

History of The Scots as it Relates to The Phoenicians, Romans, &c.



Author
Anonymous

History of The Scots as it Relates to The Phoenicians, Romans, Angles, Saxon and Germanic Tribes and Norsemen

Writer's identity is anonymous -- confidentially maintained by the author

THANKS SALIM FOR REPLYING AND IT IS INTERESTING TO READ THAT THE VILLAGERS NEAR HADRIANS WALL can be traced as akin to Northern Syrians for there is another link between UK Celts and Syria / Scythia.

From what I understand the Saxons when invading Britain attempted to enter the area we call today the Lothians. This was the breadbasket of the Britons and from what I understand the Saxons were pushed out to Lindisfarne when the Picts, Scots and Britons united to defeat them in battle. This is supposed to be the birth of the Saltire as a national emblem and it also leads to the acceptance of Christianity by the Picts and the birth of Alba, which leads eventually to Scotland. The Saxons at this time were heathen and the Scots were the race to convert them.

The whole basis of the brigand / thief reference to "Scotti" resides in such wonderful and accurate historians as Bede who also put forward the Scots were the produce or bastards of the Irish and the Picts. The Scots women being given to Pictish men and based on the late Roman writers who refer to the Scots and the Picts as attacking and harassing their northern borders of the empire.

I believe that is a biased and untrue foundation of the Scots and earliest writings indicate that the Scots named themselves after a Queen or noblewoman. Indeed the lands were called Scota Major and Scota Minor and you would surely expect Scotti Major and Minor. The term Eriguena as indicating an Ireland stems from after the fall of Rome, (and the Germanisation of Europe in many ways), perhaps coming from Ire meaning North and all earlier references are to Scota.

The main problem with the Gaul argument when looking at the Scots falls apart as the Gauls had developed the use of P and the Scots had not. I believe that the Britons were the peoples who populated the areas we now call Northumbria, Lothians, Lanarkshire, Strathclyde and Cumbria and Welsh may be a remnant of this. Welsh was spoken in Edinburgh as recently as 120 years ago and more recent in outlying areas. Again we see the use of P which would tie Welsh speakers in with the Gauls. Galashiels, one of the areas that spoke Welsh until the last century, is not far removed from Galatia and shows Gaullic roots granted. However, these peoples were only Scots from the time of MacAlpin and the eventual subjugation of Northumbria and Cumbria back into Scots hands only to be given to the Normans via suzerainty in the time of David I.

Columbanus wasn't the founder of monastery orders but he did introduce them to Germany, Austria, Northern Italy, Flanders etc so I stand corrected on that. He also was the first to establish their independence as he founded monasteries without diocese (Cardinal) or Papal permission. From what I understand the Norse attacks begin after the unification of the Britons, Picts and Scots and the beginning of "Scotland" which was known as Alba and I do not see where they come in when talking about Scots other than the raids and blackmail they introduced. The Scots had even resorted to paying the Norse to leave but they wouldn't until the battle of Troon where the Norwegians were defeated and the Scots repudiated Norwegian claims to our territory. The Norse were then confined to outlying areas such as Wick, Orkneys, etc but there was eventually intermarriage and in the time of Bruce, the Lord of the Isles returned the Isles back to the Scots and the Earls of Orkney, Man and Shetlands did the same.

I really believe that the Anglo-Saxon myth must be put to rest. Where is this great Anglo-Saxon nation whilst all these developments took place? There isn't one.

The reality is the Norse raids in many ways affected the Angles and the Saxons more than the Scots for the Norse ruled these peoples in the period immediately before the Norman invasion and we only suffered this in outlying areas such as Hebrides, Orkneys etc. As for the degeneration in the British Isles of Roman language and knowledge, I would suggest that

that was never open to the Scots as such and yet we still managed to enlighten Western Europe. The reason behind that happened by keeping literature alive thanks to saint Padraig or in the Germanic sense Patrick and Columba, Columbanus, etc.

I would also say that when referring to Scots and Welsh we should admit in the case of the Welsh certainly that we are not referring to their name and are indeed using "Anglo-Norman" terms. What does Cymri mean? The degeneration of Britain begins with the onslaught of Germanic tribes and not "Norse" as it is the Germanics who take us into a dark age which reinforces my view that the Latin words in Welsh angle is not a valid point. The Germanic tribes had encountered Rome and Roman practices before the Britons had and if they had been Romanised then would the dark ages have occurred?

