

ASSUR AND ISRAEL – CONTENDERS FOR THE BIRTHRIGHT

by Craig White

Why do the Germans and Anglo-Saxons have a ‘love-hate’ relationship extending over centuries?

Israel inherited the Birthright, but could it be true that deeply inherent in other nations, there is a feeling that they should have inherited it instead?

What is a ‘birthright’ anyway? And why are there birthright shifts or displacements in the Bible?

History Research Projects

Version 3.0

Copyright © 2002, 2005

CONTENTS

What and Why a Birthright?	3
Line of Cain compared to Babylon	5
The Example of Ishmael and Edom	6
Shem inherits the Birthright?	6
Assur versus the line of Arphaxad – another birthright shift?	7
Final Comments	10
Appendix one: Extract from <i>The Royals</i> by Kitty Kelley	12
Appendix two: George Ludwig 1660 – 1727	18

Birthright inheritance and contention between the inheritors and those rejected is a common occurrence found in the Bible. This makes for a fascinating Bible study from which we can project into time and history these ongoing rivalries.

In the course of this study we shall visit the following persons (and subsequent descendants) God chose to covenant with and grant the birthright to: Cain and Seth, Shem and Japheth, Arphaxad and Assur, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau and explore the birthright contention between these individuals and their descendants.

What and Why a Birthright?

Throughout the Bible the concept of a birthright is absolutely intertwined with the firstborn. That is, the firstborn inherits the birthright and has expectations of primogeniture. The Hebrew root for both birthright and firstborn is *bkr* and is common to both words.

Under the birthright system, the eldest son has special legal claim to a double portion of the inheritance and other blessings.

“The right belonging naturally to the firstborn son, whether the offspring of a legal wife or a concubine. Such a person ultimately became the head of the family, the line being continued through him. As firstborn he inherited a double portion of the paternal estate.

“Discoveries at Mari, Nuzi, and Alakah, however, show that the father could disregard the law of primogeniture and divert the birthright to a younger son, as in the case of Reuben (Gen. 48:22; 49:3f.), of Shimri (1 Chron. 26:10), and of Joseph’s children as they were blessed by Jacob (Gen. 48:13-20). They also indicate that the firstborn son by a concubine could be displaced if the father subsequently had a son by his legal wife (cf. Gen 21:10). In the Deuteronomic version of the law, a provision is made prohibiting the father from making the younger son the possessor of the birthright just because his mother was especially beloved (Dt. 21:15ff.) ...

“On succeeding to the family property, the firstborn was responsible for maintaining the younger sons, the widow or widows, and any unmarried daughters, as well as exercising authority over the household as a whole. As the firstborn of God, Israel was accorded the protection of a loving and provident heavenly Father (Ex. 4:22f.; Jer. 31:9)”. (*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1979 edition, article “Birthright”)

The birthright was normally given to the firstborn male, who would use that wealth and blessings to serve and lead the family. This practice also served to ensure that no disputes would erupt over the inheritance after the father’s death (see also Deut 21:17; II Kings 2:9). Under certain conditions, the firstborn may lose the birthright (due to sexual impurity, disdain or uncaring attitude toward the birthright etc).

Further light is thrown on the subject by *The New Bible Dictionary*, which states that the firstborn was

“considered ‘the beginning of his [a father’s] strength’ ... the acme of his ... power...

“He ranked highest after the father ... In cases of misconduct it could be shifted to another son ... The firstborn inherited twice as much as every other son” (article “Firstborn”).

We find that the birthright holders are also the people God covenants with. He calls people or nations to covenant with – they become His sons (the sons of God) if they agree to be bound by an agreement

between Him and them. For example, Israel became the firstborn by covenanting with God in Exodus 19 & 20. As such, they inherited more than the other non-Israelitish nations and became the prime people God has been working with and have been set up as world leaders. This is God's prerogative, but a hard point to swallow in a world where social Marxism has become so popular.

Now turn to Deuteronomy 32, also written by Moses:

Deu 32:5 They have **corrupted** themselves: *they are* not His sons; *it is* their **blemish**; *they are* a crooked and perverse **generation**.

Deu 32:6 Do you thus give back to Jehovah, Oh foolish and unwise people? *Is* He not your Father who bought you? *Has* He *not* made you and established you?

Deu 32:7 Remember the days of old; consider the years of many **generations**. Ask your father, and he will show you; your elders, and they will tell you.

Deu 32:8 When the Most High **divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam** [God brought about the different races from the beginning], He **set the bounds of the people** according to the number of the sons of Israel. [in Genesis 11 they tried to mix together, exactly like they tried to do prior to the Flood. See also Acts 17:26]

Deu 32:9 For Jehovah's portion *is* His people. Jacob *is* the lot of His inheritance. [how like Noah and his posterity became God's people] [emphasis mine]

Here, Moses is very likely writing a parallel to Genesis 6, and is warning Israel not to do what their forefathers, the 'sons of God', did.

Genesis 6 we are told:

Gen 6:1 And it happened, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and when daughters were born to them,

Gen 6:2 the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* good. And they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose.

Gen 6:3 And Jehovah said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, in his erring; he is flesh. Yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.

Gen 6:4 There were giants in the earth in those days. And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, they were mighty men who *existed* of old, men of renown.

Gen 6:5 And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually.

The context is marriage between male and female and therefore ancestries - sexual impurity for those that operate outside of the marriage bounds is strongly inferred. Referring to the pre-flood environment that Noah had to endure, *The Book of Jasher* which contains various Jewish traditions, states:

“And the judges and rulers [possibly Sethites] went to the daughters of men and took their wives by force from their husbands according to their choice, and the sons of men in those days took from the cattle of the earth, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, and taught the mixture of animals of one species with the other, in order therewith to provoke the Lord; and God saw the whole earth and it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted its ways upon earth, all men and all animals ... And Noah found grace in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord chose him and his children to raise up seed from them upon the face of the whole earth.” (chapter iv, verses 18, 21).

This shows that the sins of the pre-Flood world included wrong marriages and mixing species. The hint is obvious that human species must have been mixed too. Larry Richards in *Bible Difficulties Solved* writes:

“The sons of God who “saw that daughters of men were beautiful” and “married any of them they chose” have puzzled Jewish and Christian commentators alike. It is clear

that the text regards this as unnatural and a terrible sin. In the rest of the Old Testament the phrase *sons of God* is used for either angels ... or human beings who enjoyed a covenant relationship with the Lord ... It is likely that the text refers to intermarriage between the godly line of Seth and the line of Cain”.ⁱ

The antagonism between the line of Seth (the ‘sons of God’) and the line of Cain extends back to Genesis 4 where Cain, son of Adam and Eve, is punished for slaying his brother Abel and consequently cursed. It would appear that Cain was the firstborn (verse 1) and Abel the younger brother.

