: 17](#). God said: "That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." These promises, known in the Bible as the birthright, belonged to Ephraim and Manasseh. Jacob passed them down to the sons of Joseph. This is recorded in [Genesis 48:5-6, 14-16](#):

And now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, which were born unto thee in the land of Egypt before I came unto thee into Egypt, are mine; as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine. And thy issue, which thou begettest after them, shall be thine, and shall be called after the name of their brethren in their inheritance And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon Ephraim's head, who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, guiding his hands wittingly; for Manasseh was the firstborn. And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.

Those who oppose the belief that Israel migrated into western Europe and the British Isles, which comprise the Anglo-Saxon world today, may bicker over the meaning of Old Testament texts, but the facts of modern times speak for themselves. If God did not fulfill

the material promises He made to Abraham, then we can have no confidence He fulfilled the promise of a Savior.

[Jeremiah 31:35-36](#) states that the seed of Israel shall never cease as a nation before God. Some may argue that this refers to the Jews, but does it exclude the rest of the tribes of Israel? If not, what has become of them? The historical record is clear enough, as has been demonstrated earlier in this work. The standard explanation is that this text refers to the Church. Let us notice a quote from *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1925 ed., s.v., “tribes, lost ten,” (quoted in Parker). A partial quote of this reference was given earlier.

As a large number of prophecies relate to the return of ‘Israel’ to the Holy Land, believers in the literal inspiration of the Scriptures have always labored under a difficulty in regard to the continued existence of the tribes of Israel, with the exception of those of Judah and Levi (or Benjamin), which returned with Ezra and Nehemiah. If the Ten Tribes have disappeared, obviously they must exist under a different name. The numerous attempts at identification that have been made constitute some of the most remarkable curiosities of literature.

The movement from the Holy Land into Europe was through the Caucasus. The Jews of the Caucasus regard themselves as representatives of the most blue-blooded Israelitish nobility. They claim to be the descendants of the Israelites sent there from Judea by the Assyrian kings between the end of the eighth and close of the seventh centuries BC (Pittard, 343). One argument is that Khazar blood vitiated Jewish blood after the Khazar kingdom converted to Judaism. (Pittard tells us that the Great Russians are called Khazars by the Ukrainians). Mixed blood marriages between Jews and Gentiles were, in reality, between Jews and Christians, so that the conversion of the Khazars was of slight importance in altering Jewish blood (Ripley, 391). John Beddoe says that the Khazars were Turks of a high type and may be an Aryan mixture (Beddoe, 62). The Turks are a specialized branch of the Alpine race and closely affiliated with the races of Europe.

Those who oppose the truth about the modern identity of Israel assure us that correct prophetic interpretation is the key to a proper understanding of this belief. Then they give us their interpretation of what they think the Scriptures say. They tell us Israel will not come into prominence again until the Messiah comes to rescue them from a scattered condition. This is partially correct. While many Jews are scattered, they do have their own nation that is powerful in its own right. Some Jewish writers admit the Jews today have enough military power to crush all the Arab nations combined. They have atomic weapons, so this could certainly be true. While the ten tribes are in a scattered condition, they too have their own nations—a company of nations. The power of some of them is prodigious. [Micah 5:7-10](#) shows that power, but also shows that they will be punished for their national sins.

Opponents of British-Israelism do have some valid points, though. They criticize some of the weak prophetic interpretations and historical links used by proponents. Examples would be interpretation of the “seven times” in Leviticus 26; the “tender twig” in [Ezekiel 17:22](#), as proof a Jewish princess would go to England and establish a royal house; the commission of Jeremiah to plant the throne of David in Ireland; the three overturns in [Ezekiel 21:25-27](#), which move the throne of David from Palestine to Ireland, from Ireland to Scotland, and from Scotland to England. This is not to say any of these are not true. There are authentic accounts of these events in Keating’s *History of Ireland* (p. 137). Scholars today would demand much more proof than these. What is important, however, is that the identity of modern Israel does not hinge on the transfer of David’s throne to England, or on the

perpetuation of that throne. The massive amount of evidence that is available today clearly demonstrates the Israelite migration from the Holy Land into Europe. As such, it far surpasses any unanswered questions regarding David's throne.

