

Who and Where
are the
Lost Ten Tribes?

Reprinted from the October and
November, 1943 issues of DESTINY

Written by REVEREND JOHN HESLIP

Copyright 1943 by Destiny Publishers, Haverhill, Mass.

Price 25¢ postpaid

Who and Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

By REV. JOHN HESLIP

WHERE are they? They are somewhere on earth. They are a distinct and separate people. They are not Jews. That is what, we believe, the Scriptures say. We must look to the Scriptures for proof of these statements, then.

We look to the New Testament first. And this for one purpose mainly, to get the New Testament estimate of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Are the Scriptures of the Old Testament reliable? Can the promises there recorded be depended on? Are the Scriptures of the Old Testament a record of man's search for God and man's conception of God? Or are they a record of God's search for man and God's revelation of His will to man, as man was able to receive? Even as Jesus said to His disciples, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear [receive] them now," did God reveal His will and way, according to man's ability to receive? And are the Scriptures of the Old Testament not a record of man's conception of God, but of man's increasing ability to receive the Divine revelation? What answer does the New Testament give to these questions?

It is in the Old Testament that the promises to the fathers are found. What was Jesus' estimate of the Scriptures of the Old Testament? We may say that He had no other writings than the Old Testament Scriptures. We can say that He was well acquainted with their contents. In them He found the program for His own life. "They are they which testify of me," He said. When He was charged with teaching and acting contrary to the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures, He said, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all things be accomplished." That is strong language. It is well to note that He says, "till all things be accomplished." Not some, but all. On

another occasion He said, "And the Scripture cannot be broken." Not once is it recorded that He spoke disparagingly of the Scriptures. Not once did He intimate that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are unreliable in any respect. He did correct the rabbis' interpretation and application of the Scriptures, but He did not correct the Scriptures. Even as liberal a theologian as Dr. Harnack held that when Jesus said, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you," He was not correcting the Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets, but the false interpretation and application of the rabbis.

When one came to Him and asked Him, "What good thing must I do that I may inherit eternal life?" He directed him to the Scriptures. He said to him, "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" In looking forward to His own death, "He took unto Him the twelve and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem and all things that are written through the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man." And again, "The Son of Man goeth as it is written of Him." When hanging on the cross He said, "I thirst," it was that the Scriptures might be fulfilled. And again, "But the Scriptures must be fulfilled." When He was risen from the dead, and walking with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, "He said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory?" And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. And the same day at even He appeared to the disciples, and said to them,

"These are the things which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me."

We may here say that it would be a very remarkable thing, indeed, if all things without exception, concerning the Lord Jesus, related in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, must be fulfilled, while many, even most, of the things written concerning Israel fail of fulfillment. Even when Jesus says, "The Scripture cannot be broken."

We call attention to one more statement of Jesus, concerning the Scriptures of the Old Testament. In the story of the rich man and Lazarus, He represents the rich man in conversation with Abraham. He asks Abraham to send Lazarus back to earth to

warn his five brothers. Jesus puts these words into the mouth of Abraham in reply:

"They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. And He said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead."

Could any language more strongly confirm the integrity, the truthfulness, the utter reliability of the Old Testament Scriptures than these words that Jesus puts into the mouth of Abraham? Could any language more clearly and emphatically declare that the Old Testament Scriptures are from God and are entirely dependable?

When we pass from the record in the Gospels to the other portions of the New Testament, we find the same testimony. In the Acts we find the Old Testament referred to, again and again, as the sure word, the unfailing word, the ground and hope of the present and the future. The same is true of all Paul's letters. We need not quote specific cases. "Nevertheless, what saith the Scriptures?" And what the Scriptures say is not only the sure word and last word on any question, but the word of hope and guidance for the future. In the epistle to the Hebrews we have this:

"God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son."

That way of stating it represents the thought and attitude of every writer of the New Testament toward the Scriptures of the Old Testament. They are the record of what God has spoken, at various times, and in various ways. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."

There is this question. Can the New Testament record be relied on? And to that question we paraphrase the words of Paul in reply. "If the record cannot be relied on, then is our preaching vain, and our faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we testified that it was God who spake through the prophets, and through Jesus of Nazareth, which He did not do, if so be that the New Testament records cannot be relied on. For if the records cannot be relied on, then Christ has not died, nor been raised from the dead, and the promises of the Old Testament are only wishful thinking on the part of men, and not really the promises of God; they are not the 'sure word of prophecy.'" If

the records cannot be relied on, our faith is vain and we are without any assurance or hope. But we think we can join Paul in his triumphant assurance concerning the resurrection of Christ, and say of the New Testament records that they can be relied on to the uttermost.

Two more things about the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Jesus added nothing new in all His teaching to what is found in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. He was the New Thing. The other thing is that archaeology has confirmed the historical accuracy of the Old Testament in every particular. That will be admitted by every reasonable man today. The "assured results" of the higher critics are "assured results" no longer. Modesty, humility, a chastened spirit characterizes the honest critic of the Old Testament today. The higher criticism is becoming increasingly difficult as a way of escape from the admitted difficulties of the Old Testament for any honest man. The higher criticism must not be taken for granted if there is to be any progress in Bible knowledge.

Now we can turn to the Old Testament and study the promises made to the fathers in the assurance that they are God's promises; and assured that "no word of God is void of power." They are not cunningly devised fables nor wishful thinking.

When God called Abram to go out from his own land to a land that He would show him, He said:

"Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee; and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, make thy name great . . . and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blest."

After Lot and Abram separated, the Lord appeared to Abram again, and said to him:

"Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward and eastward and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then may thy seed also be numbered."

That promise God did not fulfill, if we interpret it in the usual orthodox way, as referring to the Jews. The Jews are today not over sixteen million souls, not as numerous as the dust of the earth.

After Abram had delivered Lot, his family and possessions, from

the hands of their captors, the Lord appeared to him again, and said to him:

"Fear not, Abraham; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. . . . And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir. And, behold, the word of the Lord came unto him, saying, This man shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and number the stars, if thou be able to number them: and He said unto him, so shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord: and He reckoned it to him for righteousness."

That promise has only partly been fulfilled. The promise as to the multitudinousness of his seed has not been fulfilled, if we interpret the promise from the standpoint of the Jews.

When Abram was ninety-nine years old, and Sarai was ninety, the Lord appeared to him, and said to him:

"I am God Almighty; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make a covenant between Me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face; and God talked with him, saying, As for Me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be the father of a company of nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for the father of a company of nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee."

According to the orthodox interpretation this solemn promise has not been fulfilled; God has not kept His word. By no possible stretch of the imagination, by no possible exaggeration, can the Jews be made to fit into this picture. After the deliverance from Egypt by Moses, and their entrance into the land of Canaan, led by Joshua, the people of the seed of Abraham were under Judges for the space of four hundred and fifty years. When they asked for a King, God gave them Saul; then David; then Solomon; then Rehoboam. In the early reign of Rehoboam, the Kingdom was divided. There were two nations then, but not a company of nations. In 721 B.C. one of the two nations, the Ten Tribes, was taken captive by the Assyrians. So far as Bible history goes the Ten Tribes ceased as a nation. About 130 years after the captivity of the Ten Tribes, the two Tribes were taken captive to Babylon. After seventy years a remnant returned, less than fifty thousand. But Judah was never a nation again, unto this day.