In *Paradise to Prison. Studies in Genesis* further light is thrown on this:

“ ... they did not sin in taking wives, but in taking wives “of all which they chose” ... the sons of God took “whichever” women they chose, without regard to their spiritual status (if the sons of God were Sethites) or to their royal status (if the sons of God were kings) ...”ⁱⁱ

They took women that *they* chose, contrary to God’s will. The problems of the pre-Flood world are like those today with violence, over-population and mixing of species (both human and animal).

Indeed, if the ‘righteous line’ (and sons of God) that the Commentaries decades ago used to refer to (ie the line from Seth through Noah, Shem down to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) are ‘the sons of God’, this would not be unique, as the Church members are the spiritual sons and daughters of God. Given that Israel is typological of the Church, Israel were the physical ‘sons of God’ continuing the ‘righteous line’. Ephraim, which often represents Israel as a whole, is called God’s dear son in Jer 31:20.

The Line of Cain Compared to Babylon

So, Israel are the physical sons of God even to this day, just as the Church is comprised of spiritual sons of God. Similarly the Church inherits the spiritual birthright as God’s firstfruits as typified by Israel (cf Is 61:6-7; Rom 8:23; James 1:18) and Christ as God’s firstborn, also inherits the universe above all others (ICor 15:20; Col 1:15,18; Heb 1:6; 12:23; Rev 1:5). The spiritual Cainites and Babylonians are bitterly opposed to the Church as Satan considers himself more worthy than Christ to inherit all things (they consider themselves to be spiritual Israelites, when they are clearly not. See Rev 2:9). Below I present a chart indicating similarities between the line of Cain and Babylon:

Line of Cain

1. Slew Abel and Enoch (Gen 4:8 23-24)
2. Abel symbolically cries out from the ground (Gen 4:10)
3. Cain had a mark placed on him (Gen 4:15)
4. Cain wondered east of Eden, possibly where Babylon was later founded (Gen 4:16)
5. He was driven from Eden, away from God’s presence (Gen 4:16)
6. Cain’s punishment was too much for him to bear (Gen 4:13)

Babylon

- Slew God’s servants (Rev 18:2, 24)
- God’s people symbolically cry out from the ground (Rev 6:9-11)
- Babylon also has a mark (Rev 13:17; 14:9; 19:20)
- The demons will be kept imprisoned below Babylon during the Millennium (Rev 18:2. See Jude 13)
- Babylon is marked for destruction and will be put out of God’s presence (Rev 16:2, 18; 18:2)
- Babylon’s punishment will be too great to bear too (Rev 18:16-19)

Tension between the inheritor of the birthright and the one rejected, occurs regularly in the scriptures and continues down the ages from Seth to Noah (a direct descendant of Seth) and onwards from his descendants as we shall see.

The Example of Ishmael and Edom

1. Ishmael:

Jacob's father, Isaac, was granted the birthright instead of his brother, Ishmael, even though Abraham wanted Ishmael to inherit it (Gen 17:18-21). Yet, Ishmael still inherited great blessings, but rivalry between their descendants are the order of the day.

The brown Semites of Saudi Arabia spring from Ishmael. Ask any Arab, they will tell you such! Ishmael was Abraham's son through Hagar, the Egyptian handmaid of his wife Sarai (as an interesting aside, Hagar means flight; the flight of Muhammed to Medina is known as the Hagira). A case may be made for her being white, but evidence seems to favour her being descended from the swarthy Mizraimites (Gen 16:1-4, 15). If this be the case, then Ishmael was half Egyptian. And having married an Egyptian wife (Gen 21:21), this would make his descendants three-quarters Egyptian. However, being descended of Abraham the Saudi Arabians still bear inexplicably (to anthropologists) "certain resemblances" to the nations located in north-west Europeⁱⁱⁱ. Many researchers would agree with this viewpoint. Raymond McNair writes that "our investigation further revealed that the modern Arabs are more Hamitic than Semitic"^{iv}, and in this conclusion he is correct.

Could it be that this granting of the birthright to Isaac is a reason for the tensions between the Arabic world (many of whom are descended from Ishmael) and the Anglo-Saxon powers (descendants of Israel)?

2. Edom:

The story of the peoples of Turkey originates in Genesis chapter twenty-five with the birth of Edom (Esau), son of Isaac. Edom inherited a great number of descendants and blessings (Genesis 36), but due to his rejection of the birthright (Gen 25:23-24), it was passed over to Jacob – this has led to ongoing antagonism between the two lines.^v

Edom married two Ishmaelites: Mahalath, a daughter of Ishmael (Gen 28:9) and Bashemath (Gen 36:17). Ishmael was himself half Egyptian, and having married an Egyptianite, his offspring were three-quarters Egyptian. Esau also married three Hittites and one Hivite (Gen 26:34; 36:2,12,14 – unless the Bashemath of Gen 26:34 is the same as Adah of Gen 36:2,12). This meant that Edom's offspring were part White, Canaanite and Ishmaelite.

Once again, the birthright having been granted to Jacob (Israel) instead of Edom is surely a major cause of the negative attitudes of the Turkic peoples toward the Anglo-Saxon powers.

Shem inherits the Birthright?

Noah had three sons: Japheth the firstborn (Gen 10:21), followed by Shem and Ham. Yet from a reading of Genesis it is clear that God chose the line of Shem.

Notice Gen 10:21:

"Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were [children] born."

Consider that Shem was 100 years old two years after the Flood (Gen 11:10), Noah was 500 years of age when he had children (Gen 5:32) and that the Flood devastated the earth in the 600th year of his life. As such his eldest son was at that time 100 years old, whilst Shem only reached his 100th year two years after the Flood. Therefore Japheth must have been the elder of the two. And as such, Ham must have been the younger son. Somehow Japheth lost the birthright to Shem – at least that is the strong inference. God did not enter into a covenant with Japheth but Shem.