Some questions are easily answered, questions such as: If David shall never want for a man to sit upon the throne of Israel ([Jer. 33:17](#)), why is a woman ruling today? If the Scythians are Israelites, why did they not circumcise? In the first instance the Hebrew word for man is "ish." It refers to both men and women. See [Job 12:10](#); [14:12](#); [15:16](#); [34:21](#), [Psalm 39:11](#); [78:25](#). In the second instance, Israel had abandoned the Law of Moses over 200 years before going into captivity. They were conquered and deported because they refused to obey God's Law ([2 Kings 17:16-18](#)). The British-Israel claim that the Anglo-Saxons are the lineal descendants of the ten tribes of Israel is only partially true. Other nations of northwest Europe, no doubt, should be included. There is a real danger, though, in attributing to oneself all the promises of God. The British-Israel claim that they are the recipients of the national promises made to Abraham is well and good, but to claim immunity from destruction in the form of national punishment, and that they alone are the executors of the commissions God gave to Israel is being presumptuous. Anton Darms is absolutely correct when he says that anyone who believes that Great Britain is now in the state of promised exaltation and blessedness has been drawn into an alliance with the godless world of British society and the demoralizing results that come from such an alliance (Darms, 28). While the English-speaking world may call itself Christian and be responsible for distributing more Bibles than all other nations combined, what is practiced, as Christianity, is not what Christ and the Apostles taught.

Chapter 8: Israel – The Type and Example

It has been said that in America, if you attend a church meeting without fear of harassment, arrest, torture, or death, you are more blessed than three billion people in the world. If you have food in the refrigerator, clothes on your back, a roof overhead, and a place to sleep, you are richer than 75 percent of the world. If you have money in the bank, in your wallet, and spare change in a dish someplace, you are among the top eight percent of the world's wealthy. If you can read the above, you are more blessed than two billion people in the world who cannot read at all. Why is it America and the democracies of northwestern Europe are so much better off than the rest of the world? Why do we possess most of the world's wealth? Is it because of our own skill and prowess? Or is the hand of God working behind the scenes?

The fact is: God chose the children of Israel, and He chose them for a specific purpose. It was not the result of some afterthought or evolving circumstance. It was foreordained long before the birth of the patriarch Jacob. "Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will shew thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee. When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" ([Deut. 32:7-8](#)). "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation" ([Acts 17:26](#)). The land and wealth that America and western Europe have attained did not come about by accident or skill. It was determined more than 3,500 years ago. The growth of the seed of Israel started out with one man and grew into a multitude of millions.

It began with a man named Abraham. God called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees—a pagan society. God said to him: ". . . Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed" ([Gen. 12:1-3](#)). This promise was repeated in [Genesis 17:4-8](#):

As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God ([Gen. 17:4-8](#)).

The promise was given in perpetuity, yet Abraham never received the promises during his lifetime. Referring to Abraham, as well as to others, Paul writes: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise" ([Heb. 11:13, 39](#)). While the promise included the land of Canaan as an inheritance, it was not

limited to it by any means. The promises given to Abraham and his descendants were for the distant future.

After Abraham proved his implicit faith in God's promise that He would give him an heir ([Gen. 22:1-12](#), [Heb. 11:17-19](#)), God made the promises unconditional. He said:

. . . By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice ([Gen. 22:16-18](#)).

From the beginning, the promise was dual and was now made absolute. It is a promise of both "race and grace"-national blessings and wealth, as well as the promise of a Messiah. God swore by Himself that He would fulfill it, but He did not say when. God said He would establish His covenant with Abraham and his seed after him ". . . in their generations. . ." ([Gen. 17:7](#)). Abraham's son was Isaac. God confirmed the covenant with Isaac when He told him: "Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy father; And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" ([Gen. 26:3-4](#)). Some years later, the promise was confirmed to Isaac's son Jacob. God said to Jacob: ". . . I am the LORD God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed" ([Gen. 28:13-14](#)).

Some argue that these promises were limited to the land of Palestine. The word "spread" means "break out," "break away," or "break forth" in the Hebrew and implies much more than ". . . the land whereon thou liest . . ." Compare [Romans 4:13](#). There would be no need to "spread abroad" if the promises were limited to the land of Palestine. This is why God told Jacob: ". . . I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins; And the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee I will give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land" ([Gen. 35:11-12](#)). What would be the purpose of making Jacob (Israel) into a nation and a company of nations if all that is involved is the small country of Palestine? True, the land of Palestine is promised to the seed of Abraham, but does that mean the promise applied only to that region of the world? Does the text say that no other land at any other time would ever belong to the seed of Abraham? (The reader will recall that the promises were passed down to the sons of Joseph-Ephraim and Manasseh.) Their descendants were to become a great nation and a company of nations. Did this occur during the Old Testament period? Our course not! But it did occur many years later after the ten tribes migrated into northwestern Europe and the British Isles. The historical record alone is enough to refute the notion that the promises were limited to the Holy Land.

