

# THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT AND ISRAEL IN PROPHECY

A Position Paper Presented to the  
Manuscript Review Team

By

John A. Halford & Ricky L. Sherrod

June 1991

1

## THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT AND ISRAEL IN PROPHECY

### DOES "THE UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN IN PROPHECY" NEED UPDATING?

The understanding that the Anglo-Saxon nations are the modern descendants of the "lost Tribes" of Ancient Israel is one of the corner stones of our belief. Most of us have accepted it on the basis of evidence presented in "The United States and Britain in Prophecy" (USB) booklet. The majority of ministers and members have probably never seriously questioned, or perhaps even studied this subject after their initial exposure in the booklet.

Our present understanding of the identity of modern Israel influences nearly every aspect of the church: its theology, its mission, its priorities, even its sense of identity. Expressions like "modern Israel", "our people" and "Gentiles" have taken on their own special meaning in the argot of the church. Therefore any rewriting and possible revision on this subject is no minor matter.

Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong introduced this understanding (we find no evidence that he ever claimed to originate it) in the late-twenties or early-thirties. He regarded it as one of the tests by which he could ascertain whether or not the Stanberry based Church of God was willing to accept "new truth."

This understanding became for several decades the focus of our evangelical thrust. It was considered an integral part of the Gospel of the Kingdom, and USB was the most requested piece of literature in the church's inventory. It was heralded as the vital key to unlocking prophecy, and the need to warn "our people" gave the Work direction and momentum.

Many, probably most, members and ministers still feel the need for this to be

done, and are concerned at the apparent lack of enthusiasm for it in recent years. We have, for several reasons, pulled it back from its front line position. Mr. Armstrong's original work is no longer promoted. The magazine and the telecast do not mention it. Some feel it would be better for the church to quietly abandon this aspect of our teaching. Certainly, it is not the easiest information to make credible and palatable today.

Be that as it may, others urge that this understanding be placed once again at the forefront of our evangelical effort. They are expecting an updated booklet to be even more "hard hitting" than the original. Such enthusiasts tend to underestimate some very real difficulties. In the last century, while Britain and America were on the ascendancy, the concept that they are descendants of the "chosen people" was an attractive and even plausible idea. Today, if it is known at all, it is associated (especially in the United States) with extremist, and somewhat unsavory racist groups, like the American Nazi Party and the Aryan League.

Mr. Armstrong's book has been widely criticized. It is not scholarly by today's standards, and there is little question that he did draw heavily on a classic work by John Harden Allen. As a result, some have accused him of plagiarism.

However, the charge of deceitful plagiarism seems unfounded. Mr. Armstrong first wrote up this subject as a 300 page study paper which he presented to the Stanberry-based authorities of the Church of God (or possibly the Oregon Conference). His style was decidedly journalistic, which is not surprising considering his advertising background. Much of that original "position paper" found its way into the published manuscript. That would not meet today's standards of scholastic integrity, but it does not seem that deliberate subterfuge was intended.

Although recognizing that it is not "holy writ," we have approached Mr. Armstrong's work with respect. We must remember the understanding of the identity of modern Israel came to Mr. Armstrong as a part of his initial remarkable learning curve. We acknowledge that he was called by God to begin the present phase of the work, and so we should not be too quick to dismiss his understanding. Others in the past have questioned his basis of belief regarding other issues, only to learn that he was essentially right. Something remarkable occurred in the Willamette Valley sixty some years ago.

However, it was sixty years ago, and it is time to look at this subject again. Matters of style are easily resolved. But almost certainly, any new publication will be carefully scrutinized by our critics for more than an update of style. A new publication must be theologically and historically sound.

Much that might once have been included as historical proof would be disregarded today, or at best considered circumstantial evidence. We are examining, where possible, what historians would accept as "primary sources." This will give us some measure of credibility, if not acceptance, in the world of scholarship. We are also compiling a comprehensive Bibliography, the lack of which was a valid criticism of the old booklet.

But the most significant primary source is the Bible itself. In fact, without the

Bible, there would be little basis (or need) for this idea at all.

It is therefore vital to establish a firm Biblical framework before any revision is published. Once this has been done, the historical evidence can be seen in perspective, and presented accordingly.

Our current belief, as presented in the booklet, can be outlined thus:

a. The promises made to Abraham had both a physical and spiritual dimensions, often referred to in Anglo-Israel literature as "Race and Grace" (although there are semantic problems with these terms today, we will need alternatives in an updated presentation).

b. That the United States and British nations are the descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh, birthright tribes of Ancient Israel.

c. That prophecy in the Hebrews Scriptures is dual, and thus the prophets sent Israel and Judah also had a message for the descendants of these people in the "latter days."

d. The church must warn modern Israel about these things.

Before a new treatment of this topic can be prepared, we must carefully evaluate each of these premises. We must not underestimate this task. Nearly every aspect of our Biblical understanding on this subject has been challenged, ridiculed and discounted. Some of the arguments are fatuous and easily dismissed. But others are formidable and need to be carefully considered. Before publishing new material we must address some fundamental questions.

In this position paper we are submitting a point by point, scripture by scripture dissection of the explanation as presented in "The United States and Britain in Prophecy."

We have used one of the older versions of the booklet rather than the later editions which were heavily edited. This earlier edition is in some ways more vulnerable, since it includes many inaccuracies and flamboyant over-simplifications that were edited out of later editions (significantly, the 1987 edition) Obviously such corrections will be included in any revision. However, we felt that the older manuscript was a more thorough exposition of Mr. Armstrong's concepts.

To help reviewers see the subject in perspective, we have included a brief background history of the Anglo Israel movement. And while recognizing that the main purpose of this paper is to discuss the Biblical argument, we have added a short summary of the historical evidence which connects the Anglo-Saxons with Ancient Israel.

## BACKGROUND TO THE MOVEMENT

Before looking at the scriptural evidence and problems, it is important to consider the background of the idea that we have called the "British-Israel" theory. Actually, this is an unfortunate tag. "British-Israelism" has become an almost pejorative term. It is often used to associate us with the British Israel World Federation and some of its unsavory American fellow travellers. The Library of Congress classifies this subject under the general heading of Anglo-Israelism, and we will use that term in this paper.

Where did the idea that the Anglo-Saxon people were descendants of the Lost Ten tribes of Israel come from? Most critics trace it to the writings of Canadian-born Richard Brothers (1757-1824).