This has perhaps led to some rivalry between the Shemites and Japhethites over the centuries in similitude to when Esau sold his birthright to Jacob and despised him ever since (Gen 25:20-34; 27:19-29, 41) or Reuben versus Joseph (Gen 35:22; 48:17-20; IChron 5:1-2).

Now let us have a look at Shem. Firstly, what does his name mean? Driver explains that it means

" 'men of name' or 'distinction' - the titled or noble race ... perhaps nothing more than the ruling caste in opposition to the aborigines ... [some researchers compare it with] the name 'Aryan' ".^{vi}

This may have something to do with the special blessing placed upon Shem in Genesis 9:26: "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem." The above statement, according to Aalders, "implies that Shem would indeed be blessed, but this blessing would come only from the Lord"^{vii} if He had covenanted with them.

In verse 27 Moses wrote that "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem and Canaan shall be his servant". Whilst this may mean that Shem shall dominate Japheth, there is another meaning which should be explored at this point. Take a look at Ex 25:8; Num 9:15; IISam 7:6; IChron 15:1; Ps 78:59-60; Is 40:22; Jer 10:20; Rev 21:3.

The clear inference is that God shall dwell with Shem as in a tabernacle which God did indeed do in ancient Israel and also dwells in spiritual Israelites through the holy spirit. He has remained faithful to Israel ever since. Similar wording is used in relation to Israel in Is 54:2. Here we have what commentators so long ago described as 'the righteous line' or as we would say today, the lineage which God is working with.

To this day the descendants of Shem enjoy bountiful blessings far above either Japheth and Ham – blessing traceable all the way back in time to the book of Genesis.

Assur versus the line of Arphaxad – another birthright shift?

Following along similar lines to the aforementioned experiences and examples, is it possible that Noah's grandsons also had a birthright issue?

Shem had five sons: Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud and Aram. Arphaxad is probably the least understood of all the grandsons of Noah, but his name may assist in understanding more about him and his descendants. It is interesting to note that it was generally understood during the Middle Ages that Arphaxad was promoted to be a fourth son of Noah^{viii}. What Does *Arphaxad* Mean ?

His name may be spelt also as Arpachshad or Arpaksad^{ix}. The "ksad" at the end of his name is a corruption of "kesed" or "kasdim", meaning "Khasdim" or "Chaldeans"^x. Professor Sayce writes:

"Arphaxad is written in the original Hebrew as Arpa-Chesed, 'the Arpha of Chesed'"^{xi}.

Josephus may also help, for he wrote :

"Arphaxad named the Arphaxadites, who are now called Chaldeans"^{xii}.

The original Chaldeans descend from Arphaxad. The Hebrew is Arpha- or Arfa- or Urfa- Chesed, meaning Chaldeans. But what does "Arfa" or "Urfa" mean ?

In the Bible Mount we have Urartu or Ararat mentioned (Gen 8:4)^{xiii}. Ur means: flame, fire, to shine, bright or light; especially the latter. By inference to be luminous, prosperous, glorious^{xiv} - a light-

bringer or bringer of truth and knowledge from the righteous line. For example, “Uriah” means “my light YHVH”; “Uriel” means “God is my light”. So here we have a people that God covenanted with.

It was through him (and to a lesser extent Aram) that the righteous line would continue; these people would be the leaders of the world, teaching God’s truth to the other nations. Who could they be?

All over the Middle East the name “Ur” is apparent: Lake Urmial (near Lake Van) and the city of Dur - sharukin; in Mesopotamia we have Nippur, Uruk, Ur, Urta; River Khabur, Urartu, Ura (in extreme north-east of Anatolia), Ura (a Cilician sea-port); Ur-billum, Urkish (near the Taurus Mountains). Granted, the name “Ur” meant city, but this was only later.

“Ur” is interrelated with the name “Ar”. Ar means “lofty” or “exalted”, later coming to mean a mountain. In the Sumerian tongue, explains Waddell, “Ar” or “Ara” means lofty, exalted, shining or glory^{xv}. This is the Sumerian root of our modern word “aristocrat” which means noblest, most excellent governor or leader. The word can also be spelt “Ha-ra”^{xvi}. Her, Hera, Herarra, Herr all mean “lord” or “master” in Gothic, Scandinavian and German. From “Ar” is derived “Aire” - chieftan of the Irish, Scots and Gaels. In the Medes tongue it is “Arios”, “Harios” or “Harri”^{xvii}. This is the origin of the name “Aryan”. “Aryan” means “noble” or “exalted”. The Aryans are the descendants of Arphaxad and Aram (Hitler’s perversion of this title notwithstanding). Many of their descendants, including those of Abraham through Keturah, settled around the Caucasus, between the Black and Caspian Seas, and north of the Black Sea - this is the “home” of the Nordids. And “chased” means to be wise or clever - they are an administrative people, bringers of light and truth.

That whole area was known as “Artashat” anciently. No doubt derived from “Arphaxad”. And the original name for the population of that area was Kuro-Araxes^{xviii}. The Caucasus itself was known as the Araxes^{xix}. And a river running just south of the Caucasus was known as the Arax River. One branch of it is known today as the Kura, the other as Aras. The whole region became known later as the Kingdom of Ararat or Kingdom of Urartu by the Assyrians. These peoples were descendents of Urfa or Arfa who was Arphaxad.

The whole of Anatolia, Urartu, northern Mesopotamia and northern Syria became known as Kur or Kura-land^{xx}. “Kur” means to be light, bright or white. Only later did it come to mean, like “Ar”, a mountain.

Anatolia, Urartu, northern Persia through to north-west India, northern Mesopotamia and northern Syria were the lands inhabited by the descendants of Arphaxad, Aram and by their descendants, through Nahor, Haran and Abraham.

What of Assur?

The Assyrians descend from Asshur, or Assur, second son of Shem (Genesis 10:22) probably twin brother to Arphaxad. Traditionally, offspring are listed according to age: the firstborn is often listed first. In Genesis 10:22, we find listed five sons of Shem. Elam is clearly the firstborn.

If Asshur was a twin brother of Elam, this would surely have been mentioned as are other twins in Scripture. But the antagonisms between Asshur and Arphaxad demonstrate that in all likelihood that they were twins with Asshur's birth probably preceding Arphaxad's (compare Genesis 25:21-23). Arphaxad and Asshur may have been twins for Scripture states that Arphaxad was begotten "two years after the Flood" (Genesis 11:10). In other words, Elam was begotten in the first year after the Flood and his two brothers begotten a year later. It is impossible for three separate births to have occurred within two years unless Elam was conceived on the ark. It is unlikely that he was conceived on the ark because of the health and safety issues surrounding Noah’s family at that time. Indeed, the entire family would have had their hands full caring for the animals and having a baby at that time would have been unwise.