As the Jews cannot be made to fit into this great picture, so

neither can the promise be spiritualized! God was speaking to Abraham of *his natural seed*. Abraham always understood it that way. There is no escaping that fact.

At the same time Abraham's wife's name was changed from Sarai to Sarah, Princess, and the Lord promised her a son, Isaac. Not a spiritual son, but a real flesh and blood son. And God said, "I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; Kings of peoples shall be of her." She did bear a son, a literal flesh and blood son, according to the word of the Lord, and his name was called Isaac. So far the promise was literally fulfilled. But the remainder of the promise has not been fulfilled, if we interpret it from the standpoint of the Jews. Nor can it be spiritualized into yielding any sense whatever.

On the occasion of Abraham's offering his son Isaac, the Lord renewed the promise in these words, "In blessing, I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens, and as the sand which is upon the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies." Again we must say that by no possible means can we make the Jews the fulfillment of this great promise, either while as a nation in Palestine or since. Either there must be another interpretation of this and such like promises, or else the promises of God are utterly unreliable.

All these promises were confirmed to Isaac and Jacob. We need not take time to refer to them. We only take time to refer to the testimony of the Apostle Paul, to the effect that a "covenant confirmed beforehand of God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect." Since the law given on Sinai could not make the promise of none effect, neither can any other thing. We must look for the fulfillment of all these promises.

When one makes the statement, "We must look for the fulfillment of all these promises," he lays himself open to the ridicule and scorn of all the "me too" folk who follow in the train of what is called "modern scholarship." "Modern scholarship" as well as traditional orthodoxy has long ago decided that God made promises, unconditional promises, that He has not fulfilled, and cannot now fulfill. So they have, in one way and another, undertaken to help God out of His dilemma. Like Abraham and Sarah, they could not see how God could possibly fulfill his word, and they have invented various schemes whereby, in their judgment, God's integrity and honesty, as well as His purpose, could be

preserved. It did look as if Abraham and Sarah had done a good and much-needed job in the case of Hagar and Ishmael. For several years it looked as if their plan had been the means of God "saving face." But their well-meaning but utterly mistaken effort not only did not help, it added to their own distress and produced a situation that has continued to be one of the very greatest hindrances to the progress of the Kingdom of God through all the centuries since.

So it did look, for many years, as if "modern scholarship" had brought forth an Ishmael. Their Ishmael was that the Old Testament Scriptures were, largely, the product of man's wishful thinking; that they were, largely, the record of man's search for God, and therefore very fallible; that the promises recorded as made to the fathers were never intended to be fulfilled as spoken; that — we must say it — Jesus' estimate of the Old Testament Scriptures cannot be accepted.

It must be admitted that they brought forth a brisk, upstanding, well-dressed lad in their Ishmael. International tailors of the highest repute contributed to his dress, and the very best literary efforts were expended on the embroidery. Their Ishmael was a credit to them. He was much praised, indeed, in all the ranks of "modern scholarship." But the Lord has come along to say, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." "Cast out the handmaid and her son; for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman." And it looks as if this Ishmael will be as great a hindrance to the progress of the true Kingdom of God as the Ishmael begotten by Abraham's and Sarah's device.

Why the Ten Tribes Are Not Jews

This will be a good place to show that the Ten Tribes are not Jews, and never were Jews. The Jews are the tribe of Judah only. All the Twelve Tribes were Israelites, being the descendants of Jacob, whose name God changed to Israel. The whole of the descendants of Jacob are often referred to as the Twelve Tribes of Israel. From the time of the separation of the Ten Tribes under Jeroboam, the northern Kingdom is almost invariably referred to as Israel, the House of Israel, Joseph, or Ephraim. But they are never once referred to as Jews. Ephraim is the chief designation. One has only to read the prophets to see this — Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah. There we find, again and

again, "Israel and Judah," "the House of Israel and the House of Judah." They are a distinct and separate people. There were some Jews, doubtless, among the Ten Tribes. Just as we know there were some of the Ten Tribes among the Jews. But the prophets are clear and emphatic in distinguishing between Israel or Joseph, the Ten Tribes, and Judah, or the Jews. Even the disciples of the Lord seem to make the distinction, when they say to Jesus, "Rabbi, the Jews were but now seeking to stone Thee; and goest Thou thither again?" Decades ago, Canon Farrar, in his *Life of Christ*, pointed out that there was only one Jew among the disciples of the Lord Jesus, Judas. The others were from Galilee, of the tribe of Benjamin. And when God filled the vacancy made by the departure of Judas, He chose a man of the tribe of Benjamin. If we would "rightly divide the word of truth" we must have a clear grasp of the distinctions between Israel and Judah, the House of Israel and the House of Judah; between Joseph, or Ephraim, and the Jews. The prophets all made the distinction clear.

The birthright was the big, the very important thing. It belonged to Isaac as the promised son of Abraham and Sarah. Of the twin sons of Isaac, Esau, the elder, did not succeed to the birthright. "Esau despised his birthright." Jacob appreciated the great importance of the birthright, and he succeeded to the birthright promises. Which of Jacob's sons inherited the birthright? Reuben was the firstborn. To him would, naturally, have come the great blessing. But we read in I Chron. Chapter 5: 1-2 this: "And the sons of Reuben the first born of Israel [for he was the firstborn: but, inasmuch as he defiled his father's couch, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph the son of Israel; and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright. For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the prince; but the birthright was Joseph's]." Wherever Joseph is today, there are the birthright blessings, Joseph representing the Ten Tribes. If Joseph is nowhere, then the promises have become of none effect, and the whole plan of God has failed. We must look for and find Joseph, and when we find him *we will find him enjoying the birthright blessings.*

It is contended by some that the Ten Tribes returned to Canaan with the return of Judah from Babylon. The Ten Tribes were not in Babylon. Those who returned from the Babylonian captivity are described by Ezra in these words: "Now these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of

those who had been carried away, whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away into Babylon and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every one unto his city." The tribes who returned he names "Judah and Benjamin." There is not a word about the Ten Tribes, nor any part of them, returning. At that time, according to Second Esdras, they had removed much farther west, from the place where they had been taken captive by the Assyrians. Esdras says: "These are the Ten Tribes, which were carried away prisoners out of their own land in the time of Osea the king, whom Salmanasar the King of Assyria led away captive, and he carried them over the waters, and so they came into another land. But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a farther country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river. For the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood till they were passed over. For through that country there was a great way to go, namely, of a year and a half: and the same region is called Arsareth." They were on their way west, toward the place that God had appointed for them. Looking for them in the place into which they were taken captive, as some say we must do, we will not find them. An object must be looked for where it is mislaid or lost; it cannot move unless it is moved. But a living, adventurous people will not stay in the place where they have been put by their captors, not when there is plenty of uninhabited territory farther west, and when their captors are no longer in a position to prevent them from moving on. They were more than a thousand miles farther west than where the Assyrians placed them, before the captives returned from Babylon. They did not return to Canaan.