The descendants of Israel lived many years in Egypt where they were forced into slavery. God sent Moses to deliver them. ". . . the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage. And God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac,

and with Jacob. And God looked upon the children of Israel, and God had respect unto them” ([Ex. 2:23-25](#)). God told Moses:

. . . I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt ([Ex.3: 7-8, 10](#)).

Three months after leaving the land of Egypt, the Israelites entered into a covenant with God. We read: “And he [Moses] took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words” ([Ex. 24:7-8](#)). The purpose that God had ordained for the children of Israel was now underway. But did they really comprehend or appreciate this purpose? The answer is no. They did not recognize or comprehend that what God was doing through them represented a physical type of the gospel. Notice what the Apostle Paul wrote: “And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ” ([Gal. 3:8-9, 16](#)). Here Paul points out that the promise of grace-Messiah-would come through the seed of Abraham, specifically through Judah. “For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the [Prince, ie., Christ]; but the birthright was Joseph’s” ([1 Chron. 5:2](#)). By obeying God’s Law, as a nation Israel was setting the example God intends for the whole world to follow eventually. This was why Moses wrote:

Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the LORD our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day? Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life: but teach them thy sons, and thy sons’ sons ([Deut. 4:5-9](#)).

This marvelous way of life will prevail in the Kingdom of God, to be established on this earth when Christ returns. Israel was the type of that coming way of life. The message Jesus preached was the gospel of the Kingdom of God ([Matt. 4:23, Mark 1:14-15](#)). It was not a message about the person of Christ. It was a message of the coming Kingdom of God. This kingdom will be established upon the earth for 1,000 years, then for all eternity ([Rev. 19:11-15; 20:4; 21:1-4](#)). During the Old Testament period, the children of Israel were required to obey the letter of the law. They were not judged for the failure to keep it according to the

spiritual intent of the law. The entire sacrificial system served as a reminder of the coming sacrifice of Christ and was done away at His death and resurrection ([Heb. 10:1-4](#), [12-13](#)).

But Israel failed to keep the requirements of even the letter of the law. Paul tells us:

For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord ([Heb. 8:7-9](#)).

Jesus Christ is the Mediator of the New Covenant ([1Tim 2:5](#), [Heb. 12:24](#)). God has taken away the first covenant in order to establish the second ([Heb. 10:9](#)). God knew in advance the inability of the children of Israel to truly obey Him. We read in [Deuteronomy 5:29](#): "O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever!" Joshua told the children of Israel: ". . . Ye cannot serve the LORD . . ." ([Josh. 24:19](#)). God knew in advance the outcome of the physical covenant He had established with the children of Israel, but it was merely a type, a forerunner of the spiritual covenant God would establish with all who accept Christ and are truly converted. God, through the physical nation of Israel, revealed the magnificence of His law to the world. For the first time since the Flood, men became aware of the great God of all wisdom, power, glory, and perfection. Of this law, David wrote, "I have seen an end of all perfection: but thy commandment is exceeding broad" ([Ps. 119:96](#)).

Equally important, however, is the fact that the entire Old Testament experience God had with Israel was for our learning.

Paul wrote:

But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come ([1 Cor. 10:5-11](#)).

Israel was the object lesson for the world to see, the record written and preserved in the sacred Scriptures, so that we may not repeat their mistakes. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope" ([Rom. 15:4](#)). Israel was cast off, driven into exile and lost from sight-but not permanently. Paul told the Roman Christians: "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew . . ." ([Rom. 11:1-2](#)). Rather, Israel has been given the spirit of spiritual slumber. "According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear; unto this day" (v. 8). "Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear" (v. 20). "For I would not, brethren, that

ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob” (v.v. 25-26). “For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all” (v.32).

The children of Israel were chosen for a purpose. Referring to them, Paul writes: “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the [sonship], and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” ([Rom. 9:4-5](#)). That purpose and lesson was for us. God is now working through a spiritual Church. The physical Israel failed because they could not abide by God’s requirements. The descendants of Israel, as well as the Gentiles, will be able to live in accordance with God’s Law in the future. “But now hath he [Christ] obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises” ([Hebrews 8:6](#)). “For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people” (v. 10). Physical Israel failed to anticipate the Messiah who could take away their sins. The Jews sought to attain righteousness by works of the law. Neither succeeded. By means of the New Covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, the true change of heart will take place, and God’s purpose will be realized.