Regardless, a birthright shift occurred and antagonism seems to have resulted between Assur and Arphaxad due to the latter inheriting the incredible birthright blessings and not Assur.

Asshur's name means 'strong' or 'powerful'. Or, as Josephus put it:

" Ashur lived at the city Nineve; and named his subjects Assyrians, who became the most fortunate nation, beyond others."^{xxi}

In other words they were a greatly blessed people, second only to the descendants of Arphaxad. God, by covenanting with Arphaxad and electing that line to do His work of servant leadership, seemingly has led to Assur's jealousy of Arphaxad and an antagonism which will culminate in a great show-down between their descendants in the years just ahead. This is not necessarily prevalent on an individual level, but on a national level – the national psyche or motivation.

A final possibility should be mentioned here. A people that dwell today in Prussia are descended from Abraham through his concubine, Keturah. Upon his full conversion he sent her away to the east country (Gen 25:6). The birthright continued through the line of Isaac (Gen 25:5) and this has led to conflict between the two lines, particularly through Asshur, son of Jokshan, son of Keturah.

From the above one may deduce that Assur, son of Shem, is second in receipt of blessings comparative to the line of Arphaxad. How close the Germans had come to winning World War One and World War Two. And to having the Atomic bomb within their grasp during the last World War.^{xxii}

Then there is the Imperial Crown representing the Holy Roman German Emperor as temporal ruler and regent of Christ on earth (it includes the cross, an octagonal shape representing the heavenly Jerusalem and 12 stones representing the tribes of Israel); and the Holy Lance (also known as the Spear of Destiny) which supposedly pierced Christ - this was politically the most important relic^{xxiii} which may be traced in its history to Jerusalem via Italy, Lombardy and Burgundy. These insignia originated with the Sumerian, Babylonian and Assyrian empires: the crown the hat of the King of the Heavens; the sceptre, orb and star mantle represent the claim to rule the entire world and beyond; the vestments are those of a high priest; the throne a triumphal chariot; the solemn processions of the Emperor under a canopy represented heaven; he has a sacred ritual observance including prayer and recalls his predecessors.

These insignia reside today in the Treasure House, Vienna, awaiting another Emperor to wear them and fulfill his dream of world peace. Here again, Germany thinks it is the true or new Israel.

What of the legend that the United States voted on an official language a long time ago that could have made German the official language of the United States, delivering the nation to domination by Germans? The story goes that it all came down to the final vote: English won by a single vote because one German-favouring member of the legislature was absent.

This is not quite true and may be labeled an 'urban legend' – having a germ of truth, but much has been added to the story. The US Congress never considered, at any time, replacing English with German. What happened was that on 13 January 1795, Congress merely considered a proposal to print the federal laws in German as well as in English. During the debate, a motion to adjourn failed by one vote (42 – 41). Apparently the motion to adjourn was taken by Congress to mean that the House had indicated no confidence in the recommendation by a committee.

A month later, on 16 February, Congress again considered the issue and the House approved publication of federal laws in the English language only. In March the Senate approved the bill and it was signed into law by President Washington.

While the urban legend is an exaggerated account of what actually occurred, it does serve to demonstrate that the German element was quite strong in early America and that if federal laws were translated into both English and German, this may have led to a later, more serious attempt to make German the official language. We shall never know in this life.

Whatever the case, God gave the birthright promises which included the abundance of North America to the children of Israel, descendants of Arphaxad, not the children of Assur.

Final Comments

What of the German origin of the British Royal House? Does this mean that the Assyrians ran Britain?

The argument is that that Queen Victoria did not speak proper English in her early years due to the royal courtiers being of German descent and she was surrounded by German-speaking people. Or that the German George Louis, elector of Hanover, became George I in 1714, succeeding to the British crown (reigned 1714-27). His descendants were: George II (1727-60); George III (1760-1820); George IV (1820-30); William IV (1830-37) and Queen Victoria (1837-1901).

Queen Victoria herself married Prince Albert, son of Ernst, Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha. But she remained as a member of the House of Hanover. Edward VII, her eldest son, was the only British monarch considered descended from the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (reigned 1901-1910). He was followed by George V (1910-36) who was responsible for adopting the family name Windsor. See the appendices for further information.

It is true that some British kings descended from the Danish-German line. But that line extends clear back in time to the royal house of Troy, founded by Darda. I wrote the following in my paper on *Some Notes on the True Origin of the Scots*:

“Another son of Zarah was Darda (see IChron 2:6; IKings 4:31). It appears that they may have given their name to the Dardanelles and were prominent at Troy about 1500BC prior to the Exodus. In other words they were among the Hittite Trojans giving rise to many European Royal Houses.

About 400 years later a descendant of Darda, Brutus of Troy, sailed to Britain and founded New Troy or Londinium (London). Here a branch of the Judahite Royal Throne was established.”

Darda was, from all accounts, the Dardanos of Troy which commenced a secondary royal line. The primary line migrated to the British Isles.

This secondary line scattered to Rome and others migrated with the Hittites into Germany founding the Danish-German royal line.

So, the British Royal line has been mainly English and Scottish, with some German infusion. But the German royals are not descendants for Assur. Instead, the German-Danish line may be traced clear back to the Judaic royalty which resided at Troy – therefore German born kings ruling in Britain suggests a union of two Judaic lines. A paper will issue on this fascinating subject in due course.

Perhaps this line resident in Germany and associated nations may reveal that somewhere, deep down in the Assyrian-Hittite psyche, lurks a desire for them to hold the royal scepter and not just the birthright?

There we have it. The persons and nations that lost the birthright, or who missed out for some reason, have been in conflict with those that inherited the birthright down through the ages and will again, in

the last days. This is not to say that such rivalries are inevitable or always occur. Rather, I am attempting to point out that such displacements in the above examples have resulted in such animosity.

In summary:

- Shem inherited the birthright instead of Japheth
- Arphaxad instead of Assur
- Isaac instead of Ishmael and Keturah's descendants
- Jacob instead of Edom

This has resulted in hatred, jealousy and ongoing conflicts. May the Messiah return soon to put an end to rivalries and wars and usher in an age of peace and prosperity for all.