The tale of Arthur is interesting, as the only "historical" Arthur is Edinburgh based. He was a war chieftain of the Britons and he chased the Saxons from Dunedin. The extinct volcano in my bonnie city is named after him and has been as long as anyone knows. Dunedin was the capital of the Britons or Pruetani, I believe. Troyes museum has a letter from Dunedin telling the tale so I believe.

I have heard much of the terms Scottish yet the correct term is Scots. I am Scots is correct. I am Scottish is not. I am guilty of this, too, from time to time, but it is incorrect to say Scottish.

The argument for England being called Anglo-Keltic is weak, as K is a modern addition to Scots and Celtic would be more correct unless we are all Greeks! I would say that England is a Saxon-Celtic nation as most of the Angles settled in what is now called lowland Scotland, Edinburgh, East Lothian etc contributing mostly to what we call lowland Scots.

With the very use of "Keltic" your "learned" friend has shown a fatal flaw in his perception of Scots and Quisling was what sprung to mind when I read the Scotti one as the idiot obviously fails to see that Scotti cannot possibly be a Scots or Irish Gaelic word. Despite numerous searches of the little Latin available in my memory I cannot find the term Scotti

meaning thief. Perhaps Quisling is strong but who needs UK historians when ignorance like that is peddled!

Unfortunately after the history we have received from the UK we are all confused as to who we are but perhaps the best line to take is we are all human and God's own!

I also understand that Saxon villages and Roman villas sat side by side but again this has nothing to do with the Dalriada / Scots nor the make up of these islands. A look at the telephone directory of any city north of Derby will show as many macs as Glasgow or Edinburgh and the names of towns such as Caerlyle or Carlisle will show again the make-up of these people. Add to that the massive emigration of Scots/Irish to "England" and we see that the concept of "Anglo-Saxon" is a myth. In Birmingham and London the two main cities south of Manchester we have Scots/Irish as the largest ethnic groups and considering 250 years of this emigration to England has taken place I really doubt that England is Anglo-Saxon and Britain or the UK is most certainly not.

To say 10 years ago that South Africa was an "Aryan" nation would have brought considerable outrage and I fail to see how "Anglo-Saxon" Britain is treated differently.

It fails to accept that this is not some "Aryan" nation whose roots lie in Germany...

The truth is a person in deepest Berkshire is more "Keltic" than any "Celt" and should be looked as more than Anglo-Saxon which is a total denial of their roots. The Scots and those now called Irish bear little if any resemblance to these Gaullic Belgae of Southern England and certainly not the Germanics in terms of religion, language and cultural flags such as music. Again what the UK fails to explain is how the Scots play music in a pentatonic scale. Again showing links with Egypt and India the only two other cultures to play in this scale. The Scots/Irish refused to accept European music and similar to the Egyptians refused to change this approach. How does this tie in with the "Kelti" and the Germanic tribes of Europe? The truth is that UK history will not seek to address these

points, as it no doubt feels that it will encourage nationalism in the so-called Celtic fringe. I think it is too late for that and their very politic in history will be the motivation behind a drive for independence. Scots do already smell a rat and the "Anglophiles" who like to imagine that Britain is an entity and UK history is authentic and politic free will really is known as Quislings to their culture.

I find it amazing that the Scots are constantly derided. Padraig was Scots, Columba was Scots, Johannus Scotus was Scots. Are we seriously suggesting the men who did more to keep the progress started by the Phoenicians amongst others alive were all thieves? Johannus the thief? Padraig the thief? The Anglophiles will not stop and see that all they are doing is constantly stating their case for Scots ignorance for they do not want to accept the inevitable truth of history. There is no great Anglo-Saxon Germanic Britain and there never will be. Jim Davidson their archetypal Cockney, the epitome of Englishness has a Scots mother and father. The mayor of London Ken Livingstone is the same.

Michael Portillo has a Scottish mother/Spanish father and he is supposed to be the face of English nationalism! The list is endless and has been for a long time for the Anglo-Saxons have never been successful at ruling themselves!

Seriously there are a lot of questions to be answered regarding the Scots and the use of Irish and Irish monks is part of this denial of Scots contribution. The interesting thing for me was the lack of P in the Semitic/Phoenician alphabet and the use of laryngeal vowels or glottal stops another feature of Gaelic and Scots pronunciation certainly amongst the working class.