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more ([Jer. 31:31-34](#)).

Israel’s national sins were Sabbath-breaking and idolatry ([Ezek. 20](#)). They were completely intractable. For these reasons, as well as others, they were taken into national captivity and deported from the land.

Notwithstanding they would not hear, but hardened their necks, like to the neck of their fathers, that did not believe in the LORD their God. And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that were round about them, concerning whom the LORD had charged them, that they should not do like them. And they left all the commandments of the LORD their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal. And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the LORD, to provoke him to anger. Therefore the LORD was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only Until the

LORD removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day ([2 Kings 17:14-18, 23](#)).

Judah was not far behind. They, too, turned from God and, as a nation, refused to repent. About 120 years later, God also removed them from the land. "Also Judah kept not the commandments of the LORD their God, but walked in the statutes of Israel which they made. And the LORD rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers, until he had cast them out of his sight So Judah was carried away out of their land" ([2 Kings 17:19-20; 25:21](#)). "And them that had escaped from the sword carried he [Nebuchadnezzar] away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia" ([2 Chron. 36:20](#)). The northern kingdom-Israel- was conquered and carried away by three successive Assyrian invasions. The southern kingdom-Judah-was defeated and carried away by the king of Babylon. Both these captivities were only temporary in nature. The people of the northern kingdom broke away to the north and northeast, eventually migrating to northwestern Europe. Only a small number of the people of the southern kingdom returned to Palestine. As a people they, too, were scattered around the world, many of them migrating to eastern and western Europe, where many of their descendants are still found.

God punished both Israel and Judah, but He did not destroy them. Speaking of Israel, the prophet Hosea wrote: "My God will cast them away, because they did not hearken unto him: and they shall be wanderers among the nations" ([Hos. 9:17](#)). Amos adds: "Behold, the eyes of the Lord GOD are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the LORD. For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth" ([Amos 9:8-9](#)).

Notice the following passages:

Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The LORD of hosts is his name: If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever ([Jer. 31:35-36](#)).

Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant, saith the LORD: for I am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee: but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure; yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished ([Jer. 46:28](#)).

And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the LORD ([Ezek. 20:38](#)).

But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away ([Isa. 41:8-9](#)).

For my name's sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off ([Isa. 48:9](#)).

For the LORD hath chosen Jacob unto himself, and Israel for his peculiar treasure ([Ps. 135:4](#)).

For thou hast confirmed to thyself thy people Israel to be a people unto thee for ever: and thou, LORD, art become their God ([2 Sam. 7:24](#)).

And an angel of the LORD came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I swore unto your fathers; and I said, I will never break my covenant with you ([Judges 2:1](#)).

For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed ([Mal. 3:6](#)).

The children of Israel broke the covenant relationship with God. But because of His promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, He spared His people. They, along with the Gentiles, will be privileged to enter into a New Covenant relationship after Christ returns. They did not vanish from the face of the earth, as some believe. The house of Israel was the recipient of the promises of race; the house of Judah, the nation that brought forth the Great Lawgiver—the Messiah ([1 Chron. 5:2](#)).

The entire Old Testament experience teaches us the inability of Israel to abide by the physical requirements of the Law. Jesus Christ came to magnify the law, to make it honorable ([Isa. 42:21](#)), to give it a spiritual dimension, and to give man the power to live it by means of the Holy Spirit. The Old Testament experience was a necessary lesson that man must receive the help of God in order to fulfill His will. Jesus said: ". . . I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me" ([John 14:6](#)). By accepting His sacrifice and repenting, man can receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. He then can start on the path of spiritual growth and true obedience to God.

The physical nation of Israel was a type of the government of God. God is now preparing a people to be future priests and kings who will rule with Christ when He returns ([Rev. 20:6](#)). Rather than building a physical kingdom, Christ is now building a spiritual Church. The Church is now the spiritual house of God ([1 Pet. 2:5](#)). Those called to the Truth today are the spiritual children of God. Nationality is of little importance. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" ([Gal. 3:26-29](#)). Paul speaks of the spiritual creation—the new man, ". . . which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all" ([Col. 3:10-11](#)). "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God" ([Rom. 2:28-29](#)). "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new [creation]. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God" ([Gal. 6:15-16](#)).

The prophet Jeremiah foretold the time when God will make a new covenant with His people.