Brothers was an eccentric self-styled prophet who became obsessed with the belief that he was a messenger of God, sent to deliver England of impending Divine judgement. He made a nuisance of himself writing letters to dignitaries, spent time in the debtors prison, was accused of treason and eventually incarcerated in a lunatic asylum. Although generally considered a fanatic, he gained a considerable following, including at least one member of Parliament. His prophecies were made against the backdrop of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, when ancient thrones tottered and a new European as well as world order was about to emerge; the very time when, in the tradition of the Church, the Birthright promise to Joseph hung in the balance. As today, the late eighteenth century had its share of oddball sundowners.

An examination of Brother's writings certainly confirms that he was irrational. He called himself a "Nephew of the Almighty" and declared he was a descendant of David. In 1794 he wrote *Revealed Knowledge* in which he declared that on November 19th, 1795 he would be revealed as a "Prince of the Hebrews." We have not found any evidence that he wrote about the Anglo-Israel idea until 1822, when he published *A Correct Account of the Invasion of England by the Saxons, Showing the English nation to be Descendants of the Lost Tribes*. This book is generally cited by opponents of the Anglo-Israel theory to be the foundation of the theory.

That Brothers was attracted to this idea is hardly surprising, considering his other concepts. But he certainly did not invent it. It seems to have been an idea that had been in the background of British folk lore. The first mention of it in print appears to be in a book entitled *Rights of the Kingdom*, written by John Sadler in 1649 at the time of Oliver Cromwell's interregnum. There is also reputed to be a volume entitled *Ten Lost Tribes in French* by Counsellor Le Loyer, published about 1590. (We are studying the question of the origin of the theory thoroughly. We hope to examine additional primary sources in the British Library this summer.)

It should not surprise us that later supporters of the Anglo-Israel theory were anxious to disclaim Brothers. The more scholarly *Our Israelitish Origin* by John Wilson was published in 1840. This volume draws from much of the best current scholarship and methodology of the period. The first work to capture popular imagination was *47 Identifications of the British Nation with Lost Israel* by Edward Hine published in 1871. Hine lectured on the subject before sizeable audiences throughout the British Isles

during the late-nineteenth century.

The movement grew in strength in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and gathered some distinguished followers. These included the astronomer Royal of Scotland, the Keeper of the Crown Jewels, and several members of the British Royal family. Queen Victoria was apparently intrigued, and one of her direct descendants was patron of the movement until her death a few years ago. At one stage, up to 20 million people were reputed to be active believers. Literally hundreds of books and several journals and magazines on Anglo-Israelism flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

The British-Israel World Federation was formed in the late-nineteenth century, to bring together many of the various believers in an organized body. It is still in existence, but has an aging and dwindling following.

Although non-proselytizing, the idea has always been seen as a threat by mainstream churches. They believed it was in conflict with their understanding of the New Covenant, and argued that it diminished the role of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, it had many supporters among prominent churchmen and theologians from a wide variety of Protestant denominations. Anglicans seem to have played a central role in formulating the principal concepts of the Anglo-Israel theory.

Opponents attacked the idea as foolish, unintellectual and unprovable. Today it is generally dismissed as ridiculous, and utterly unsupported by archeological evidence.

Although it may seem difficult to prove, we must not forget that many learned people were once convinced that there was something in it. Intellectual ideas go in and out of fashion as surely as do clothing styles, and not always because of better information. Much depends on the mood of the times. This is particularly true of a theory like Anglo-Israelism.

The idea rose to prominence at a time when something remarkable was happening to the Anglo-Saxon people. Although it is an oversimplification to assert the critical importance of a specific date (like 1803--see "What Are the "Times" of Leviticus 26?" below), and leaving aside for the moment the question of whether the events are connected, it is a fact of history that about 2,520 years after ancient Israel ceased to be an independent kingdom, the Anglo-Saxon people began to grow in influence.

The nineteenth was Britain's century. The British seemed to be able to do nothing wrong. To their astonishment, they found themselves ruling about a quarter of the world's population and a fifth of its land mass (and that being not just any locations, but the choicest and most fertile territories). Across the Atlantic, the United States' destiny was becoming manifest. It is hardly surprising that educated people of the day saw the hand of God.

In those more Biblically literate times, it is not surprising that educated people saw an analogy between their situation and that of the chosen people of ancient Israel. Was not God blessing them as he had promised to bless those ancient people? It did not seem unreasonable to see the British Empire as the Kingdom of God on earth, and the British as a "chosen people." Some even began to regard the British Empire as the fifth

"stone" kingdom prophesied by Daniel.

It is also important to realize that about this time, the British began to alter their perception of their ancestral roots. Traditionally, the view had been that the British were descended from the Ancient Trojans, and from Gomer, son of Japheth. (It was not then considered uneducated to trace one's national origins to the Bible, even as Jews and Arabs do now.) But as the scientific and industrial revolutions took hold, the British began to shift the focus to their Anglo-Saxon Teutonic origins.

Thus, as the influence of Britain and America grew, it became both fashionable and logical to look for a connection between the Anglo-Saxons, and the people of ancient Israel.

In research, you tend to find what you are looking for. Enthusiast soon discovered parallels between the Israelites and the Anglo-Saxons. Some of this "proof" is contrived, much of it nonsense. But there is nevertheless a core of evidence that is food for thought. The Anglo-Israel theory may be an unlikely explanation of the origin of the Anglo-Saxon people. But it is not a preposterous one. Today it is not in fashion. If it were, the evidence might be viewed more favorably, even though it is unlikely there is sufficient primary historical material to make an incontrovertible case.

This underscores the basic point of this paper. The most essential primary source must be the Bible itself. Do the scriptures support the idea? How strongly? What are the consequences? And what is the responsibility of God's church in this matter?

Was Mr. Armstrong beguiled by a piece of historical esoterica? Or was God bringing to his attention a vital piece of understanding that should still add urgency and impetus to this work?

## THE PROMISE

Note: To save space, we have edited some scriptures down to key phrases.

How we interpret the promises made to Abraham is fundamental to the belief that the Anglo-Saxons are the descendants of Ancient Israel.

The USB booklet's explanation is that the promises had both a spiritual and a physical dimension. The spiritual dimension leads to the understanding that Jesus Christ was of the seed of Abraham, and members of the church he founded became the spiritual heirs of the chosen people in the Hebrew Scriptures. This is a well accepted precept of theology, and Mr. Armstrong's work does not contest it. But neither does it provide a thorough exposition of this aspect of the subject, since it is not its principle theme.

The argument for these being a physical component to these promises stems from the precept that not all the promises were fulfilled by the first coming of Christ and the New Testament church.

The key references used to establish this point are:

GEN 12:1 - 3 KJV And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great. . . and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

This is expanded:

GEN 17:1 - 5 KJV I . . . will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. . . my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. . . thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.