**Appendix one: Extract from *The Royals* by Kitty Kelley
Chapter two**

Available at http://www.twbookmark.com/books/94/0446605786/chapter_excerpt372.html

Once upon a time . . . the House of Windsor was a fantasy. The figment of a courtier's imagination. **The dynasty was created in 1917 to conceal the German roots of the King and Queen, and the deception enabled the monarchy to be perceived as British by subjects who despised Germany.**

Until then, many English kings never spoke the King's English. They spoke only German because for almost two hundred years, from 1714 until this century, a long line of Germans ruled the British empire. By 1915 England finally had a king, George V, who could speak English without a German accent. Although he was a German from the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha line that had ruled England for eighty years, he considered himself to be indisputably British. His subjects, who hated Germany, Germans, and all things Germanic, were not convinced.

For years, especially in the early 1900s, the English had become increasingly afraid of Prussian militarism. They felt threatened by the Kaiser's oppression. And they were "sore-headed and fed up," as George Bernard Shaw wrote, with Germany's rattling sabers. They viewed World War I as a war against Germany. Newspapers carried eyewitness accounts of revolting cruelty by the Germans, who bombed undefended towns and killed civilians. Those actions shocked the world in 1915. In England, editorials denounced "The March of the Hun" and "Treason to Civilization" as German U-boats sank British ships. The mounting death tolls on French battlefields caused hardships in England, which exacerbated Britain's hatred of foreigners.

King George V was disturbed as he watched his subjects stone butchers with German names and burn the homes of people who owned dachshunds. Pretzels were banned and symphony conductors shunned Mozart and Beethoven.

This antipathy was not unique to Great Britain. Blood hatred of everything German had infected all of Europe and spread to America, where Hollywood produced a string of hate films such as *To Hell with the Kaiser*, *Wolves of Kultur*, and *The Kaiser: The Beast of Berlin*.

The King of England deplored the "hysterical clamor," calling it "petty and undignified," but few listened. The image of the hideous Hun as a fiendish torturer who raped, pillaged, and murdered innocents had gripped the public imagination.

The King became so concerned about the reaction of his volatile subjects that he was afraid to protect his relatives of German descent. Instead he stood by silently as his beloved cousin Prince Louis of Battenberg was vilified simply because of his German name. When war had threatened, Battenberg as the First Sea Lord of the Royal Navy mobilized the Admiralty with speed and efficiency, so that when war broke out, England was ready. But Battenberg, a naturalized British subject, became a target for abuse: his name was German, he was born in Germany, he spoke with a German accent, he employed German servants, and he owned property in Germany.

Despite his total loyalty to the Crown, he was forced to resign his military position and relinquish his princely title. The final humiliation occurred when the King told him to change his name. Shattered, Prince Louis dutifully anglicized Battenberg (berg is "mountain" in German) to Mountbatten to make it acceptable to the English.

The King tried to mollify his cousin by making him a British noble. Louis accepted the title of Marquess of Milford Haven because he wanted his children to be noblemen, but he never recovered from the shame of renouncing his ancestry. Somehow, though, he kept his sense of humor. He wrote in his son's guest book: "June 9th arrived Prince Hyde; June 19th departed Lord Jekyll." His younger son and namesake, Louis, was shocked by the news of his father's resignation. "It was all so stupid," he recalled years later. "My father had been in the Royal Navy for forty-six years. He was completely identified with England, and we always regarded ourselves as an English family. Of course, we were well aware of our German connections; how could we not be? It certainly never occurred to any of us to be ashamed of them--rather the contrary. We are a very old family, and proud of it. . . . My father had worked his way to the top of the Royal Navy by sheer ability and industry. And now his career was finished--all because of the ridiculous suspicion that he might be in secret sympathy with the very people he had come to England to avoid!"

Next, the King moved to cleanse the rest of his German family. Like the monarchs of mythology who bring magic clouds with them wherever they go, King George V waved his royal wand. Overnight, one brother-in-law--the Duke of Teck--became the Marquess of Cambridge, and the other--Prince Alexander of Teck--became the Earl of Athlone. One stroke of the royal quill eradicated all traces of Mecklenberg-Strelitz, Hesse, and Wettins from the King's lineage: the ugly German ducklings were transformed into beautiful British swans. The royal family's Teutonic dukes, archdukes, and princelings instantly became English marquises.

But the King felt he still needed to make the monarchy appear less imperial to survive. He decreed that members of the royal family could marry into the nobility. So, for the first time in history, royalty could marry commoners, whether they were titled or not. This paved the way for his second son, Albert, known to the family as "Bertie," to propose to a sweet-faced Scottish girl, reared as an Earl's daughter, although her mother has been rumored to have been one of the Earl's Welsh servant girls (these rumors, never officially acknowledged, have yet to be borne out by any evidence). Ironically, Bertie's marriage in 1923 to the commoner, Elizabeth Bowes-Lyon, brought stability to the British throne and propped up the dynasty for several generations. During the First World War, concern was voiced over the bloody role of the King's German cousin Prince Albert of Schleswig-Holstein, who was in charge of British prisoners of war in a camp outside Berlin.

"He's not really fighting on the side of the Germans," said the King defensively. "He was only put in charge of a camp of English prisoners." "A nice distinction," Prime Minister Asquith later observed to a friend. His successor, Lloyd George, was even more blunt. When he received a royal summons to the Palace, he turned to his secretary and said: "I wonder what my little German friend has got to say to me." The Prime Minister's antipathy spread to his staff, who kept the King's private secretary, Lord Stamfordham, waiting on a wooden chair in the hall and refused to rise when he entered their office. The private secretary ignored the discourtesy. "We are all servants," he told shocked courtiers, "although some are more important than others."

As the devoted secretary to Queen Victoria, Lord Stamfordham was by far the most important of the King's men. He had served Victoria's heir, King Edward VII, who had put him in charge of his own son, George, at an early age. "He taught me how to be a king," said the master of his servant.

It was Lord Stamfordham who received the unenviable job of telling King George V about D. H. Lawrence, who had been hounded into hiding because he married a German woman. The once revered writer had married the sister of German military aviator Baron Manfred von Richthofen, the legendary Red Baron, credited with shooting down eighty Allied planes during World War I. After their wedding, Lawrence and his bride, Frieda, were forced by public hostility to seek refuge in the English countryside, where they hid in barns like animals.