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the

LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more ([Jer. 31:31-34](#)).

The two houses of Israel have never reunited since the division at the time of Rehoboam. The prophet Ezekiel foretold the time when they will be again united, this important text cannot be overemphasized. It is absolute biblical proof that the Jews are not the house of Israel, and that the two houses did not unite when the Jews returned from Babylon.

Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not shew us what thou meanest by these? Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand . . . And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all . . . And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them ([Ezek. 37: 16-19, 22, 24](#)).

Notice again carefully. David will be king over them. That never happened in the past. These texts are a prophecy for the future. They speak of a time when David will be resurrected. When will this take place? It will occur at the time of the resurrection ([1 Cor. 15:23](#))! This is when the New Covenant with the two houses of Israel will be inaugurated. Until that time they will remain separate.

This is what God has to say regarding the Jews:

And now therefore thus saith the LORD, the God of Israel, concerning this city, whereof ye say, It shall be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence; Behold, I will gather them out of all countries, whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: And they shall be my people, and I will be their God . . . And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me ([Jer. 32:36-38, 40](#)).

When the Jews returned to Palestine under Ezra and Nehemiah, they remained intact as a nation until the time of the Romans. Even then, they manifested only a shadow of their former glory. Because of their rebellion, the Romans eventually destroyed the nation and drove them from the land. The Jews in Palestine today are only a small minority of the Jews worldwide. More Jews reside in some western cities than are found in Palestine. Jeremiah, in the text above, talks of a time when Judah will be restored and will enter into a new covenant relationship with God. Certainly that cannot apply today, as the Jews to this day refuse to accept Christ as the Messiah. And they certainly do not “dwell safely,” but with constant bloodshed and the threat of war hanging over them.

Hosea spoke of this same time-the time when the two nations will be joined.

Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God. 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 Jezreel ([Hos. 1:10-11](#)).

This text, like the others, is a reference to the time when the New Covenant will be established with the children of Israel, that is, both houses. During the Millennium, Christ will rule over the nations of the earth ([Rev. 19:15](#)). Notice this time period described:

And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more ([Isa. 2:2-4](#)).

Christ will be in the midst of Israel ([Joel 2:27](#)), and the 12 Apostles, under King David, will rule over the 12 tribes of Israel ([Matt. 19:28](#)). The world will be blessed beyond belief. God's Spirit will be poured out in abundance.

And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit ([Joel 2:28-29](#)).

Man will have access to all of God's good graces.

But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant. . . ([Heb. 12:22-24](#)).

This is the time spoken of by the prophet Micah. "He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea. Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old" ([Micah 7:19-20](#)).

Let us be reminded of a few facts.

If God did not keep His promise of great national wealth and power, as well as sending the Messiah, we can have no confidence in any of God's Word. The promises of race and grace stand or fall together. The validity of God's Word rests on the surety of these promises. That history draws a blank on what happened to the lost ten tribes of Israel is demonstrably wrong. There is ample evidence to support the hypothesis that the lost ten tribes of Israel now constitute the great western powers of the world. They were lost from sight because they lost their name and their language. Historians did not know where to look.

The culmination of God's promises to Israel-the promises of race and grace-is found in the confirmation of national power and wealth, and in the historical Jesus. The promises were given to Abraham-the friend of God ([Jas. 2:23](#)). He was the friend of God, "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" ([Gen. 26:5](#)). Abraham was an example of righteousness. Righteousness is defined as obedience to the Law of God ([Ps. 119:172](#)). The Scriptures tell us: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God" ([Jas. 2:21-23](#)). "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" ([Heb. 11:8-10](#)). "And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness" ([Gen. 15:6](#)).