USB argues that to say all these scriptures are fulfilled by the New Testament church is "spiritualizing them away." It argues that this cannot be since the church is taken from many nations to become one holy nation. Continuing:

GEN 17:7 - 8 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.

USB argues that what "seed" refers to here is obviously plural, and therefore cannot be referring solely to Christ. Note also:

GEN 17:9 And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations.

After Abraham showed he was willing to sacrifice Isaac, God made the promise unconditional:

GEN 22:16 By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing. . . 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.

The promise becomes unconditional because Abraham has been tested and found faithful (or at least faithful enough.) The incident recounted in some detail in Genesis 15, where only God passes through the sacrifice, also shows that the promise was "one-sided," and not conditional on subsequent behavior. In Abraham, God had found an adequate "father of the faithful" through whom he could continue to develop the plan of salvation.

These unconditional promises of grace and race are reiterated to Isaac and Jacob. For example:

GEN 28:13 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 (Jacob's) 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.

And:

GEN 35:11 And God said unto him [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;

Again, USB argues that to make these promises refer only to Christ and the church is "spiritualizing them away." It also discounts a physical fulfillment through the Jewish people, except that the Royal line that led to Christ did continue to be with Judah. But whereas "the scepter shall not depart from Judah" (Genesis 49:10), "the birthright was Joseph's" (1 Chron. 5:2)

. . . and even more specifically, it became the inheritance of his sons Ephraim and Manasseh:

GEN 48:3 - 5 And Jacob said unto Joseph. . . I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make of thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession. 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.

An Anglo-Israel argument relies heavily on the above interpretation of the promises. It is not by any means the standard explanation favored by most Christian and Jewish theologians. They tend to regard all the covenants of the Hebrew Scriptures as being fulfilled by the New Testament church, with perhaps some minor aspects fulfilled in the historical experience of the Jewish people, through the ages, and especially since the establishment of the Jewish state in 1947. Several of the popular expositions see the modern state as the Israel of end time prophecy. Thus our understanding that the State of Israel is Judah, and that the modern descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh are the British and Americans is truly unconventional. It is an understanding that enabled Mr. Armstrong to establish a framework of prophecy that is unique to the Worldwide Church of God. Without that understanding, our concept of prophecy becomes more "mainstream protestant."



Conversely, if we are to maintain our unique position, we must be able to defend it.

Thus it becomes very important to establish an acceptable and consistent explanation of these scriptures in Genesis.

## The Old Covenant

We also need to consider the implications of the Old Covenant established with Israel at Mount Sinai. This agreement strikes a rather different tone to the promises made to Abraham. It was clearly conditional:

If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people:" (Exodus 19:5)

The conditional aspect is strongly reinforced in the "blessings and cursings" chapters of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. This is illustrated by what happened in the wilderness. God did suspend the "birthright" for one generation when the Israelites rebelled in the wilderness. So, the booklet argues, why could he not also do this for several dozen generations after the chosen people were taken into captivity in the eighth century B. C.?

The Hebrew Scriptures show how the Israelites failed to keep to their side of the agreement. 2 Kings 17 records how the Northern Kingdom was invaded, and became the "Ten Lost Tribes." The argument is that God, in order to fulfill the unconditional promises to Abraham, needed to eventually restore the birthright promises to the physical descendants of the people taken into captivity.

As previously stated, Mr. Armstrong believed and taught that there was a spiritual fulfillment not based on race in the New Testament era. A glance at the scriptural index of USB shows several references to key New Testament scriptures. Many of our critics do not seem to have grasped this, and accuse us of teaching racial elitism. The booklet clearly shows that the promises have spiritual fulfillment in the church of the New Testament dispensation. But it also claims there is a need for some aspects to be fulfilled through the physical descendants of Joseph as well.

This challenges the premise that all the covenant promises of the Hebrew Scriptures are fulfilled in Christ and the New Testament church, leaving no room--or need--for the Anglo-Israel concept. The booklet argues that we cannot consolidate all aspects of the Abrahamic covenants into the Sinai agreement. These promises were made well before Sinai, and cover a wider range of promises. Thus the terms of the New Covenant made with the church supersede only the terms of the agreement made with Israel at Mount Sinai.

God said to Israel "IF you will obey my voice" and this was reinforced by the "blessings and curses" chapters of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. That it was conditional was almost immediately demonstrated by the fact that the generation that came out of Egypt did not enter the promised land.

The Abrahamic covenant, on the other hand was unconditional. "By myself" said God in Genesis 22:16. Consequently, there are some aspects of the unconditional covenant relationship that could hardly be fulfilled by a church called from many peoples, united in spirit but scattered throughout the world.

The covenant, seen this way, is like a "time release" medicine capsule, with different ingredients activated at different times. We know that God does things "decently and in order." Thus the various aspects of the Covenants are "released" in

orderly and logical sequence:

a. After the Flood, God made a promise with Noah that he would not again destroy mankind. (Gen. 8:21 -22) This in is the "oldest" covenant.

b. Then, in Abraham, God chose Abraham, a man through whom he could begin the process of salvation and made unconditional promises to him.

c. Israel, the descendants of Abraham were chosen to be a holy nation of Kings and Priests. The conditional Old Covenant was made at Sinai. Israel did not fulfill their part of the conditional agreement, and paid the penalty of exile.

d. It was not necessary that there be a flourishing nation of Israel inheriting the fullness of the birthright promises in order for Christ to accomplish what needed to be done at the time of his first coming. But there did need to be a remnant of the "holy nation, a kingdom of priests", and God went to great lengths to see that this was the case ( viz. the events recorded in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, etc.). A sort of rump state existed precariously until Christ's earthly ministry was completed.

e. During his ministry, Christ transferred this responsibility from the physical nation to "a holy nation" he would call from all the people of the earth. Once the responsibility there was no need to preserve the physical trappings of the old "kingdom of Priests." It ended in 70 A.D.

f. However, many prophecies concerning the second coming of Christ do seem to demand the existence of a physical people who, aware of their identity and repentant of their national sins, are rescued and restored. They form the nucleus of the Kingdom of God, into which eventually all nations of the world are eventually embraced.

Viewed like this, the various components of the Abrahamic Covenant complement rather than contradict each other. Such an interpretation does not diminish the role of Jesus Christ, or the centrality or responsibility of the New Testament church? Rather, it attests to the love and foresight of a Savior, who being the same yesterday, today and forever, has thought through a plan by which all can eventually begin to understand salvation--nationally and individually?