You have to remember that the Scots rebelled against the usage of QE II or Queen Elizabeth the Second as her royal title for she was our first Queen Elizabeth and the insignias had to be changed in Scotland due to a bombing campaign. Scots consider this family as theirs for the British had to go outside these isles when crowning William of Orange and the Hanover kings and the reason this could go ahead was because both kings were married to Stuarts. They come into the British Royal Family when a Stuart

marries a daughter of Robert the Bruce who could claim the crown because his mother was Lennox and she in turn was related to Appin and back it goes to the Dalriada kings and beyond.

There were some Saxon women who married Scots kings such as Margaret the wife of Malcolm Canmore who was an extremely popular woman in her time but there are no other links for her line and with it the last of the real Aethelings is dead. There were other marriages from this line that produced and it is through these that the Queen can claim relation to Aethrelred but if she was honest she would confess she would find it easier to get to Lennox, Appin and other "Celtic" nobles.

I think that perhaps we see too much Anglicising and Romanising and not enough realising in the UK.

PS. I was not serious when I suggested you remove the anglophiliac stuff. I wouldn't dare to impose myself on a friend like this but I hope you let your English friends know that this Jock ain't buying it!

PPS. Does your friends know the Scots/Irish brought the Harp to Britain. I never knew that the Gauls played the harp and I am sure they were not pentatonic in Europe. Where do the pentatonic, lack of P, and the lack of Romanisation come from?

PPPS. The UK monarchy has a long tradition of seeking New Jerusalem and this contrasted with the European thought, which was along the Athens/Rome line. This Semitic/Phoenician link is best exemplified by the UK aping the Spartan model and it is only in the last 60 years that Athens has become popular in both the British and American intelligentsia. The British aped the Phoenicians in using a large navy and establishing coastal bases where there was trade opportunities and using only a small professional army to back this up. The ideology was if an inferior society required cutlery and pottery for example we would offer these and in return take their gold or other assets. Does it sound familiar Salim? Remember England until Elizabeth I was a pirate state. There was no church recognition of England and therefore it was an early "criminal state". It is only after the union that England thrives as a state and traders for we

brought the Baltic trade and some of the most fertile land in the whole of Europe not to mention a sound basis in Presbyterianism and with it the recognition of universal progress. The most magnificent ships at the time of Elizabeth are not English, Spanish or Portuguese. No they are recognised as the Scots and perhaps the Templar fleet coming here had something to do with this. The largest ships in terms of cannon, sails and size were Scots and in this period that was the mark of strength.

The type of excuses we hear to maintain this Anglo-Saxon history of Britain fails to amaze me. They have suggested Romans left Egyptian faience beads found in burial cairns in Scotland. The lack of P is because we were a truly barbarian tribe. So that make the Phoenicians barbaric then... The pentatonic scale is because this shows we were a primitive people yet this ignores that pentatonic societies do it for a specific reason. The lists go on. Phoenician and Egyptian designed gold displaying jaguars and elephants found buried in old kings burial tombs are put down as Roman gifts (which must be a first!) and this is said from a culture than insists that we were barbarians.

I still await a good answer on these questions and the fact we were the greatest mathematicians of the last 1600 years. In addition, the Phoenician type writing and the use of Phoenician like names such as Tyre and Barra and the laryngeal vowels lack of P. The fact that the declaration of independence or declaration of Arbroath -- the foundation of the modern independent state according to American historians, I believe -- stresses our links with Egypt and Scythia akin to Johannus Scotus and earlier Roman writers with it's references to Moses and Methuselah and insistence on leaving Egypt and settling in Scythia for a long time and then founding a kingdom in Spain and finally coming to Scotland.

I know that it is too much to say they were Phoenician or Egyptian for that matter but I do not think we originate in these isles. The Milesians from whom the Scots claim descent and which most historians accept signified a real historical series of events namely the Scots invading Ireland as it is known today were supposed to have come from the land of the dead which is associated with Spain and this is again asserted in the Arbroath letter. Have I already told you that we claim to have had a

kingdom surrounded by savages and the Catalans who still call a ship Barca are our kin? The only peoples I know that had a kingdom surrounded by savages was the Carthaginians and what separates the Scots from the Celts who invaded Spain is again the lack of P and the lack of spears in burial. Thanks for reading my latest epic and if you want to put anything up run it past me as I am known to get excited on this matter and sometimes heart rules head! I hope everything is going well for you and that life is looking after you.