The promises were passed down to Abraham's descendants. Israel-the Old Testament Church ([Acts 7:38](#))-was a type of the New Testament Church. The biblical record is a permanent testimony of that Church. It illustrates the results of the lack of faith and inability to live in agreement with God's requirements. The New Covenant will change all that. For the first time man will have the spiritual strength to obey God according to the spiritual intent of the law. When Christ returns, the two houses of Israel will be united and the New Covenant instituted. Millions of physical Israelites and Gentiles will enter into a spiritual relationship never known before. Spiritual Israel-the Church-will be the "Israel of God." God gave Israel the same law Abraham obeyed. Israel of old-the Old Testament Church-was required to keep this law physically. They were not judged according to the spiritual intent. The New Testament Church-spiritual Israel-is required to obey the spiritual intent of that law. This is what the Sermon on the Mount was all about. It is the heart and crux of Christianity. Yet, today, few are able to stand fast in it. Spiritual Israel-the Church-is the antitype of physical Israel. Paul said there was no profit in the flesh. Man must live by every Word of God. Man must live by the spiritual intent of the law, not the letter of the law only. Today, various arguments of one kind or another are advanced to repudiate the call and purpose of Israel, as well as the plan of God. Some try to spiritualize away the literal meaning of the Scriptures; others apply all the promises of God to the Church and completely overlook the future. Some apply the promises to present-day governments of the earth, not realizing that the governments of this world are anything but Godly. Others refuse to acknowledge the identity of the lost ten tribes because they labor under the misconception that to do so would mean they would have to obey God's commands. They do not realize that millions of Israelites today have little interest in obeying God in anything, and that one must be called of God to really comprehend what obedience to God means. While many of these people like to call themselves Christian, they make no attempt to follow in the footsteps of Abraham-the friend of God.

The notion that the northern and southern kingdoms united after the Babylonian captivity limits God's promises to Abraham. Only a remnant of Jews returned after the Babylonian captivity. History demonstrates that millions of both Israelites and Jews have never

returned. Prophecy shows they will be joined as one nation after the return of Christ. Israel of the Old Covenant failed. Israel of the New will not. Israel of the Old did not understand God's purpose. Israel of the New will understand. What needs to be understood is that obedience to God leads to blessings and prosperity. Disobedience leads to curses and suffering. Israel of Old is the example of disobedience. One way of life leads to salvation, the other leads to death ([Rom. 6:23](#)). Salvation itself is wrapped up in the promises that God gave to Abraham. Let us come to appreciate God's great plan and purpose. Let us come to see what God has really done for America. Let us make an effort to rededicate ourselves to Him.

Bibliography

- Artamonov, M. I. 1974. *Kimmeriitsy i skify*. [Cimmerians and Scythians] Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo leningradskogo universiteta.
- Baker, John R. 1981. *Race*. Athens, Georgia: Foundation for Human Understanding.
- Bancroft, Hubert H. 1883. *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*. Vol. 5, "The Native Races of the Pacific States." San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Co.
- Baron, David. n.d. *The History of the Ten "Lost" Tribes*. 4th ed., enl. and rev. London: Morgan and Scott.
- Beddoe, John. [1912]. n.d. *The Anthropological History of Europe*. Reprint of 1912 edition. Washington, D.C.: The Cliveden Press.
- Benware, Paul N. 1977. *Ambassadors of Armstrongism*. Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed.
- Bible Advocate. 1968. "The Fallacies of British-Israelism." Part 1, February 1968; Part 2, March 1968; Part 3, May 1968; Part 4, June? 1968, Part 5, July? 1968.
- Bible Research. See Bible Research Handbook.
- Bible Research Handbook. 1946. London: The National Message, Ltd.
- Bihl, Josef K. L. 1953. *In deutschen Landen*. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press.
- Bradley, Henry. 1903. *The Goths*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- The Century Dictionary and Cyclopaedia*. s.v. "celts." New York: The Century Co.
- Capt, E. Raymond. 1985. *Missing Links Discovered in Assyrian Tablets*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Artisan Sales.
- Chadwick, Nora. [1970] 1971. *The Celts*. Pelican Books. Reprint. New York: Penguin Books.
- Christopoulos, George A., ed. *History of the Hellenic World*. "Prehistory and Proto-History."
- Cronholm, Neander N. 1902. *A History of Sweden*. 2 vols. Chicago, New York, and London: published by author.
- Crossland, R. A. and Ann Birchall, eds. 1974. *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean*. Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield. Park Ridge, New Jersey: Noyes Press.
- Darms, Anton. n.d. *The Delusion of British-Israelism*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers.
- Davies, Edward. [1804] 1979. *Celtic Researches*. London. Reprinted. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Davies, Nigel. 1979. *Voyagers to the New World*. New York: William Morrow and Co.
- Deevey, Edward S., Jr. 1952. "Radiocarbon Dating." *Scientific American*, Feb., 24-28.
- du Chaillu, Paul B. 1889. *The Viking Age*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Eckert, Allan W. [1967] 1981. *The Frontiersmen*. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown. Reprint. New York: Bantam Books.
- Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., s.v. "celt," "Germany," Ireland."