### What Did God Promise David?

Our booklet maintains that since God told David that he would never lack a man (or conceivably a woman) to sit on his throne, the promise of a continuing dynasty should be taken literally. It follows that there is a descendant of David ruling the descendants of Israel today. The Bible certainly seems to say that God made a covenant with David guaranteeing his throne in perpetuity:

2SA 7:4 The word of the Lord came unto Nathan, saying, Go and tell my servant David. . . when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom . . . and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever.

This promise was not conditional on the heir's behavior:

verse 14 If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever.

This surely cannot be interpreted as a reference to Christ, who never sinned.

Note also:

2CH 13:5 Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David for ever, even to him and to his sons by a covenant of salt? (A symbol of permanence.)

Also:

Psalm 89:30 - 37 If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.

In this regard, Jeremiah 33 adds:

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness. For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit

upon the throne of the house of Israel. (Jer. 33:14 - 17)

When ancient Israel was to be divided, God told Jeroboam, the first King of the northern Kingdom:

Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee: (But he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel:) Howbeit I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand: but I will make him prince all the days of his life for David my servant's sake, whom I chose, because he kept my commandments and my statutes: But I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it unto thee, even ten tribes. And unto his son will I give one tribe, that David my servant may have a light alway before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen me to put my name there. (2KI 11:31-37)

The booklet therefore concludes that someone, somewhere will be sitting, or eligible to sit on a Throne that can be traced back to David, until Christ returns to claim it for himself. It is evident from the Gospel of Luke that Christ is the ultimate claimant:

"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." (Luke 1:32)

But Jeremiah suggests that the prophecy cannot fulfilled with Christ as the only claimant:

JER 33:16 In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely [hardly true of Jesus' time] . . . for thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. . . If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me. . . If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers (not "ruler") over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.

USB then traces the story of how this happened, through the adventures of Jeremiah and the daughters of Zedekiah.

Jeremiah's Commission

Judah went the same way as Israel 130 years later.

2KI 23:27 KJV And the Lord said, I will remove Judah also out of my sight, as I have removed Israel, and will cast off this city Jerusalem which I have chosen, and the house of which I said, My name shall be there.

The last King of David's line was Zedekiah. The Babylonians killed his sons before his eyes, after which he was blinded. The Bible records his death in Babylon:

JER 52:11 KJV Then he put out the eyes of Zedekiah; and the king of Babylon bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon, and put him in prison till the day of his death.

Theoretically, the line could have been continued through Zedekiah's predecessor, Jeconiah, who was restored to favor after years of captivity. However, the Bible seems to make it quite clear that God had decided not to continue David's dynasty through Jeconiah or his sons. Jeremiah says:

Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah. (Jeremiah 22:30)

The account in 1st Chronicles reinforces this:

And the sons of Jeconiah; Assir, Salathiel his son, Malchiram also, and Pedaiah. . . And the sons of Pedaiah were, Zerubbabel. (I Chron. 3:17-18)

Jeconiah's great-grandson Zerubbabel was chosen to lead the Jews back to Jerusalem at the time of the restoration. But he was never a King, and there was no throne at this time.

The Davidic covenant was maintained elsewhere by what the booklet describes as "Jeremiah's Mysterious Commission."

JER 1:9 Then the Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant.

The Mysterious Breach

In this regard, we need to consider our interpretation of the breach that occurred at the birth of Judah's twin sons.

And it came to pass in the time of her travail, that, behold, twins were in her womb. . . when she travailed, that the one put out his hand: and the midwife took and bound upon his hand a scarlet thread, saying, This came out first. And it came to pass, as he drew back his hand, that, behold, his brother came out: and she said, How hast thou broken forth? this breach be upon thee: therefore his name was called Pharez. And afterward came out his brother, that had the scarlet thread upon his hand: and his name was called Zerah. (Gen. 38:27 - 30)

The booklet says that the fact that this breach is recorded implies that it will be healed. The implication is that Pharez, who forced himself into the firstborn position would eventually be reconciled with Zarah.

David, Zedekiah, and, by his human descent, Jesus Christ, were of Pharez. The booklet says, without citing evidence, that the Zarah line wandered away from the promised land, and ended up in Ireland, as part of a colony of Israelites, in the days of David. (This will need to be documented in a new treatment of the subject. It seems that a plausible, if not iron clad case can be made historically.)

Citing as evidence a scripture from Ezekiel, the booklet shows God was to heal the breach, by an intermarriage between a ruler of the Zarah branch in Ireland and the daughters of King Zedekiah, the last "Pharez" ruler of Judah.

The riddle and parables of Ezekiel 17 and scriptures from Ezekiel 21 are cited as evidence that Zedekiah's daughters would be united in marriage with a ruling member of the Zarah line.

EZE 21:25 - 27 And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.

Jeremiah was spared deportation, but was taken to Egypt with Zedekiah's daughters. (Jer 41:10 and Jer. 43:5 - 7) According to legend, he travelled to Ireland, with the princesses and Jacob's Pillar Stone, which had become a physical symbol of the covenants. In Ireland, he "planted" the throne through the marriage of one of Zedekiah's daughters to an heir to the other branch of Judah's "sceptre" family. Then through two more "overturns" the throne migrated from Ireland to Scotland and eventually to England.

Critics target several areas that they feel invalidate this theory:

a. The story of Jeremiah, Baruch, Tea-tephi, Heremon, etc. cannot be established from historical records. Many go as far as to say it is a total fabrication, with no basis of historical truth whatsoever.

b. According to some geologists the Coronation stone is almost certainly Of Scottish, and not Middle eastern origin. It is however, very difficult to get definitive, authoritative information on this.

c. There are short interregnum periods in the line of David. So why not a long one, from Zedekiah's death, to the return of Christ?

d. We have misinterpreted the meaning of the "everlasting covenant" with David.

Some of these criticisms have merit. The historical material is complicated, and is based on legend, although there is an evident basis of truth. A new presentation must be thorough, and clearly show how much weight can be put on the historical value of legend.

## Were the Tribes Lost?

Another important point of discussion is whether or not there are is such a phenomenon as "Ten Lost Tribes." Were they ever lost? The booklet cites the report on 2 Kings as evidence:

2KI 17:18 - 23 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 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. . . For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they departed not from them; 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.