Josephus, who wrote about 70 A.D. says: "The Ten Tribes did not return to Palestine; only two tribes served the Romans after Palestine became a Roman province." The leading Jews of today say the same thing. In 1918, just after the great war had ended, the Chief Rabbi said: "The people known at present as Jews are descendants of the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with a certain number of descendants of the Tribe of Levi. As far as is known there is not any further admixture of other tribes."

In the Scriptures, which Jesus says cannot be broken, we find in Ezekiel an account of the union of Joseph and Judah "in the latter

days." The prophet was told to take two sticks, one for Judah and one for Joseph, "and join them for thee one to another into one stick." And the meaning of this was made clear in these words: "Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the Tribes of Israel his companions; and I will put them with it, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick and they shall be one in my hand. . . . Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the nations, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land . . . and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all . . . so shall they be my people, and I will be their God."

If Joseph (the Ten Tribes) is mixed with Judah now, as some say, and has been so mixed since the return of Judah from the captivity of Babylon, how could there be this union in the latter days? The two are distinct and separate. This union has never taken place. But it is beginning to take place before our eyes today in the land of Palestine.

Now we follow the fortune of the Ten Tribes. According to the Scripture, they would be "lost," even losing their identity, and being called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord would name. But they would not be forgotten of God. Read Hosea, and be sure of that. Hosea was a prophet to the northern kingdom.

"How shall I give thee up, Ephraim. . . . I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim; for I am God and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee and I will not come in wrath." "I will call them my people who were not my people."

Read Amos, and be assured that though Ephraim may forget God, God will not forget Ephraim. Amos, too, was a prophet to the northern kingdom. And this is what we read there:

"For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall to the earth."

That statement is not mere rhetoric. It means something. It means that God is watching over His Israel in and through all their wanderings, their wars, their trials, their chastisements, and their tribulations. "O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me."

In the song of Moses, which the Lord instructed him to write, we have this remarkable statement:

"When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the children of men, He set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel. For the Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance."

This statement concerning God's providential dealings with the nations is confirmed by the statement of Paul at Athens, when he said, "The God that made the world and all things therein, He being Lord of heaven and earth . . . made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitations."

Let us look at the statement made by Moses. When he made it, the children of Israel were a people not over two millions in number, if so many. The territory to which they were going, the land of Canaan, was but a very small country, about the size of the State of Vermont. The most of Europe was, most likely, quite sparsely settled, perhaps the west and northwest hardly settled at all. The British Isles were known as "the ends of the earth," the farthest west of any known territory, and probably not long separated from the mainland of Europe, as geologists assure us. America was not known to man to exist until almost three millenniums later. Yet Moses writes that God set the bounds of all these people according to the number of the Children of Israel. When, today, we think in terms of the little land of Canaan, and the fifteen or sixteen millions of Jews on the earth, who are not even a nation, nor have been a nation for more than nineteen centuries, the statement is very ridiculous. It is not much wonder that it is not even considered or thought of as having any bearing on world affairs today. But if we cease thinking in terms of the small territory of Canaan, and of the Jews as constituting the chosen people, and think in terms of the Appointed Place for Israel and of the promises made to the fathers, "a nation and a company of nations," and a people in number like the sand on the seashore, as the stars of the heavens for multitude, then the statement takes on new meaning and calls for the most earnest consideration of every thoughtful person who is interested in world affairs today. The statement made by Moses is most vitally related to the happenings among the nations at this present time.

It seems quite evident that God never intended that the people of Israel should be confined to the little land of Canaan. Had they continued increasing as they had done in Egypt and later, long centuries before the coming of Christ it would have been a physi-

cal impossibility for the land of Canaan to have held and sustained them. That Canaan was to be the center of their government and worship is clear enough; as it will be in days to come. But, manifestly, they were not to be confined to that territory. We find that as early as the early part of the days of the Judges, Dan and Asher were a seafaring people, going as far west, doubtless, as "the ends of the earth," the British Isles. In the song of Deborah and Barak we have this: "And Dan, why did he remain in ships? And Asher sat still in the haven of the sea, and abode by his creeks." Our thought must not be confined to the small territory of Canaan, nor to the sixteen millions of Jews. For the Scriptures do not confine our thought there, as we shall see.

When David conceived the plan of building a house to the Lord and made known his thought and purpose to his friend Nathan, the prophet encouraged him in his plan. But that night the Lord appeared to Nathan and said to him that he should go to David and tell him that as he had shed much blood he would not be permitted to build a house to the Lord. His son would build it. Nathan was to express God's appreciation of David's thought, and say to him:

"Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, that should'st be prince over my people, over Israel; and I have been with thee . . . and I will make thee a great name like unto the great ones that are on the earth. And I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in their own place, and be moved no more."

That appointed place cannot mean the land of Canaan, for God's people Israel were already there. It must be some other place. Should anyone contend that it means the land of Canaan, he is faced with the fact that, in that case, God's word of solemn promise was never fulfilled, nor ever can be fulfilled. Israel was moved from the land of Canaan; first the Ten Tribes, then Judah and Benjamin. And for almost 1,900 years the Jews have been scattered far away from the land of Canaan. The Lord must have meant some other place than the land of Canaan. That is the place we are in search of, some appointed place where God's Israel is planted and secure, where God's solemn word of promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is being fulfilled; where His word to David is being fulfilled. Wherever that place is there is Joseph, the birthright people.

We read in Jeremiah: "For thus saith the Lord: David shall

never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel." That word has not been fulfilled, and can now never be fulfilled, if we interpret it from the standpoint of the Jews. Nor can it be spiritualized into meaning anything whatever. Neither can it be thrust into the Millennium, when the Lord Jesus shall sit upon the throne of His father David and reign over the house of Jacob. Where is the God-appointed place? And where is the throne of the house of Israel on which the kingly line of David sits? They are somewhere, unless Nathan and Jeremiah put a lie into the mouth of the Lord.

In Jeremiah, chapter 31, we have this solemn assurance:

"Thus saith the Lord, who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinance of the moon and stars for a light by night, who stirreth up the sea, so that the waves thereof roar: the Lord of Hosts is His name: If these ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me forever. Thus saith the Lord: If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, then will I also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done saith the Lord."

Did the Lord say that? Or did Jeremiah put a lie into the mouth of the Lord? Was Jeremiah a false prophet, pretending to speak in the name of the Lord when, in fact, the Lord had not sent him? There is one thing that makes it sure as the word of the Lord — "then will I also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done." Man would cast them off for all that they have done. But not God. He will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will remember no more. That is the same as God said through Hosea — that He would not cast off the seed of Israel because of their sin, "For I am God and not man." It was that character of God that led Micah to exclaim:

"Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity and passeth over the transgression of the remnant of His heritage? He retaineth not His anger forever, because He delighteth in lovingkindness. He will again have compassion upon us; He will tread our iniquities under foot: and Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depth of the sea. Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the lovingkindness to Abraham, which Thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old."