- Ewald, Heinrich. 1878. *The History of Israel*. Vol. 4, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter from the second German edition. London: Longman, Green, and Co.
- Fasken, W. H. n.d. *Israel's Racial Origin and Migrations*. Hollywood, Calif.: New Christian Crusade Church.
- Fell, Barry. 1974. *Life, Space, and Times: A Course in Environmental Biology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fell, Barry. *America B.C.: Ancient Settlers in the New World*. New York: The New York Times Book Co., Demeter Press.
- . [1980] 1983. *Saga America*. New York: The New York Times Book Co., Times Books.
- . 1982. *Bronze Age America*. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown.
- Gawler, J. C. 188-. *Our Scythians Ancestors*. London: W. H. Guest.
- Gamboa, Pedro Sarmiento de. 1947. *History of the Incas*. Trans. and ed. by C. Markham. Vol. 22, ser. 2 of *Works Issued by the Halkuyt Society*. Cambridge.
- Gish, Duane T. 1985. *Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record*. Rev, and enl. ed. of *Evolution: The Fossils Say No!* El Cajon, Calif.: Creation-Life Publishers, Master Books.
- Goetz, Delia and Sylvanus G. Morley. 1950. *Popol Vuh: The Sacred Book of the Ancient Quiché Maya*. Vol. 29 of *The Civilization of the American Indian Series*. Norman, Okla.: Univ. of Oklahoma Press.
- Grant, Madison. 1916. *The Passing of the Great Race*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Günther, Hans F. K. n.d. *Racial Elements of European History*. Trans. by G.C. Wheeler from second German ed. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co.
- Haberman, Frederick. [1962] 1979. *Tracing Our White Ancestors*. Reprint. Phoenix, Ariz.: *America's Promise*.
- Haddon, A.C. [1912] 1984. *The Wanderings of Peoples*. Oxford University Press. Reprint. Washington, D.C.: The Cliveden Press.
- Hammond, Peter B., ed. 1964. *Physical Anthropology and Archaeology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hannay, Herbert B. 1915. *European and Other Race Origins*. London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co.
- Izvestiya. 1987. "Tainy drevnikh kurganov." [Secrets of the ancient kurgans] *Izvestiya*, 3 May 1987.
- Jairazbhoy, R. A. 1974. *Ancient Egyptians and Chinese in America*. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jerome. Letter 123. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Second series, volume 6. Translated and edited by Henry Wace and Philip Schaff. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893.
- Jowett, George F. 1975. *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*. London: Covenant Pub. Co.
- Justice, Gene. 1984. *The Israel Identity Syndrome*.
- Karp, Walter. 1977. "How Did Human Races Originate?", "Who Raised the Megaliths?" In *Mysteries of the Past*, Joseph Thorndike, Jr., editor. New York: American Heritage Pub. Co.
- Keating, Geoffrey. 1857. *History of Ireland*. New York.

Kent, Charles Foster. 1901. *A History of the Hebrew People*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Kephart, Calvin. 1960. *Races of Mankind, Their Origin and Migration*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Langer, William. [1948]1952. *Encyclopedia of World History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Latham, R.G. 1854. *The Native Races of the Russian Empire*. London and New York: Hippolyte Bailliere.

Lehman, R.P.M., and W.P. Lehman. 1975. *An Introduction to Old Irish*. New York: Modern Language Association

Lemprière, J. [1788] 1984. *Lemprière's Classical Dictionary*. London: Bracken Books.

Lewis, Lionel S. 1955. *Saint Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury; or, The Apostolic Church of Britain*. London: James Clarke and Co.

MacKenzie, Donald A. 1923. *Ancient Man in Britain*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes.

Marek, Kurt. W. [C. W. Ceram, pseud.] 1956. *The Secret of the Hittites*. Trans. by Richard Winston and Clara Winston. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

McBirnie, William S. 1973. *The Search for the Twelve Apostles*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers.

McClintock, John and James Strong. [1867-1887] 1981. *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. s.v. "Ararat." Harper and Brothers. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

MacDougall, Hugh A. 1982. *Racial Myth in English History*. Hanover, New Hampshire: Univ. Press of New England.

McGovern, William M. 1939. *The Early Empires of Central Asia*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press.

Menzel, Wolfgang. 1885. *The History of Germany*. Vol. 1. Trans. by Mrs. G. Horrocks from the 4th German ed. London: George Bell & Sons.

Mierow, Charles C., trans. and ed. 1915. *The Gothic History of Jordanes*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press.

Milner, W. M. H. [1902] 1964. *The Royal House of Britain an Enduring Dynasty*. 13th edition. London: Covenant Pub. Co.