A common argument against there being any lost tribes is that only the leaders of the Northern Kingdom were deported. The Assyrian Emperor Sargon claims to have taken 27,000+ captive from Samaria. Certainly the Assyrian court records are a primary source. But they are also suspect because Sargon probably wasn't King at the time, and may have fabricated a role for himself. It is his word against the Bible, where God says:

I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men. (Deu. 32:36)

There are hints of elements of the Northern Tribes being among the people of Judah or left as a remnant in Samaria after Israel's fall. The New Testament has references to "the twelve tribes." This evidence is cited as evidence that only a small number of leading people were taken captive by the Assyrians. The rest either fled as refugees, or were assimilated into the alien populations transplanted in the Northern kingdom. Thus--no "lost tribes."

Whether Israel became lost or absorbed is not an either/or argument. There seems to have been elements of both. However, we must ask if the Biblical statement "Judah only was left" should be taken at face value. It seems to summarize the situation in the Northern Kingdom after the Assyrian conquest, if one accepts the scriptures as a valid "primary source." Jewish tradition, which anticipates an eventual reunion of the physical twelve tribes as part of its messianic eschatology, also strongly supports there being lost tribes.



Where Did the "Lost Tribes" Go?

The booklet next shows how the tribes can be traced by hints in the prophecies. For example, Amos warned what he called the "remnant of Joseph" (5:15) they would be scattered, but not lost:

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)

Note also:

Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as before time. (2 Sam. 7:10)

and:

Also I will ordain a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, and they shall dwell in their place, and shall be moved no more; neither shall the children of wickedness waste them any more, as at the beginning. (1 Chron. 17:9)

Having thus established that Israel would be sifted, and then led to a permanent home, a progression of scriptures show how the new land can be traced to the Isles to the north and west of the promised land--the British Isles. Proof texts include:

Ephraim feedeth on wind, and followeth after the east wind. (Hosea 12:1)

i.e. by following the east wind he went west.

I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. (Psalm 89:25)

Go and proclaim these words toward the north, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel. (Jer. 3:11 - 12)

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

They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble: for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn. Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock. (Jer. 31:9 - 10)

This use of scripture does seem a bit contrived. However, if our Biblical

reasoning is sound thus far, historical evidence begins to bear a greater burden of proof. Perhaps these scriptures can be cited as supporting evidence. But when examined in the light of skeptical twentieth century criticism, they do not seem sufficiently definitive to strengthen our case a priori.)

What Are the "Times" of Leviticus 26?

And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins. And I will break the pride of your power; and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass: And your strength shall be spent in vain: for your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits. And if ye walk contrary unto me, and will not hearken unto me; I will bring seven times more plagues upon you according to your sins. (Lev. 26:18 - 21)

Mr. Armstrong argues that "seven times" of verse 18, in context is a measurement of prophetic times, equalling 2,520 years. Conversely, in context, the "seven times" of verse 21 is referring to intensity.

Using the principle of a day for a year (Numbers 14:34, Ezekiel 4:4 - 6) it can be calculated that "seven times" =  $7 \times 360$  days = 2,520 days and thus years. 2,520 years from Israel's captivity brings us to about 1800 A.D., when it is proposed God began to restore the birthright to the modern descendants of Israel.

We weaken our argument when we put too much emphasis on a particular date (e.g. 1803). However, it is undeniable that 2520 years after Israel to be harassed by the Assyrians, Britain and America began an astonishing rise to world prominence. If presented carefully, such a "coincidence" is a powerful argument in favor of this understanding of prophecy.

The Sabbath Covenant

The booklet states that one significant reason why God's punished Ancient (and thus modern) Israel was Sabbath-breaking. The argument is that the Sabbath was not part of the Old Covenant, being ratified after the agreement at Sinai was sealed in blood. (Exodus 24:6 - 8). The Sabbath covenant was not made until Exodus 31:14 - 17. Thus, the Sabbath remained binding even after the Old Covenant was supplanted by the new. So, God will punish modern Israel for breaking the Sabbath even as he did their ancestors.

Are we comfortable maintaining this line of reasoning in an updated booklet?

## How Did the Israelites Get to Europe?

A valid criticism of USB is its over-simplification of the historical data. Having seen the Biblical case, the reader is expecting some equally compelling historical material showing how the "Lost Tribes" got from Mesopotamia to the British Isles. It is a scenario that seems unlikely, and the reader naturally wants details.

There is a great shortage of primary material, but the story can be reconstructed from the shards of history we do have. This position paper is not the place to go into detail, but here is a synopsis of how we propose to trace what happened:

Some members of Israelitish clans had left Israel well before the final deportation in 721 B.C. Danites left Israel shortly after the Exodus for Greece, and then Ireland. During the reign of Solomon and other kings it is probable that Israelitish colonists left Israel for Britain, Ireland and northwestern European coastlands. The Bible tells us that Solomon had a navy, which he operated with the Phoenicians. We know the Phoenicians established colonies in North Africa, Spain and Ireland. It seems reasonable to presume that the Israelites did the same.

The Assyrians took the Israelites into captivity in the 730's B.C. and the final deportation from Samaria began in 721 B.C. The power of Assyria was broken in 612 B.C.--when the Babylonians, Persians and their Scythian allies destroyed Nineveh. After that date, some of the Israelite tribes in captivity (south of the Caspian Sea) began to free themselves and migrate towards Europe. This continued for several centuries.

The first wave of Israelite people (the Cimmerian or Celtic people ) migrated from Assyria through the Caucasus mountains then on into Western Europe.

Those people became known to the Greek writers by the name "Celts" (Kelts) but were known to the Romans as Gauls. The migration of the Celts into Europe took several centuries.

The second wave of Israelites (the Scythians) migrated around the Eastern side of the Caspian before turning westward. They passed through what is now South Russia into northern Poland and Germany. They were pressed from the rear by the Samaritians (or Slavs.) The Scythians overspread much of North West Europe, becoming Normans, Danes, Swedes, Franks, Lombards, Scots, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, etc. From here the story is clear, since no one disputes that the British are Celtic and Anglo-Saxon, or that the United States was initially settled by those people.

Historians have noticed that the successive waves of migrants into Europe were essentially the same people. However, we must be careful not to over-generalize. Not all Scythians or Celts were Israelites. The historical record is fragmented and tracing lost Israel's trail is like tracking an underground river. One can follow its course by finding the occasional places where it breaks through the surface. But you have to know what you are looking for.

The evidence is in history, but the key is prophecy. This should not surprise us.

God said "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 9:9)

Therefore, Biblical evidence must be admitted and accepted before this can be presented as anything more than an interesting but speculative idea. But, if the reader is unwilling to admit Biblical authority as evidence, what does all this matter anyway?

## CONCLUSION

The final chapter of Mr. Armstrong's book conveys a stern warning to the modern Israel from the Prophets of old. Like his introduction, it is powerful, compelling material, and has undoubtedly helped many people to make a commitment to this work.