This news was unsettling to the King, who also had a German wife. But the clever Queen--Mary of Teck--speaking English with a slight guttural accent, began referring to herself as "English from top

to toe." The King immediately stopped addressing Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, the commander of the German forces sweeping across Europe, as "sweet cousin Willy." His German-hating subjects, who avoided references to sex, began referring to the male member as a "Willy."

Still, the hatred of Germans became so intense in England that the King's mother begged him to remove the Kaiser's honorary flags from the chapel. "Although as a rule I never interfere, I think the time has come when I must speak out," wrote Queen Alexandra. "It is but right and proper for you to have down those hateful German banners in our sacred Church, St. George's, at Windsor."

The Queen Mother sent her letter to "my darling little Georgie" after the *Daily Mail* had excoriated him for allowing the eight flags of "enemy Emperors, Kings and Princes" a place of honor at Windsor. "As long as the offending banners remain, their owners will be prayed for," thundered the newspaper. "What are the King's advisors doing?"

The King ignored the criticism until it came from his "darling Mother dear." Then he yielded and had the banners removed. "Otherwise," he told a friend, "the people would have stormed the chapel."

The King then threw himself and his family into the war effort. He dispatched his sons to the western front, sending the Prince of Wales (Edward, but known to the family as David) to France, while Prince Albert (Bertie) served on the battleship HMS Collingwood. The King banned alcohol and began strict rationing at the Palace to set a national example.

In March 1917 his cousin the Emperor Nicholas II of Russia ("dear Nicky") was forced to abdicate, in part because he, too, had a German wife whom the King blamed "for the present state of chaos that exists in Russia."

The King's equerry was more brutal on the subject: "The Empress is not only a Boche by birth, but in sentiment. She did all she could to bring about an understanding with Germany. She is regarded as a criminal or a criminal lunatic and the ex-Emperor as a criminal for his weakness and submission to her promptings."

That was all the King needed to hear. Concerned about the survival of his throne, he withdrew the warm friendship he had once extended to his "beloved cousin." When the Czar appealed for asylum for himself and his family, the King refused, prohibiting them entry into England. The King felt he needed to separate himself from Russian imperialism, especially when wrapped with a German ribbon. So he wrote his cousin that he did not think it "advisable that the Imperial Family should take up their residence in this country." He suggested instead Spain or the South of France. At that point the revolutionaries in Russia realized that the King would not use military force to save his relatives. Thus abandoned, the Czar and his family were seized and sent to Siberia.

The King was more determined than ever to hang on to his threatened monarchy. He resented references to his German ancestry and raged over the caricatures of Max Beerbohm, who drew him as a comical and lugubrious figure. He lost his temper when a Labor Member of Parliament called him "a German pork butcher," and he erupted again when H. G. Wells branded him a foreigner. In a letter to the *Times*, the British journalist and novelist called for an end to "the ancient trappings of the throne and sceptre." He damned the royal house of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha by calling it "an alien and uninspiring Court."

"I may be uninspiring," boomed the King, "but I'll be damned if I'm an alien." He resolved then and there to rid himself and his royal house of what he saw as its dreadful German taint. With the greatest sleight of hand since the sorcery of Prospero, he asserted his divine right and rechristened himself with the most euphonious, melodious British name conceivable. His courtiers had spent weeks searching for just such a name that would reestablish the monarchy as thoroughly English.

Finally, Lord Stamfordham found it and secured his place in history by proposing the name of Windsor. That one word summoned up what the King was looking for--a glorious image that resonated with history, stretching back to William the Conqueror. For Windsor Castle, the most thoroughly British symbol extant, had been the site of English monarchs for eight hundred years. Although no king had ever lived there, several had died in Windsor Castle, and nine were buried in its royal crypt. The name was enough to redeem a tarnished crown. The proclamation of the House of Windsor was announced on July 17, 1917, and appeared the next day on the front pages of England's newspapers. The British press dutifully reported that the King had renounced his German name and all German titles for himself and all other descendants of Queen Victoria and that henceforth he and his issue were to be referred to as the House of Windsor. In the United States, news of the British royal family's reinventing itself was reported on page nine of *The New York Times*. In an editorial, the *Times* noted "the unnamng and renaming" was approved in a meeting of the largest Privy Council ever assembled and suggested that the name of Windsor, an Anglo-Saxon fortress where the legendary King Arthur sat among the Knights of the Table Round, might have been selected for its "sense of continuity, of ancientness." America's newspaper of record praised England's King for choosing "a venerable name for his house."

In Germany, the news was reported with less reverence. The Kaiser laughed at his quixotic cousin and said that he was looking forward to attending a performance of that well-known play *The Merry Wives of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha*. But the Kaiser appreciated the political necessity of accommodation. As he pointed out, "Monarchy is like virginity--once lost, you can't get it back." Still, he exacted revenge nineteen years later when the King died by sending the Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha to his cousin's funeral in Windsor Castle. The Duke wore his Nazi uniform.

George V never expressed any qualms about his actions. He pragmatically buried his German roots to save his throne and then systematically ostracized his foreign relatives. He did this without compunction, even after receiving news from Russia that the Czar and Czarina and their four daughters and young son, who were moved from Siberia and Ekaterinburg, had been massacred by the Bolsheviks.

"It was a foul murder," he wrote piously in the diary he kept for posterity. "I was devoted to Nicky, who was the kindest of men and a thorough gentleman." By keeping his distance, the King of England had held his crown in place. He then proceeded to rule the House of Windsor for the next two decades with probity. There was no scandal attached to his reign, and like his grandmother Queen Victoria, he excelled at the virtues the English prize most: duty and punctuality. His subjects saw him as a simple, decent man whose plain tastes reflected their own.

The King had started his adult life as the Duke of York and spent seventeen years shooting grouse on the moors of Sandringham. He became the heir apparent when his older brother, the Duke of Clarence, died. Even then the King kept the clocks at Sandringham set forward an hour to provide more time for shooting. A proper country squire, he enjoyed tramping across his twenty-thousand-acre estate in Norfolk. He adored his wife, indulged his daughter, and terrorized his five sons. "I was frightened of my father, and I am damn well going to see to it that my children are frightened of me," he said.

Poorly educated, he rarely read, shunned the theater, and did not listen to classical music. He ignored the arts, letters, and sciences. For recreation he licked postage stamps and placed them with childlike percision in blue leather stamp books. By the end of his life he had compiled an enormous collection of stamps from places he never wanted to visit. Known as "the Sailor King," he did not travel for education or pleasure. "Abroad is awful," he said. "I know because I've been there." Except for touring military installations, he took few trips. He made an exception in 1911 to go to India for his coronation and in 1913 to visit relatives in Germany.