Minns, Ellis. H. [1913] 1971. *Scythians and Greeks*. New York: Biblo and Tannen.

Morant, G. M. 1939. *The Races of Central Europe*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Morgan, W. [1860] 1978. *Saint Paul in Britain*. London: Covenant Pub. Co.

Mountain, James. 1930. *The Triumph of British-Israel*. London: The Covenant Pub. Co.

O'Donovan, John. 1856. *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland, by the Four Masters*. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co.

Olson, S. Gusten. 1981. *Incredible Nordic Origins*. Sevenoaks, Kent, England: Nordica S.F.

Parker, C. F. n.d. *Researches into the Ethnic Origins of Israel*. Vancouver, B.C.

Pavlu, Ricki D. 1986. *Evolution: When Fact Became Fiction*. Hazelwood, Missouri: Word Aflame Press.

Peschel, Oscar. 1898. *The Races of Man, and Their Geographical Distribution*. Trans. from the German. New York: D. Appleton and Co.

Piotrovsky, Boris B. 1969. *The Ancient Civilization of Urartu*. Trans. by J. Hogarth. New York: Cowles Book Co.

Pittard, Eugene. 1926. *Race and History*. Trans. by V. C. C. Collum. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Pliny. 1947. *Natural History*. 10 vols. Trans. by H. Rackham. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Price, George McCready. 1926. *Evolutionary Geology and the New Catastrophism*. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Pub. Assoc.

Procopius. 1916. *History of the Wars*. 6 vol. Trans. by H. B. Dewing. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Rawlinson, George. 1687a. *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*. In three vols. Chicago and New York: Belford, Clarke and Co.

–. 1887b. *The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*. Chicago and New York: Belford, Clarke and Co.

–. 1883. *The Origin of Nations*. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons.

Ripley, William Z. 1915. *The Races of Europe, a Sociological Study*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Rutherford, Adam. 1934. *Anglo-Saxon Israel, or Israel-Britain*. 2nd ed. London: pub. by the author.

Sayce, A. H. 1891. *The Races of the Old Testament*. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Schütte, Gudmund. 1929-33. *Our Forefathers: The Gothonic Nations*. 2 vols. Trans. by Jean Young. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Smith, William. 1854. *A History of Greece*. London: John Murray.

Speiser, Ephraim A. 1930. *Mesopotamian Origins: The Basic Population of the Near East*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

Spencer, Morton W. 1901. *The Missing Links; or, the Anglo-Saxons, The Ten Tribes of Israel*. In two vols. Hollis, New York: The Holliswood Press.

Spotlight. 1986. "...Evolution Theory Proponents." *The Spotlight*, 3 February 1986, pages 14-15.

Taylor, Isaac. 1895. *The Origin of the Aryans*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Trump, D. H. 1980. *The Prehistory of the Mediterranean*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press.

Turner, Sharon. 1839. *The History of England*. In 12 vols. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans.

Valentine, Tom. 1987. "Uranium-Lead Dating Method." In *The Spotlight*, 26 January 1987.

Van Sertima, Ivan. 1976. *They Came Before Columbus*. New York: Random House.

Verrill, A. Hyatt and Ruth Verrill. 1953. *America's Ancient Civilizations*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Waddell, L. A. [1924] 1983. *The Phoenician Origin of Britons, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons*. Reprint. Hawthorne, Calif.: The Christian Book Club of America.

-. [1929] n.d. *The Makers of Civilization in Race and History*. Reprint. Hawthorne, Calif.: Omni Christian Book Club.

Wainwright, F. T. 1955. *The Problem of the Picts*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons.

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. 1962. *The Long-Haired Kings*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Wassermann, H. P., M.D. 1974. *Ethnic Pigmentation*. New York: American Elsevier Pub. Co.

Weyl, Nathaniel, and Stefan T. Possony. 1963. *The Geography of Intellect*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.

Williams, Brian. 1970. *How the Gospel Came to Britain*. Birmingham, England: Brian Williams Evangelistic Association.

World Book Encyclopedia. 1965. s.v. "archeology."

Wuthenau, Alexander von. 1975. *Unexpected Faces in Ancient America: 1500 B.C.-A.D. 1500*. New York: Crown Publishers.

1. References in text are "Author date, volume:pages," 'date' omitted unless more than one work of one author is quoted. Bibliographical entries are organized "Author(s).[long. pub. date] Pub. date. Title. Vol. and edition information. Place: Publisher."