In the spirit of the Prophets, USB has persuaded many thousands to turn from their sins, and to seek repentance, baptism and the Christian life. Arguably, it was this teaching that built the church in the years of greatest growth. Thousands saw it as the key that began open the Bible to their understanding.

Some of our detractors notice that we are now deemphasizing this teaching and accuse us of abandoning our responsibility as "watchmen." Some have taken up the banner of Anglo-Israelism themselves. However much we repudiate their approach, we must recognize that their seditious efforts cause some of our membership to defect.

The Worldwide Church of God must consider this carefully. Do we now question the validity of Anglo-Israelism as we have historically understood it? Are we still able to assert that this is a legitimate use of the Old Testament message? Does prophecy hold such a warning? Is it dual in nature, teaching that God will again intervene as he did in Old Testament times? Will that punishment begin with the people who are the descendants of physical Israel? Is this the correct way to understand "Jacob's trouble?" Can we say there is "divine protection" to those who will heed?

If the above is true, is it the church's job to do carry out this "Ezekiel-like commission" today? Mr. Armstrong never questioned that it was. Once he understood, he regarded it as his life's work; a logical and legitimate extension of the role of the true church in the end times. Since his death, some have argued that the New Testament nowhere instructs the followers of Jesus to do this.

After reviewing carefully all aspects of this topic, we feel the church cannot abandon its position, even if it is controversial and unfashionable. The true Church of God, the "holy nation and kingdom of priests" of the new Covenant has inherited the spiritual responsibilities of Ancient Israel. One of those responsibilities was the need to sound, when necessary, a prophetic warning.

God chose prophets from Israel to make announcements that became a permanent part of the Hebrew Scriptures. Malachi 3:6 and Hebrews 13:8 tell us God does not change, and Amos tells us he does not intervene in human affairs without first giving fair warning through "his servants the prophets" (3:7).

Is it then not logical that God would use his church--spiritual Israel--as a prophetic voice in the New Testament dispensation, at such times when a prophetic warning should be delivered? That church is built on the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets. The New Testament church had prophets in a limited sense. There are New Testament prophecies. Could it not then be the job of the "holy nation" to be called to witness as did the prophets from Ancient Israel and Judah? Mr. Armstrong taught that the church was called to act "in the power and spirit of Elijah."

It is our conclusion at this stage of our research that the Anglo-Israel concept is a defensible idea. If presented carefully and Biblically, it is not racist. Neither, when its

implications are properly understood, is it incompatible with New Testament teachings. The Bible does seem to have a message for the physical heirs of Abraham's birthright as the end of the age approaches. Whether this is an appropriate time to give priority to that message is for others to decide. Eventually, however, it seems that modern Israel must be made aware of its heritage and its destiny, for:

"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse."  
(Malachi 4:5 - 6)

While awaiting the MRT's comments and suggestions on the questions and proposals raised in this position paper, we will continue to research and gather material towards an updated publication.

John A. Halford and Ricky L. Sherrod

A survey, conducted independently of this study, will help establish the validity of this. Autobiography of Herbert W. Armstrong, Vol. 1, pp. 361-363. Mr. Armstrong sent the letter to Andrew Dugger. A photo copy of Dugger's reply appeared in earlier editions of the Autobiography.

Apparently, the Church of God Seventh Day had earlier exposure to this idea. Their position seems to have been that while admitting there might be some truth in the idea, they saw little potential in it, as A.N. Dugger's reply to Mr. Armstrong suggests. The idea of Anglo-Israelism is not inherently racist any more than Christianity is inherently violent. It depends who is practicing it. Anglo-Israelism was born and grew to maturity in an intellectual climate heavily tainted by ideas of evolution and racial superiority. Although Wilson's first printing of *Our Israelitish Origin* (1840) pre-dates Darwin's *Origin of the Species* (1859), a host of other publications--e.g., Count de Gobineau (*The Inequality of the Human Races*, 1853-1855) propounded Nordic superiority, and, more relevant to our concerns, John Mitchell Kemble (the successor to Sharon Turner whose work inspired Wilson [see McDougall book on racial myth in English history] and author of *The Saxons in England*, 1849)--place Wilson's thesis in this genre of literature. Even more incriminating is *47 Identification* by Hine, which is in places belligerently anti-Semitic and decidedly anti-Irish (he claims the Irish are of Canaanite descent).

Critics with knowledge of this intellectual milieu will be quick to suggest that Anglo-Israelism is but another expression of the "racialism" around mid-century--one

larger piece of the fabric of a flawed and prejudicial nineteenth century Weltanschauung.

A re-write of USB must address this point, and our treatment must distance ourselves from any racist position. But surely the multi-racial, integrated worldwide nature of our church today can surely bear testimony to our lack of racial bias and a correct understanding of the New Covenant.

Actually, many of the nineteenth century proponents of anglo-israelism went to great lengths to avoid racism overtones. The movement was non-proselytizing, essentially non-denominational and always tried to work within the framework of the established churches. Certainly the language they used leaves us feeling uncomfortable today. But most Anglo-Israel material was written before the Nazi race theories poisoned the well.

Judah's Scepter and Joseph's Birthright. An analysis of the Prophecies of Scripture in regard to the Royal family of Judah and the many Nations of Israel. John Harden Allen (Merrimac, Massachusetts: Destiny Publishers, 1901).

However, there are many books on this subject, and they all tend to be somewhat alike. They draw on the same limited pool of primary sources, with the attendant risk of perpetuating bias and error.

Mr. Armstrong's assertive and vigorous style does sometimes seem unnecessarily confrontational today. It was strikingly similar to much of the religious writing which was produced during his years of conversion. (See Darrell Jodock, *The Church's Bible: Its Contemporary Authority* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989], pp. 22-23.) Moreover, through the history of God's work, there have been times when a confrontational approach was the appropriate response, e.g., Elijah (I Kings 18:21ff.) or even Jesus Christ (Mk. 1:22, 11:15-19).

All of us are to some extent are influenced by the intellectual climate of our times. George Washington had slaves. Paul told slaves they should "seek not to be free." Almost certainly, those men would do and phrase things differently if they lived today, and were exposed to the mood of our times. Critics of Mr. Armstrong's book put too much emphasis on his style, and impute a mentality that those of us who knew him know was not there.

Mr. Armstrong was not a racist. Arguably, he did more than anyone else to take the racial prejudice out of Anglo-Israelism. If J. Gordon Melton is correct, (*Cults in America*) the number of adherents apart from the Worldwide Church of God, is only about 10,000-20,000, so we outnumber them. Perhaps we should not be overly intimidated by these insalubrious fellow-travellers. A major difference between Mr. Armstrong and these neo-Nazi crack pots is that he taught submission to God, the equality of all mankind and the punishment rather than the superiority of the chosen race.