"My father, George V, took quiet pride in never having set foot in the United States," said his eldest son.

"Too far to go," said the King.

What he was, his children would become. In later years his eldest son, the Prince of Wales, who became the Duke of Windsor, was so humiliated by his father's ignorance that he reneged on an agreement to write a book of royal family reminiscences. He confided the reason to his publisher: "I'd hate for the world to know how illiterate we all were." The Prince of Wales embarrassed himself at a dinner party by not knowing the name of the Bronte sisters, who in their short lifetimes wrote *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*, both considered classics of the English novel. The Prince of Wales, who rarely read, did not know who they were or how to pronounce their name. "Who are the Bronts?" he asked.

Unenlightened about mental illness, the Prince of Wales considered the condition of his youngest brother, Prince John, a source of shame. The last of the monarch's six children, John was mentally retarded and an epileptic. He was secretly removed from the family at an early age and lived on a farm on the Sandringham estate, where he died in 1919 at the age of thirteen.

As uneducated as the King was, George V won wide respect from his subjects for his conscientious performance of royal duties and for his numerous military uniforms and the obvious pleasure he took in wearing them in royal parades. **His subjects looked up to him as the father of their country and the personification of their values.** England had gained enough land by conquest during the First World War to give her dominion over a quarter of the globe and a fourth of the world's inhabitants, thus making George V the last great Emperor King. During his reign, the sun truly never set on the British empire. By the time King George V died in 1936, his beleaguered country was on the brink of another world war with Germany, which would end Britain's imperial power. And the House of Windsor, which he had built on the quicksand of illusion, started sinking under the weight of scandal.

For the last two years of his life, the King agonized over his heir. He dreaded leaving the monarchy in the hands of his feckless son, who at the age of forty-one was still unmarried. Following a fourteen-year affair with another man's wife, the Prince of Wales was now besotted with a married American woman, once divorced, named Wallis Warfield Simpson. Already Mrs. Simpson envisioned herself as the next Queen of England. The concept of a divorced person in royal circles was considered such sacrilege in those days that the King refused to receive his son's "unholy lover." He forbade his son to bring a woman defiled by divorce into his royal presence. When the King realized he was dying, he made his wife swear that she would never receive the despised Mrs. Simpson. The Queen, who regarded the King as more than her husband--"He's my almighty Lord and sovereign"--obeyed his command for the rest of her days.

At the end of his life, King George V cursed the laws of primogeniture that barred his solidly married second son from succeeding him. Although Bertie's stutter and stammer irritated him beyond bearing, he would have done anything to save the Crown from the Prince of Wales and his wenching ways.

"After I am dead," he said, "the boy will ruin himself in twelve months." In that the King proved prescient.

He wanted the throne to pass to his second son and then to his beloved granddaughter Elizabeth, who called him "Grandpapa England" because he referred to the National Anthem ("God Save the King") as his song. She sat on his lap, tousled his hair, pulled his beard, and plucked food from his plate for her Welsh corgi dogs. She also made him get down on his hands and knees to play "horsey" with her. The old King doted on his first granddaughter and held her in his arms on the balcony of Buckingham Palace so she could hear the crowd roar. "They're cheering for you, you know," he told

her. Later he confided to an equerry: "I pray to God that my eldest son Edward will never marry and have children, and that nothing will come between Bertie and Lilibet and the throne."

Critically ill for days, George V died on Monday, January 20, 1936, at 11:55 P.M. His end was hastened by Lord Dawson, who gave him a lethal injection of cocaine and morphine. The courtier wanted the King to die before midnight so that his death could be announced in the morning *Times* rather than in the less prestigious afternoon newspapers. The King, who had renamed the royal family, now lost his life to meet a newspaper deadline. Such was the legacy of the House of Windsor, which would eventually rise and fall as a puppet show for the media. (emphasis mine)

Appendix two: George Ludwig 1660 - 1727

Available at <http://www.hfac.uh.edu/gbrown/philosophers/leibniz/georgludwig/georgludwig.html>



[Georg I. Ludwig](#)
[King of Great Britain & Ireland](#)
[\(1714-1727\)](#)



[Georg I. Ludwig](#)
[King of Great Britain & Ireland](#)
[\(1714-1727\)](#)

Georg Ludwig (1660-1727), elector of Brunswick - Lüneburg (Hanover) and, from 1714, king of Great Britain. He was the eldest son of Sophie (1630-1714), electress of Hanover, and elector Ernst August (1629-1698). In 1698 Georg Ludwig inherited, undivided, all the dominions of his father. The second son, Friedrich August (1661-1690), had to content himself with appanage and serve as officer abroad. In 1717 the youngest brother of Georg Ludwig, Ernst August (1674-1728), became the "secular bishop of Osnabrück." In 1682, while still electoral Prince, Georg Ludwig married his first cousin, the princess of Celle (Ahlden), Sophie Dorothea (1666-1726) of Brunswick - Lüneburg - Celle, the only daughter of Duke Georg Wilhelm (1624-1705). This marriage had been encouraged by Ernst August in order to avoid the possibility of a male heir to Georg Wilhelm's estate. After the death of his uncle in 1705, Elector Georg Ludwig was able to unite the principality of Lüneburg - Celle with the Electorate of Brunswick - Lüneburg - Calenberg (Hanover).

After the electoral princess Sophie Dorothea had brought a son and a daughter into the world, she was estranged from her husband. Georg Ludwig preferred his mistress of many years, Countess Melusine von der Schulenburg (1667-1743), and since 1690 Sophie Dorothea had a love connection to Count Phillip Christoph von Königsmarck (1665-1694).