Then, as sure as the sun shines; as sure as day follows night and night succeeds the day, the Ten Tribes, the birthright people, exist as a nation today in God's appointed place, enjoying the

birthright blessings, the blessings of the firstborn. "I am a father to Israel, Ephraim is my firstborn."

Who Are They? Where Are They?

In seeking to answer these questions we must be guided by the Scriptures and history. History unfolds prophecy. The Scriptures tell us that they would be "lost." They were called, as we know, "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel." They would be "wanderers" among the nations. Hosea wrote of them: "Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit; yea, though they spring forth, yet will I slay the beloved fruit of their womb. My God will cast them away, because they did not hearken unto Him; and they shall be wanderers among the nations." (This, of course, is stated of the Ten Tribes, Ephraim. It has no reference to the Jews.) They shall go toward the north and west. They shall inhabit the isles of the sea, the western isles. They shall inhabit the wilderness, and there God will deal with them and "speak comfortably to them," as we read in Hosea. (By "wilderness" is not meant an uninhabitable place, but an uninhabited place, a place capable of habitation and cultivation. Esdras records that they started to go to a land that had never been inhabited. No doubt God's appointed place.) They were to be a numerous people, so the Lord promised of the birthright people to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And Hosea writes of Ephraim, the northern Kingdom, "the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered." Again, according to Hosea, they are to be in the new covenant, for "it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, ye are the sons of the living God." They are to be a maritime people, possessing the gates of their enemies. They are to be a nation and a company — a commonwealth — of nations. They are to be God's witnesses in spreading the truth of the New Covenant.

These are only some of the fingerposts of Scripture to guide us in our historical search for Joseph, the birthright people. And there is only one people in the world that fits the picture, the Anglo-Saxon people, especially Great Britain and her colonies, and the United States of America. And, as one has said, they fit the picture as perfectly as a key fits the lock for which it was made. With them must be included the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Denmark,

and others. But we will, in this article, confine ourselves to Great Britain and America, for the most part.

Among the hundreds of confirmations we will confine ourselves to four. And, of course, we must depend on the researches and findings of those who have made a real study of the subject, historians and others.

1) We trace the Ten Tribes from the place where the Assyrians placed them. At the time of Ezra, as recorded in Second Esdras, at least a part of them had moved west more than a thousand miles, to Arsareth, in the southeast of Russia. That they did not all go then we may gather from Josephus, who states that, in his day, they were in the same general territory in which the Assyrians placed them, and were a very great multitude. But a part at least, and a large part, had already moved west, toward God's appointed place, as early as the days of Ezra, and before the return of the Jews from Babylon. The others followed in their time. They were called Scythian wanderers. They bore other different names. They left their marks behind them, as they proceeded west during the centuries, marks that are manifest unto this day.

Sharon Turner, the historian, has made the most exhaustive study along this line. His testimony is all the more worthy of consideration by the doubting ones, in that he never dreamed of such a thing as the Anglo-Israel question. That light had not yet "broken" from God's Word. He was an historian tracing the different names, fighting one another and not knowing that it was kindred fighting kindred, fighting others, until they reached God's appointed place. The tribe of Dan, especially, left its mark wherever it went. While yet in the land of Canaan it was the habit of that tribe to give the name Dan to any conquered place, "after Dan their father." The tribe continued to do that in all their journeyings westward, toward the isles of the sea. Danmark is the place or territory of Dan.

These tribes arrived in the isles of the sea at different times, and under different names. We are familiar with such names as Picts, and Scots, and Jutes, and Danes, and Angles, and Saxons. The last to arrive were the Normans. But all these were from the same stock, and came originally from the same territory, from where the Assyrians placed the Ten Tribes. Sir F. Palgrave, in his "English Commonwealth," says: "Britons, Anglo-Saxons, Danes and Normans were all relations; however hostile they were all kinsmen, shedding kindred blood." Professor Freeman, in his

"Origin of the English Nation," says: "Tribe after tribe, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Frisians, poured across the sea to make new homes in the Isle of Britain. Thus grew up the English nation — a nation formed by the union of various tribes of the same stock. The Dane hardly needed assimilation: he was another kindred tribe, coming later than the others. Even the Norman was a kinsman." Dr. Thomas Nicholas in his "Pedigree of the English People," says: "The researches of modern historians unequivocally favor the opinion that under the names of Gauls, Gaels, Celts, Cimmarii, Cimbri, Cymry, Brython, Scots and Picts — only one race under different tribe or clan divisions, political organizations, and periods of existence is spoken of . . . hence . . . one people." The *British Medical Journal* says: "The more we dig into the physical character of the English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish peoples, the more do anthropologists become convinced that all four nationalities are compounded out of exactly the same racial stocks of mankind."

Professor Huxley, in "Racial Origins," says: "The invasions of the Saxons, the Goths, the Danes, the Normans changed the language of Briton, but added no new physical element. Therefore we should not talk any more of Celts and Saxons, for they are all one. I never lose an opportunity of rooting up the false idea that the Celts and the Saxons are different races." Again, he says: "I miss no opportunity of uprooting the notion that the people who form the British nation are descended from various nations. All the detachments who flowed into Britain are branches of the self-same stock." And, we may add, all can be traced, and have been traced, to the self-same place, the territory where the Ten Tribes were placed by the Assyrians.

Sir Arthur Keith tells us that he has had to revise his opinion of the origin of the old British people. Facts obliged him to revise his opinion. He tells us that he is satisfied that "the early British, the early Scots, the early Ulstermen, the Welsh, the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Danes and Normans are all part of one common stock which have come from the east." Prof. Max Müller gives the same testimony. So does John Richard Green, the historian.

If all this testimony is contrary to what we have believed, we may quote Sir F. Palgrave again. He says:

"The fundamental rule of science, whether in history or elsewhere, is not what has been believed, but what is true. The inquiry into what is true on the

present subject discovers a strong link of relationship between the Cymry and the English."

That fundamental rule of science, *not what has been believed but what is true*, must guide us in this study, as in all others, in relation to Scripture and history. Is it true? That is the question, here as elsewhere, no matter what we have been taught or believed hitherto. There is yet much, very much, truth to break from God's Holy Word.

We make one more quotation. Professor Roland G. Usher, of Washington University, says: "The greatest achievement of the careful researches of the late Bishop of Oxford into the Constitutional history of England was the conclusive establishment of the fact that by the close of the 13th Century the consciousness in the people of any difference in ancestry had entirely disappeared . . . surely the fact that Englishmen became conscious of their common blood is a striking and important fact." It surely is. And it corroborates the word of the Lord through Amos:

"For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall to the ground."

And it corroborates the word of the Lord to David through Nathan:

"And I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and they shall be moved no more."

Dr. Neubauer, the learned Jew, writes in the *Jewish Chronicle*: "If as you Christians say, the Christ has come, then the House of Joseph ought to be manifest; and what you have got to do is to find the people who represent them." They are found in the appointed place, worshipping Christ as God.