Even so, some of Mr. Armstrong's statements may nevertheless cause us to wince today. He would probably share our concern if he were a product of the second half of the twentieth century.

There is a tendency in the church's recent research to approach this and other controversial subjects as either being provable or nonprovable, and consequently right or wrong. This is vital where matters of clear doctrine are concerned, and where the Biblical evidence is definitive.

In certain important respects, critics of the Anglo-Israel idea are victims of limitations imposed by the historical-critical method and the criteria by which post-Enlightenment Western society mandates we must validate fact or truth (see Jodock, *The Church's Bible*, pp. 1-29)--a methodology which obviates faith as a factor in the equation. Lesslie Newbigin's discussion of "reigning plausibility structures" (*The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Erdmans Publishing Co., 1989], pp. 1-7, 9-11, 16, 24, 28, 31, 38-39, 52, 58, 68-69, 90, 103, 112-113, 199) is also helpful in revealing how the criteria for truth is an evolving set of standards. Newbigin effectively shows how the received opinion in every age is subject to its own set of flaws and weaknesses--how every set of standards used to measure and evaluate truth are based on certain a priori assumptions which do not always stand the test of close examination.

One searches in vain for clear, incontrovertible historical evidence to support some aspects of the Anglo-Israel position. Nevertheless a position can be defensible even when the evidence is not iron clad. As we consider this subject, we should keep in mind the various levels of evidence admissible in law. In summary, they are:

Beyond reasonable doubt: No other conclusion can be considered likely.

Preponderance of Evidence: Such evidence as, when weighed against that opposed to it, has more convincing force, and thus a greater probability of truth.

Clear and convincing evidence: More than a preponderance, but not proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Tangible evidence: Guns, bullets, blood stains, the Rosetta stone, the Behistun rock, or in our case, an old document that states clearly that Ephraimites and Mannesites passed by asking how to get to Britain! (But there isn't anything like that, unfortunately.)

Circumstantial evidence: Proven facts that provide a basis of inference that other facts are true.



Publishing code: 10667/8107

Which leads us to ask: was Brothers a ploy by Satan at a critical time in history? Was the function he performed similar to what disreputable televangelists have done to discredit television as a respectable method of preaching the gospel today? It is not uncharacteristic of our Adversary to do this? Even Christ was suspect because he came from Nazareth. (John 1:46). Prior to His first coming, there were apparently "Red Herrings" dragged before the people of Jud<sup>h</sup>ea to muddy the waters at the precise time the Messiah was due to arrive. (Acts 5:34 - 36)

This is the title of the book as cited in literature critical of the Anglo-Israel position. In our own research, we have discovered that this monograph, located in only two places in the United States (the libraries at the University of Texas at Austin and Pennsylvania State University) is catalogued under a different title which does not posit the Anglo-Israel connection: *A Correct Account of the Invasion and Conquest of the Roman Colony Ailbane, or Britain, by the Saxons*. Neither library will provide it through Inter-Library Loan. Dr. Sherrod hopes to travel to Austin in June or July to examine the book to see just how clear a connection in fact exists between Brothers and the genesis of Anglo-Israelism..

From a paper entitled "The Lost Tribes, and the Influence of the Search for them on the Return of the Jews to England," read by Albert M. Hyamson before the Jewish Historical Society of England on May 18, 1903 and later published in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*. Hyamson observes that "in Sadler's work. . . are to be found the earliest hints of an Israelitish ancestry for the English." p. 673. In a poorly documented study by Helene W. van Woelderren entitled *Strange Parallel: Zebulun, A Tribe of Israel*, reference is made to a 16th century book by Adriaen van Scrieck which traces Dutch origins back to the Hebrew people. See pp. 86, 88, 90.

In a short essay entitled "A Jubilee of Witness," Harold E. Stough, Secretary of the British-Israel World Federation (1969), observed that Wilson "was developing a theme that other men had considered." Among them was Sharon Turner (1768-1847), a monumental figure in British historiography, whose work *A History of the Anglo-Saxon Peoples* (published at the turn of the 19th century) traces the Anglo-Saxons back through Europe to the Balkan countries and ultimately to the Crimea and Caucasus mountain range. A medical doctor, George Moore (1803-1880), contributed to this discussion with his *The Lost Tribes or Saxons of the East and West* which appeared in 1861. Stough writes that "these three compared notes and, together, Sharon Turner, Dr. George Moore and John Wilson corresponded" (p. 5).

However, the most recent research and archeology tends to alter the view that the Anglo-Saxons were wild-eyed savages. They seem to have had strong cultural links with the people who had inhabited Britain in Roman days. Since the period of Anglo-Saxon settlement truly constitutes the lost centuries of British history, any new understanding may prove to be significant.

Catherine Hills, writing in *Blood of the British: From Ice Age to Norman*

Conquest (London: George Philip, 1986) shows continuity in the settlement of the British Isles, from megalithic to Norman times. She concludes:

"Archaeology does provide a great deal of information about the past, and we do know more than we used to. But the answers aren't always obvious, and we sometimes have to rid ourselves of preconceptions in order to arrive at them. One of those preconceptions is that all change equals invasion, or, conversely, that all invasions equal change. . . . Could some of the 'Saxons' really have been Britons? Or were there a lot of Britons still living in England who have left little or no traces? Neither of these ideas is unreasonable, but neither is easy to demonstrate."

Such a proposition conforms markedly to the traditional Anglo-Israel hypothesis that more than a single wave of Israelitish people settled the British Isles over a length span of time (see "How Did the Israelites Get to Europe?" below).

As one example of many we could cite, here is a quotation from Lord Roseberry (as far as we know, not a British-Israelite but former British Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister), speaking to the students of Glasgow University about the British Empire in November 1900: (emphasis ours)

"How marvelous it all is! Built not by saints and angels, but by the work of men's hands; cemented with men's honest blood and with a world of tears, welded by the best brains of centuries past; not without the taint and reproach incidental to all human work, but constructed on the whole with pure and splendid purpose. Human, and yet not wholly human, for the most heedless and the most cynical must see the finger of the Divine. Growing as trees grow, while others slept; fed by the faults of others as well as the character of our fathers; reaching with a ripple of a restless tide over tracts, and islands and continents, until our little Britain woke up to find herself the foster-mother of nations and the source of united empires. Do we not hail in this less the energy and fortune of a race than the supreme direction of the Almighty?"