Once their love interest had been discovered, the threat of a scandalous elopement involving Sophie Dorothea and Königsmarck became a serious concern to the Hanoverian court. Both Sophie Dorothea and Königsmarck had been warned to break off the affair, but the lovers lied about their involvement, which they continued despite the warnings. During the night of 1/1 July 1694 Königsmarck was seen to enter the palace in Hanover and make his way toward Sophie Dorothea's apartments. Whether he reached them is unknown, but it is certain that he was killed that night. According to information gathered by Duke Anton Ulrich of Brunswick - Wolfenbüttel, the murder was the work of four courtiers from the court of Hanover. One of these, named Montalban, was identified as having struck the fatal blow. It has been discovered that shortly after 1/11 July Don Nicolò Montalbano, an Italian who had endeared himself to Ernst August's family during work on the new palace at Osnabrück, was paid 150,000 talers from Ernst August's coffers. At the time, Montalban's annual salary was merely 200 talers and that of the highest-paid electoral minister just 1,500 talers. So a reward of 150,000 talers was an extraordinary sum, leading to the not unreasonable suggestion that it was for Montalban's part in the assassination of Königsmarck. According to Anton Ulrich's information, Königsmarck's body was sunk in the Leine river in a sack weighted with stones. Matters moved apace in the aftermath of Königsmarck's disappearance. The marriage between Georg Ludwig and Sophie Dorothea was finally dissolved on 28 December 1694 (OS). As part of the agreement between her father Georg Wilhelm and Ernst August, Sophie Dorothea was banished for life to the family castle at Ahlden (Celle), completely separated from her children and her father¹ and denied the right to remarry. Although endowed with a generous income

and a court of her own, she was allowed to drive her carriage only under observation and only for a given distance; she was not allowed to walk on foot outside the courtyard at Ahlden.

At the time of Georg Ludwig's accession to throne of England, Leibniz was Librarian and Privy Counselor of Justice to the court at Hanover, where he had served for nearly forty years—first under Georg Ludwig's uncle, Johann Friedrich (1625-1679), and then under Georg Ludwig's father, Ernst August, who became the first elector of Hanover in 1692. Georg I. Ludwig, who had never fully appreciated the extent of his Privy Counselor's genius and fame, and had always been rather ill-disposed towards him, refused to summon Leibniz to join the royal family in London, ostensibly on the grounds that Leibniz had not made progress—sufficient, at least, to satisfy the King—on writing the history of the king's royal House of Brunswick with which he had been commissioned many years before. In December 1714 Leibniz petitioned the king, through Caroline (1683-1737), princess of Wales, and the king's Hanoverian Prime Minister, to make him historiographer of England on the grounds that his history of the House of Brunswick required him to take account of the history of England. The king refused, but Caroline continued to champion Leibniz's cause. In September 1715 she told Leibniz that she had again spoken to the king about his desire to become historiographer of England, but the king replied: "Er muss mir erst weisen daß er histroien schreiben kan; ich höre er ist fleißig [He must first show me that he can write history; I hear that he is diligent]" (Klopp, p. 46).

As king, Georg I. visited his Electorate five times, but on the sixth trip, in 1727, he died at Osnabrück. At his death, Georg I. left behind two heirs by his cousin and former wife, Sophie Dorothea: a son, Georg August (1683-1760), who became King George II. of Great Britain, and a single daughter, Sophie Dorothea (1687-1757), who in 1706 married the Elector of Brandenburg, later king of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm (1688-1740). Georg I. also left behind three illegitimate daughters by his mistress, Countess Melusine von der Schulenburg.

--Adapted from the website, Die Welfen

Notes

¹Georg Ludwig did sanction visits to Ahlden by duke Georg Wilhelm, which were denied by the agreement of 1694. However, no visits took place for reasons unconnected with Georg Ludwig. Georg Ludwig also permitted Georg Wilhelm's widow to move from her dower-house in Lüneburg to the castle of Celle in order to make her frequent trips to visit her daughter less strenuous.

Sources

- *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 13th edition. New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1926.
- Aiton, E. J. *Leibniz: A Biography*. Boston: Adam Hilger, 1985.
- Hatton, Ragnhild Marie. *George I: Elector and King*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Klopp, Onno, ed. *Correspondenz von Leibniz mit Caroline*. New York: G. Olms, 1973.
- Cf. Britanica 2002 article.

GPO Box 864, Sydney, Australia 2001

www.originofnations.org

No limitation is placed upon reproduction of this document except that it must be reproduced in its entirety without modification or deletions. The publisher's name and address, copyright notice and this message must be included. It may be freely distributed but must be distributed without charge to the recipient.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ Bible Difficulties Solved, page 28

ⁱⁱ Paradise to Prison, page 114

ⁱⁱⁱ Glubb 1969:16

^{iv} McNair 1963:316

^v The International Bible Encyclopedia, article “Esau” states:

“The birth narrative that mentioned the second child grasping the heel of the first foreshadowed the subordinate relationship of the Edomites to the offspring of Jacob (cf. Jer 49:8; Ob. 6; Rom 9:10-13) ...

Archaeological discoveries from Nuzi have shown that disposing of the birthright among members of the same family was not unknown.

Esau’s apparent indifference to such valued possessions as the birthright was reflected in his marriage to two local women who were not of Abrahamic stock. This was a matter of great regret to Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. 26:35), and doubtless prompted the latter to instruct Jacob in ways of obtaining the patriarchal blessing that properly belonged to Esau (ch. 27).”

^{vi} Driver 1930: 95

^{vii} Alders 1981: 208

^{viii} Poliakov: 1974 : 114

^{ix} Douglas: 1972 : 86

^x See *ibid.*

^{xi} Sayce: 1928 : 100

^{xii} Josephus : *Antiquities* : 6 : 1

^{xiii} Gen. 8 : 4

^{xiv} “Strong” : 1890: # 215-228

^{xv} Waddell : 1929 : 5

^{xvi} *ibid* : 6

^{xvii} *ibid.* I was very surprised that Waddell came to the conclusion that “Ar” (Noble) is the origin of the word Aryan for this, too, was my conclusion.

^{xviii} Lang: 1970 : 78

^{xix} Sayce: 1928 : 78

^{xx} Waddell: 1929 : 41, 44, 45.

^{xxi} Josephus *Antiquities*, I.vii.4

^{xxii} The Rigby Joy of Knowledge Library. History and Culture 1 1977: 160

^{xxii} Kaiser Wilhelm II wanted “*a place in the sun*” for the German people. The problem was the only places left were in the shade. There was very little room left for new colonization in the early part of the 20th century [Britain had already taken over ¼ of the world – Israel inherited the Birthright, not Assur]. Never the less the Kaiser built up the German military machine and under the Tirpitz Plan, built a naval fleet to rival that of Great Britain. The term “saber rattler” sums up his politics as well as his personality. Historian Barbara Tuchman put it well when she referred to the Kaiser as “possessor of the least inhibited tongue in Europe”.