2) *The language!* The ancient British language is closely related to the Hebrew. The Welsh Cymry, is so closely kin to the Hebrew that a Welsh writer, Charles Edwards, "was so much struck with its similarity, when he first commenced the study of Hebrew at the University of Oxford, that he felt he must make known his discovery." Another has written, "Scarcely any Hebrew root can be discovered that has not its corresponding derivative in the ancient British language." An eminent Cornish scholar of the last century, who devoted a great deal of time to prove the affinity between the Hebrew and Welsh languages, observes: "It would

be difficult to adduce a single article or form of construction in the Hebrew grammar, but the same is to be found in Welsh, and that there are many whole sentences in both languages exactly the same in the very words." Canon Lyson finds 5,000 Hebrew roots in the English tongue. And William Tyndale, who gave us the English translation of the Bible, says: "The English agreeth one thousand times more with the Hebrew than the Latin or the Greek." This is quite understandable in the light of the fact that the British Isles were peopled by the descendants of the Ten Tribes. On any other premise it is hardly understandable.

3) The third matter we call attention to relates to Jeremiah and the two daughters of King Zedekiah, the last king of Judah. When the Lord called Jeremiah a prophet, He said to him:

"See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up, and to break down, and to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant."

The last we know of Jeremiah, so far as Bible history records, he was in Egypt, and with him were the two royal daughters of Zedekiah. He was in Egypt against his will, brought there by the disobedient Johanon. While in Egypt the Lord had spoken through him concerning the future of those who had gone there, in disobedience to the expressed will and promise of God. That we may see clearly the prospect confronting those who insisted on going to Egypt against the expressed will of God, we quote the words spoken to Jeremiah:

"Behold, I will set my face against you for evil, even to cut off all Judah. And I will take the remnant of Judah, that have set their faces to go into the land of Egypt to sojourn there, and they shall all be consumed; in the land of Egypt shall they fall; they shall be consumed by the sword and by the famine; they shall die, from the least even unto the greatest, by the sword and by the famine; and they shall be an execration, and an astonishment, and a curse and a reproach. For I will punish them that dwell in the land of Egypt, as I have punished Jerusalem, by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence; so that none of the remnant of Judah, that are gone into the land of Egypt to sojourn there, shall escape or be left to return into the land of Judah, to which they have a desire to return save such as shall escape."

We may assume with certainty that the Judge of all the earth would not deal with the righteous as with the wicked and that Jeremiah and his two wards would most surely escape.

Now we leave Bible history with Jeremiah in Egypt. Hence-

forth we must depend upon secular history and tradition in following the fortunes of Jeremiah and his two royal wards, and his friend and secretary Baruch. But it is tradition so well established that we may well accept it as accredited history; and so well confirmed by subsequent history and so much in harmony with Bible prophecy that it cannot be denied. We may again assume that Jeremiah would not return to the land of Judah, certainly not to remain there. After all that had happened he would be suspected by the authorities of Babylon, even if there were any security in the land. According to well-established tradition, Jeremiah, with the two royal daughters of Zedekiah, and Baruch his secretary, and others, took ship to Spain, the Iberian Peninsula, and thence to Ireland. Both in Spain and in Ireland he would come among his own people, Israelites. The tribe of Dan, the Tuatha de Danaans, as it is expressed in the ancient Irish language, had been traced to Ireland centuries before this time, and as coming by the way of Greece. The "Psalter of Cashel" says, "The Tuatha de Danaans — the tribe of Dan — ruled Ireland for about two centuries, and were highly skilled in other arts from their long residence in Greece and intercourse with the Phoenicians." The tribe of Judah, the Zarah branch, has been traced to Ireland centuries before the coming of Jeremiah. Also some of the tribe of Ephraim.

We may here turn aside to say that, according to those competent to judge, there is an ancient Irish literature, awaiting translation, equal to the best literature of ancient Greece, if not even far surpassing it. If one tenth of the scholarship that has been expended in attempting to show that the Old Testament scriptures are, largely, of man's device, and that Jesus' estimate of them cannot be accepted, had been devoted to the bringing of this literature to the knowledge of the people, the Christian church would be much richer, and would not be muddling about in uncertainty regarding God's covenant promises and their fulfillment.

But to return to Jeremiah. About two years after the Jews were taken captive to Babylon, there arrived in Ireland, from Egypt, by way of Spain, a sage. He brought with him a princess and his scribe or secretary. "The ship that brought them to Ireland belonged to the Iberian Danaan. They landed on the northeast coast of Ireland, where Carrickfergus now stands. The little party brought with them a huge, mysterious chest, a banner, and a large rough stone. The name of the aged seer was Ollamh Fodhla

(wonderful prophet), the princess was called Tamar Tephi (Palm Beautiful) and the scribe's name was Brug or Bruch." This is according to the Irish records. The name Brug or Bruch is practically identical with Baruch, Jeremiah's scribe. Irish poetry is full of the praises of Tamar Tephi, "of her lofty birth, her stormy life in Jerusalem and at Tahpanhes, in Egypt, her voyage to Spain, and thence to Ireland." To this very day Jeremiah's burial place is pointed out on Devenish Island, in Lough Erne, Co. Fermanagh. It has been known through the centuries as "Jeremiah's Tomb."

So when Jeremiah and his party came to Ireland, they came to their own kith and kin, which was, of course, the reason they came to Ireland, at least among other reasons. For we can very well believe that Jeremiah would have divine guidance in the matter. At this time the King of Ireland was Eochaidh Heremonn. The Heremonn was the head King of Ireland. The different provinces had each its own king. Then these Kings chose the head King, the King for all Ireland. Heremonn of Ireland was young. Tamar Tephi is described as very beautiful. The young people soon won each other's affections. The Ollamh Fodhla's consent had to be obtained, and was given on three conditions: "The worship of Baal must be renounced and the worship of God established. The nation must accept the moral law, as contained in the two tables. The King must provide a school for Ollamhs." This was agreed to, and the marriage took place.

The young Heremonn is believed to have been of the tribe of Judah, of the Zarah branch. If so, the two branches of the tribe of Judah were united in this marriage. But whether the Heremonn was of the house of Judah does not matter. The royal house of Judah, in the person of Zedekiah's royal daughter, began its reign in Ireland, on the throne of David. The succession from that time on is traced, without a break, from Ireland to Scotland, from Scotland to England, to the present occupant of the throne of Great Britain. Thus has been fulfilled and is being fulfilled, the solemn promise made by God through the prophet Jeremiah, "David shall not want a man to sit upon the throne of Israel forever." "No word of God is void of power." "Has He promised, and shall He not bring it to pass?"