In these days of Biblical illiteracy, it is hard to realize to what extent people of the past identified with the Bible: In *God's Englishmen: The Evolution of the Anglo-Saxon Spirit* (Little, Brown and Co., 1944, pp. 70-71), Leland Dewitt Baldwin writes:

"In song and story, in sermon and miracle play, the Bible --and particularly the Old Testament-- became woven into the being of Englishmen. Something in the peasant culture of England rose to meet the Book that had been produced by the peasant of Palestine. . . . That the Bible has become an integral part of the background of the Anglo-Saxon race is a fact that no one seeks to escape, even those who have sneered at its moral teachings. . . . Written for a race of shepherds and vintners, (its words) have become the comfort, the admonition, and the marching orders of another race that has carried its power to every part of the earth."

It is our opinion that the "New Covenant" is a separate and vitally important subject that demands a separate treatment. At present the church has no clear and definitive

material in print, at least as a major booklet. Consequently, too much emphasis has been placed by some of our members on being physical descendants of Israel. Such nonsense needs to be corrected once and for all.

Therefore, we feel that in conjunction with a new USB booklet, we should prepare a separate booklet or brochure on the correct understanding and consequent implications of the New Covenant. The question of the New Covenant, what it means and its implication and application is the issue of Christianity for most of the world. We feel that to conflate the two subjects into one booklet would not do justice to either, since neither one is a subset of the other.

Mr. Armstrong's focus in USB was retrospective, i.e., his "proofs" concentrated on those prophecies of Genesis 48-49 fulfilled around the turn of the nineteenth century. He did not dwell upon the dimension cited in f. above, but perhaps we should in any future publication. Scripture certainly seems to forecast a latter day (Isa. 11:11) or "second exodus" of unparalleled magnitude (Deut. 28:68--cf. 4:27-30)--one which will dwarf in significance the exodus of the fifteenth century led by Moses (Jer. 16:14-15, 23:7-8, 29:14, 31:16, Isa. 11:16); and one which will bring physical, national Israel together to Palestine from all four corners of the earth (Jer. 31:7, Isa. 48:20-21--cf. Isa. 11:12, 49:12, 60:4, Ps. 107:3-7) at the return of Christ (Isa. 27:12-13). If we understand these prophecies as having physical as well as spiritual fulfillment, they add great weight to the case for Israel's post-captivity existence.

The seventeenth and eighteenth century concentration on these very prophecies was a critically important part of the theological climate which helped the Anglo-Israel theory become more acceptable.

The best arguments in this regard are to be found in Allen H. Godbey's *The Lost Tribes A Myth: Suggestions Toward Rewriting Hebrew History* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974) and Roger R. Chambers' *The Plain Truth About Armstrongism*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988), especially pp. 91-128. Frequently cited Biblical passages in this regard are II Chron. 30:1-18, 31:1, and Lk. 3:36. See the Soncino Commentary on Isa. 43:12-21, Jer. 23:6-8, Ez. 37:19, as well as the above footnote on the "second exodus." Note also Jer. 33:7.

In the classic work by Allen, Isa. 49:12, 20 is cited as evidence that Israel would immigrate in a northwesterly direction. See *Judah's Sceptre*, pp. 227-228.

For references to an island location, see also Jer. 31:1-3, 9-10, Isa. 24:15, 41:1, 5, 51:5, 66:19, Ps. 89:25. Isa. 23:3 implies that Israel will be a maritime people. Cf. Ez. 17:4-5.

One plausible way of making such a case is to consider the broader sweep of Assyrian-Israelite relations. This relationship began to sour as early as the mid-ninth century B. C. Deteriorating relations progressively continued until the final denouement in 701 B. C. when Simeon, the final tribe outside of Judah proper, was taken captive by the army of Sennacherib (in part of a general Assyrian campaign described in II Kings 18, II Chron. 31, Isa. 36). Working from such a premise, the period . D. 1670 - 1820 becomes a critical one. As Assyrian intrusions into Israelite affairs inexorably increased and the impending catastrophe of massive deportation

approached, might it be logical to assume that we would find a corresponding crescendo of Israelitish power across the 150 years leading to the expiration of the withholding of the Birthright? It is a matter of clear historical record that during this very century and a half, the foundation was laid for Anglo-American military, political, and economic dominance of the last two centuries.

The question of the identity of the other tribes is not the main focus of the booklet, nor of prophecy. Much research has been done by French, Dutch and Scandinavian adherents of the Anglo-Israel movement to link their nations with one or other of the tribes. With the exception of Dibar Apartian's "Pays de les Langues FranÁaise en Prophetie," connecting Reuben to the people of northern France, we have not published anything major on the identity of other tribes. On a smaller scale, we did publish an article entitled "Why the Dutch Beat Back the Sea," in the January 1984 Plain Truth. In this piece, John Ross Schroeder outlines the principal arguments linking the Dutch to the tribe of Zebulun.

We have also encountered some studies that try to show Ephraim is the U.S.A. and Manasseh is Britain. Such studies are peripheral to the main argument, and need not detain us here. It might be necessary to address some of the points raised in an updated presentation.

Scythian appears to be more a generic name for tribal peoples rather than a specific ethnic group. As we have often suggested, some Israelites were included in the group so designated after the close of the seventh century B. C. Note in Col. 3:11 the interesting Biblical use of the term "Scythian" in juxtaposition to "Barbarian" (which can be understood to imply Israelite vs. non-Israelite just as "neither Jew nor Greek" implies). It is actually easier to make a convincing historical case for linking modern Germany with ancient Assyria. There is more to go on, once you know what you are looking for. But then, God did not say the Assyrians would be "lost."

The Ambassador College text for Western Civilization, A History of Western Society (3rd ed.), observes: "Their cities destroyed and their power shattered, the Assyrians disappeared from history, remembered only as a cruel people of the Old Testament who oppressed the Hebrews. . . . The glory of their empire was forgotten." We might consider introducing some of the German history material as a "gravity assist" in tracing the fate of their captives.

The Church of God International publishes a 140+ page case bound free booklet by Garner Ted Armstrong on this subject. It contains little that is new, but in the absence of something from us, is probably the most convincing treatment of the subject presently available.

In this connection, Harold Stough observed that Mal. 4:5-6 "must really mean that the hearts of the children are to be turned to the fathers, which can only refer to our forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the patriarchs. It must be some mission that reconciles the present generation with its inheritance with Israel of old and this is a

tremendous thing because, in fact, it is the identity message: identifying ourselves with our forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. "Jubilee of Witness," October 1969.