And what about the large rough stone that Jeremiah brought with him to Ireland? There is a stone under the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey, with a very remarkable history. Is that,

maybe, the stone that Jeremiah brought to Ireland? Let us trace its history and see. Its history can be traced very definitely without bringing in one iota of guesswork. That stone was brought from Scotland to England in 1296 A.D., nearly 650 years ago. All the Kings and Queens of England and Great Britain have been crowned on that stone since then. Dean Stanley, in his memoirs of Westminster Abbey, writes, "The chief object of attraction to this day, to the innumerable visitors to the Abbey, is probably that ancient monument of the Empire known as the Coronation Stone. . . . It is the one primeval monument which binds together the whole Empire. . . . The iron rings, the battered surface, the crack which has all but rent it, bear witness to its long migrations. . . . The sentiment of the nation has, through a hundred generations of living men, made it felt that Jacob's Pillar Stone was a thing worth dying for in battle. By the treaty of Northampton in 1328, the emeralds, pearls and rubies were carried off without a murmur. But the Ragged Old Stone — Oh, no! — the Londoners would have died for that! The Stone of Scone, on which it was the custom for the Kings of Scotland to be set at their coronation, the Londoners would on no account suffer to be sent away." So Dean Stanley writes of the Ragged Old Stone.

But how did the stone get to Scotland? It was brought from Tarah, Ireland, to Scotland in the year 487 A.D. Fergus Mac-Earca, son of Queen Earca, of Ireland, conquered Argyll, Scotland. He was crowned King of Argyll, and at his request the stone was brought from Ireland for the ceremony. "About 563 A.D. the saintly Columba came to the small island of Hy, and at his request, the king removed the stone to the holy Isle of Hy, now known as Iona. . . . When Columba was dying at Iona, he asked his friends to carry him into the sanctuary and lay his head upon the sacred stone. With his head on Jacob's Pillow, Columba whispered a short prayer, and like Stephen, departed this life, with his face radiant with the love of God."

The stone remained at Iona for about 300 years, and all the kings of Argyll during that time were crowned on it. When Kenneth McAlpin, the last king of Argyll, became king of all Scotland, he had the stone removed to Scone. It was called Jacob's Pillar Stone, the Stone of Destiny, or the Stone of Scone. Before it was brought to Scotland from Ireland, the kings and queens of Ireland were crowned on it for ten centuries. It was called in Ireland Lia Fail (Wonderful Stone). This is actual, traceable history. The

history of this stone is traced from Westminster Abbey, to which it was brought in 1296 A.D., to Scotland, to which it was brought from Ireland in 487 A.D., to Ireland, where it was for more than five centuries before the Christian Era. This is not fancy, but fact, historical fact.

When Jacob was dying in Egypt, he put the care of the Stone of Israel into the hands of Joseph. "Of whom is the shepherd, the keeper, of the Stone of Israel." Wherever that Stone is, there is Joseph, the Birthright people. Wherever Joseph is, the Birthright people, the shepherd of the Stone of Israel, there is the Stone.

The Stone has in it two iron rings, one on each side. These rings are worn almost through. Since 1296 A.D. the Stone has been resting in Westminster Abbey. For 800 years it rested in Scotland. For about 1,000 years it rested at Tarah, Ireland. How, then, did the iron rings get worn almost through? It must have been during the forty years' wandering of Israel in the wilderness, as it was carried from place to place by the tribe of Joseph, the Shepherd of the Stone of Israel. Above it in Westminster Abbey are the words, "This is the House of God."

4) *The introduction of Christianity into the British Isles.* We were taught that Christianity was introduced into England by the Monk Augustine, in 596 A.D., and that he found then a barbarous people. Nothing could be further from the truth. Eusebius, the Father of Church History, says: "The Apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles." Eusebius lived 300 years before Augustine. The early British historian Gildas writes: "Meanwhile, these islands . . . received the beams of light, that is, the true Sun . . . at the latter part, as we know, of the reign of Tiberius Caesar." Tiberius Caesar reigned from 14 to 37 A.D. Archbishop Usher writes: "The British National Church was founded 36 A.D., a hundred and sixty years before heathen Rome confessed Christianity." Sir Henry Spelman writes: "It is certain that Britain received the faith in the first age from the first sowers of the Word. Of all the churches whose origin I have investigated in Britain, the Church of Glastonbury is the most ancient. Tradition has it that Joseph of Arimathaea was the first to preach the gospel in Britain, and that he, with the aid of some of the apostles, built the first Christian Church that was ever built. It was built at Glastonbury, and was called 'The Wattle Church.'" Chrysostom, who died in the year 407 A.D., almost two hundred years before the arrival of Augustine in England, said: "The British Isles which

are beyond the sea and which lie in the ocean have received the Virtue of the Word. . . . Though thou should'st go to the ocean, to the British Isles, there thou should'st hear all men everywhere discoursing matters out of the Scriptures, with another voice indeed, but not another faith; with a different tongue, but the same judgment." They were not a barbarous people when Augustine arrived.

This will suffice to show that the people of the British Isles were among the very first to receive the word of everlasting life. They were the first people, as a people, to accept Christianity. The reason is not far to seek. They were the people of Israel, in the appointed place, a people prepared of the Lord.

The reply of the British Church to the Pope's delegate for submission to the Pope of Rome is one of the finest things in Christian Church History. "Be it known and declared that we all, individually and collectively, are in all humility prepared to defer to the Church of God, and to the Bishop of Rome, and to every sincere and godly Christian, so far as to love every one according to his degree, in perfect charity, and to assist them all by word and in deed in becoming the children of God. But as for any other obedience, we know none that he whom you term the Pope, or Bishop of Bishops, can demand."

May we take a look again at Jeremiah's commission? The Lord said to him: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant." It is easy enough to see the fulfillment of his commission "to pluck up and to break down and to destroy and to overthrow." But if we leave him in Egypt, where Bible history leaves him, we see no fulfillment of the commission "to build and to plant." If, however, we follow Bible promise and prophecy, and subsequent history, we see Jeremiah, in another land than Canaan, in the appointed place, doing the very thing God commissioned him to do — "To build and to plant."

But the question will be asked; and rightly enough, what difference does all this make, and what advantage is there to vital Christianity in knowing that the Ten Tribes exist as a distinct people, and who they are, and where they are? We answer in the words of Paul in another relation, "Much every way, but chiefly as it relates to the Oracles of God." Among the many advantages which might be named we confine ourselves to three.

I— *The Bible, the Oracles of God*

Every thoughtful person, however much he may esteem the Holy Scriptures, finds many difficulties there. Those who do not find difficulties in the Bible either do not study it, or do not think, or simply accept what someone else has said about it. And the very greatest difficulties the honest student of the Bible has to contend with relate to the "great and precious promises" of the Old Testament. In the Old Testament are many things hard to be understood which not only "the ignorant and unlearned wrest to their own destruction." And the fact that one accepts Christ's and the whole New Testament's estimate of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, does not make the difficulties less, but rather more. Such a one does not have the convenient way of escape presented by the higher critical hypothesis.

Interpreting the great and precious promises made to the Fathers from the standpoint of the Jews, their past history, and their place in the world today, men like Thomas Paine, and David Hume, and Charles Bradlaugh were led to disbelieve in a Divine Revelation altogether. They were confronted with the fact that the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had not been fulfilled. Not knowing what he said, for the truth about the Ten Tribes had not "broken" from God's word, Charles Bradlaugh declared that the British nation looked far more like the fulfillment of the promises than did the Jews. Had these, and thousands of other intellectually honest men, known and seen that the great and precious promises were being fulfilled today in the Anglo-Celtic-Saxon, and kindred peoples, there would have been no denial of divine revelation.

The Scriptures of the Old Testament have been the fertile field for the higher critics, as they are called. Many of these critics have been honest in their search for truth, in seeking a way of escape from the impossible traditional interpretation. They were "confirmed believers," but were not able to accept what Christ and the writers of the New Testament said about the Scriptures of the Old Testament. So they sought a way out of the difficulty that confronted them. Speculation ran rife and no hypothesis was too wild to get consideration, if only the name of "scholarship" was attached to it. While claiming to contend for a scientific study of the Old Testament Scriptures, they were very often far removed from scientific methods. Hypothesis and

not scientifically proved facts were made the foundations on which elaborate structures were builded. And though discovered facts have, again and again, shown that the hypotheses were wrong, they still go on building on the scientifically discredited hypotheses. Like "The Forged Decretals of Rome" on which the claims of the Roman Catholic Church were built, these disproved hypotheses are still built on. Every Roman Catholic historian admits that the "Decretals" were a forgery. Yet the church goes on building on that false foundation. And the followers of the "higher criticism" go on building on the false hypotheses, and talk about "assured results." But it is only stating a fact, which every honest critic of the Old Testament will admit, when we say that practically every position taken has had to be abandoned. In the field of archaeology, Sir Charles Marston, following many other devoted men, has done his work so well that it is frankly admitted that every historical statement in the Old Testament has been confirmed. There was a time when the name of Wellhausen carried far more weight, in so-called scholarly circles, than the name of Christ. And Wellhausen was not a "confirmed believer." But that day is passing swiftly, and soon it will be past forever, to the great benefit of the Kingdom of God.

When the truth about the Ten Tribes, the Birthright People, is seen the honest searcher for the truth will no longer need a way of escape from the facts of Old Testament history and promise. And when the fine, and in most cases, honest scholarship is given over to the interpretation and application of the Old Testament in the light of prophecy and history, where the Lordship of Christ is recognized in this as in every other department of thought and life, we may well expect, with God's blessing, the universal revival of true religion that millions have been praying for, and which is so much needed in our world today.

Those who do not seek this way of escape, and will have none of the higher critical hypothesis, have their own troubles. They believe that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God"; that "holy men of God spake unto the fathers in the prophets"; that "the Scripture cannot be broken"; that "the Scriptures must be fulfilled." But they are faced with the fact that, according to the traditional interpretation, many, very many, of the great and precious promises made to the fathers have not been fulfilled, and cannot now be fulfilled. While they contend for the full inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures, if they are honest

they must admit that the promises as made cannot now be fulfilled. Whether they are pre-millennialists, post-millennialists, or a-millennialists, they are obliged either to ignore these promises made concerning the natural seed of Abraham, or else spiritualize them out of all recognition.

The Futuristic pre-millennialists take Jesus' estimate of the Old Testament, and believe, and rightly believe, that "The Scripture cannot be broken." But, interpreting the Scriptures from the standpoint of the Jews, they are faced with the same facts as the rest. They, too, must seek a way of escape. Their way of escape is to put off the fulfillment till the Millennium. Some, in their desperation, even teach that the Sermon on the Mount is not for this age, but for the Millennial age; even though the Lord Jesus concludes that great discourse by saying, "He that heareth these sayings of Mine and *doeth* them," etc. The result of following this way of escape is that these earnest people, instead of seeking to bring the Kingdom of heaven on earth now, put everything off till the Millennium. These good people enjoy, with the rest of us, the greatly improved social conditions in every democratic country in the world, brought about by scientific discoveries, and by the efforts of men of prophetic vision and outlook. But they do not give their earnest efforts to bringing the Kingdom of God on earth now: the Kingdom of righteousness, peace, and brotherhood.

II—*The Social Application of the Gospel of the Kingdom*

It is not a "Social Gospel." That, as one has said, is little better than political economy. It is *the gospel of the Kingdom*, redemptive for the individual, and for human society. It is the doing of the will of the Father in heaven. The Kingdom of heaven that the Lord Jesus spoke so much about was the Kingdom promised to Israel, the Kingdom of Israel, and is to come on earth and be effective in every realm of human thought and activity. And while, as we believe the Scriptures teach, the Kingdom will not come in its glorious fullness till Christ comes again in the glory of the Father, and of the holy angels; yet we are to seek to bring the Kingdom of God on earth, as much as possible, in every realm of human thought and behaviour. Christ must be made Lord in everything. Just as we seek, individually, to be as Christlike on earth as the grace of God can make us, while waiting for the full

likeness at His coming, so must we seek to bring everything unto the obedience of Christ now. The principles of the redemptive Kingdom of God are to be the practice of the individual and of human society. "Blessed is the Kingdom that cometh, the Kingdom of our father David." It is the gospel of the Kingdom, redemptive in its every aspect.

It has been said that the Lordship of Christ is the emphasis in the Old Testament, and the Saviourhood the emphasis in the New Testament. There may be truth in that way of stating the matter. But the preaching of the Apostolic age might be stated in three words — Christ is Lord. He is Saviour because He is Lord. The Christ who brought grace and truth; who gave Himself for us, to redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to Himself a people for His own possession; who died for our sins; who met the principalities and powers of darkness and triumphed over them on the cross; whom God raised from the dead, the Victor over sin, death, the devil, and the everlasting curse — that Christ is Lord. God has made the Jesus whom men crucified both Lord and Christ. "He is Lord of all." He is King of the Kingdom. Obedience to Him is the whole of the Christian life. That is life in the Kingdom of God; "doing the will of God from the heart."

The fact that the emphasis in the New Testament is on grace, rather than on government, as in the Old Testament, *does not lessen the Lordship of Christ*. It *increases it*. We need and must have the message of *both* Testaments — the message of Amos as well as the message of John. What we call "The Golden Rule" Jesus calls the sum of the Old Testament, the Law and the prophets, or practical Christianity.

Any gospel that does not apply to the individual, and change the individual, is not the gospel of the Kingdom. Jesus says,

"Either make the tree good, and the fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and the fruit corrupt. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit."

The individual must be changed. Any gospel that stops with the individual, and does not apply to every social condition, is not the gospel of the Kingdom. Whether the approach be through the individual to the social application; or whether the approach be to the individual through the social application — in either case it must be a gospel of redemption. Less will not avail, neither for the individual nor for human society.

When we pray, "Thy Kingdom come, on earth as it is in heaven," we must put forth every effort to bring the Kingdom of God into every realm of human thought, life and activity. One has written: "Religious teachers are today strong on data for the next world, quite overlooking the fact that two thirds of the Old Testament, and much of the New Testament, deals with instructions for 'Israel,' to be used and fulfilled in this everyday world of ours here and now, where God's kingdom is and has been during the last two thousand years."

"Ye seed of Israel's chosen race,
Ye ransomed of the fall,
Hail Him who saves you by His grace,
And crown him Lord of all."

Crown Him Lord of every heart and every home, in every land. Crown Him Lord of every church and every school, of every factory and every farm, of every business and every pleasure. Crown Him Lord of all knowledge — religious, moral, scientific. Crown Him Lord of all politics — state, national, and international. That is the Kingdom of God on earth, the Kingdom set forth in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, the Kingdom that Jesus came to bring on earth, for which He gave Himself on Calvary.

In Denmark, in the Scandinavian countries, and increasingly in other lands, where "the seed of Israel's chosen race" dwell, the economic laws of Moses and of Christ, given on Sinai and in the Sermon on the Mount, are being more and more carried out. How gloriously the great Kingdom Psalm, the seventy-second, will shine in days to come, when Christ, through His people, is fulfilling what is there written of Him and His righteous reign! It fills one with abounding hope for tomorrow, and for all the tomorrows. "He shall not fail, nor be discouraged till He has brought justice on the earth. And the Isles shall wait for His law."

III—Toward One World

The third thing we mention, and a matter of the most vital importance, is that Great Britain and America, and the other peoples of the Ten Tribes, are bound to draw closer and closer together. They may have to go through the fire, and be purged

in the furnace of severe trial and tribulation; but it will come forth as gold refined. This closer and better understanding will come, in spite of politics and politicians. One greater than all the politicians is guiding His Israel. The outlook for the future is full of hope, no matter what the prophets and prophetesses of doom may say. The Lord Jesus is on the march. His voice is heard above the noise of the battlefields, saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the good news."

Great Britain and the United States are the two greatest nations on earth today. That can be said without reflecting adversely on any other nation. And more than that can be said. It can be truthfully said that they are the two greatest nations that have ever been on the earth. The Roman Empire, at its greatest, never equalled either of these nations. They must and will play an increasing part in world affairs. From that they cannot escape. It is their destiny. No American who is a follower of Christ, who thinks in terms of the Kingdom of God, and who daily prays, "Thy Kingdom come, on earth as it is in heaven," can be an isolationist. He knows that this great nation cannot live unto itself, and ought not, any more than an individual can or ought to live unto himself. "Ye are My witnesses," saith the Lord.

The leadership of Great Britain and the United States must be redemptive. It has been, in measure, along that line. Of the twenty-five thousand missionaries, in different fields, working in different capacities, about twenty-three thousand are from Anglo-Saxon countries. With the "rediscovery of the Kingdom of God," and the social application of the gospel of the Kingdom, these two nations may be expected to play a far more redemptive part in the affairs of the nations than heretofore. The pen of inspiration set down the unselfish Kingdom prayer centuries before the Lord Jesus taught His disciples to pray, "Thy Kingdom come, on earth as in heaven." "God be merciful unto us, and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us. That Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy salvation among all nations. Let the peoples praise Thee, O God, let all the peoples praise Thee. Oh let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for Thou wilt judge the peoples with equity, and govern the nations upon earth. Let the peoples praise Thee, O God, let all the peoples praise Thee. The earth hath yielded its increase; God, even our own God, will bless us, God will bless us; and all the ends of the earth shall fear

Him." That is most hopeful — "all the ends of the earth shall fear Him," through the living, witnessing power and influence of Israel blessed of her God.

When the "seed of Israel's chosen race" come to realize their identity, through the study of the word and history, repent and turn to God in Christ, and follow Christ fully, obeying Him as Lord in every department of human life; then will come the fulfillment of the "great and precious promises" of God concerning the natural seed of Abraham, the children of the promise, as well as the spiritual seed. Has not God said, "I will yet for this be enquired of by the House of Israel, to do it for them"? Is not this what the Holy Spirit through Peter meant, when He said, "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, so that there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord"? When the "seed of Israel's chosen race" enquire of the Lord concerning those promises made to Abraham and his natural seed, flesh and blood seed, then it will be seen as in the case of the coming of the Saviour promised, "no word of God is void of power." Then, when Israel repents, believes God's promises, and turns to the Lord in truth — then will come to pass what was spoken by the Psalmist-prophet, "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the Kingdom is the Lord's; and He is the Ruler over the nations." Paul says it will be as life from the dead. "Let all the House of Israel — Joseph and Judah — know assuredly, that God has made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."

In the days of the Covenanters, in Scotland, there was a godly, devoted, earnest man named Donald Cargill, who sacrificed much and labored most earnestly "For Christ, Crown and Covenant." One who had labored with him, but later accepted the Indulgence referring to Cargill, and others like him, said, "Why all this ado? We will get to heaven, and they will get no more." When the retort was relayed to Cargill, he replied, "Yes, we will get more: we will get God glorified on the earth, which is more than heaven." Well and nobly said!

If one should say, We will get to heaven without knowing who the Ten Tribes are, why trouble about this? we reply in the spirit of Donald Cargill: It makes this great difference, that we see that God is a God of truth, a Covenant-keeping God, whose

word shall stand. We see that the Old Testament is no longer the football of every theorist with some new hypothesis. We see God vindicated, glorified on the earth. And that is better than a thousand ways of escape to heaven. We are assured that the time is at hand, when God will fully vindicate His righteousness on earth.

"Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will place them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them forevermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the *nations* shall know that I am Jehovah that sanctified Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forevermore."

Thus God will vindicate His righteousness, His unsullied honor, His truthfulness before all nations, for their salvation. "For the gifts and calling of God are not repented of." "I have made a covenant with my chosen. I have sworn unto David my servant: Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips."

As we contemplate this great thing, the faithfulness of God, we must cast away our pessimism, and exclaim with Micah, "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth over the transgression of the remnant of His heritage? He retaineth not His anger forever, because He delighteth in lovingkindness. He will again have compassion on us; He will tread our iniquities under foot; and Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depth of the sea. Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the lovingkindness to Abraham, which Thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old."

Does DESTINY Come to Your Home?

DO YOU receive DESTINY regularly each month at your home? If not, it will take but a moment to enter a subscription and be assured of each month's issue. Do you not want to keep informed of the meaning of events in the months ahead? There is no better way to have an adequate understanding of the present, and to intelligently anticipate the future than to consistently read DESTINY month by month.

DESTINY is the most vital magazine in America today! It deals with the destinies of the nations of the world, our changing economy, and with the outcome of the struggle for world supremacy. It clearly explains the purpose and aftermath of present chaos and its conclusions are founded on the only authoritative source for such information — the prophecies of the Holy Bible.

DESTINY is published monthly by a non-profit, non-sectarian, non-political organization with the single aim of transmitting the national information from the Bible pertaining to the origin, history and destiny of the English-speaking and kindred peoples. It is being increasingly read by well-informed people everywhere. Specially edited, with a scholar's regard for truth, it has alertness, perspective and vision resulting from the decades of devoted, painstaking study of the Scriptural prophecies — now being fulfilled — which comprise its background.

By subscription only, \$3.00 a Year or \$5.00 for Two Years in the United States and possessions or Canada (Canadian Money Orders should be made payable at Toronto, Ontario); in other countries, \$3.50 a Year.

DESTINY PUBLISHERS • Haverhill, Massachusetts