—son—he is fascinated by the Phoenicians as I relay the tale of Hannibal to him. Thanks for this Salim, as I want him to embrace the roots of his culture, which, I believe, should steer him away from the Romano-Greco ignorance. There is far more to life than Athens and Rome and they seem to forget Hellenism was in many ways the peak of the Phoenician influence on Greece as you have so well shown. Write back soon and let me know what you wish to use and as long as it is not a rant from me I am proud you feel that my thoughts are of value.

Remains of undersea ancient city discovered off Tyre

TYRE, Lebanon, March 31, 2001 (AFP) - The remains of a 4,000-year-old city, Yarmuta, have been found off the shores of southern Lebanon, proving the gradual receding of the eastern coast of the Mediterranean. Historian Yussef Hurani and the president of the syndicate of Lebanese professional divers, Mohamad Sarji, announced this week the discovery of the city of Yarmuta off the coast of Zahrani, north of the ancient city of Tyre.

The remains of the city, stretching over an area of four square kilometers (1.5 square miles), are located on a depth of between three and 17 meters some 60 to 800 meters off the coast.

Among the remains was a 30-meter-long wall with a width of 70 centimeters found 60 meters off the coast.

"The excellent state in which the wall was found proves that the receding of the shore was a slow process," Hurani said in an interview with AFP. They also found paved roads, covered with algae, some of which were 60 meters long at a depth of five meters some 250 meters off the coast.

A pile of stones which had apparently been used for the construction of houses was also discovered on the site, as well as remains of a stairway, squares and dikes at a depth of some 17 meters.

"The theory of the receding shores was born after the discovery of many remains swallowed by the sea," said Hurani who has been gathering and studying documents about undersea cities off the Lebanese coasts for 40 years.

"Writings dating back to 1934 by French archaeologist Poidebard, who had carried out studies about the remains of the city of Tyre, had first drawn my attention," he explained.

Hurani said Poidebard had "gathered testimony from old fishermen, who had all clearly recalled having seen visible remains under the water, off the coast of Tyre, that had later disappeared."

The name of Yarmuta last appeared in the "Letters of Tell Amara," written in 1370 BC by the governor of the ancient port city of Byblos, north of Beirut.

In the document, Yarmuta was described as an important centre of supplies, particularly in wood, for the Pharaohs.

Searches have also led to the discovery of a statue with the head of a lion and the body of a man resembling the god of "Basta," revered by the ancient Egyptians in the 15th century BC.

"In the Pharaonic texts, dating back to more than 38 centuries, Yarmuta was mentioned as one of the hostile cities located along the present Lebanese coast such as Sheet, Byblos or Araqa, at a time Tyre, Sidon and Beirut did not yet exist," said Hurani.

He said searches on the remains of Yarmuta started two years ago following the undersea discovery, by divers led by Sarji, of remains of the antique city of Sidon.

He said the remains of the antique Sidon led to the discovery of squares and streets that consisted as "a first evidence of the possibility of the gradual receding of the Lebanese coast."

Hebrews

By chance I checked my guest book and found your message. Thanks for your kind words. I have looked at your most interesting website and will certainly link to it from my page on Phoenicia.

Let me take up one point with you while I am writing. You complain justifiably about the Euro and Hebrew centredness of western history. This is quite true but you are accepting it yourself in a most important way that you might decide to change.

I refer to the use of the word Hebrew to mean Jewish. Thus you write with emphasis:

The claim that the Hebrews were Phoenician Canaanites was/is an unfounded heresy. The Phoenicians and the Hebrews were **NEVER** the same people.

You mean, of course, that the Phoenicians and the Jews were never the same people. As you will know, the Phoenicians were part of the Persian province of Abarnahara -- Eber-niri, to the Assyrians -- the region 'Beyond the River' (Euphrates) to the people like the Assyrians and Persians who lived further east. This region is what we now call the Levant and included Phoenicians, inland Canaanites (Edomites, Moabites, Israelites, Ammonites), Aramaeans, Arabs and the remnants of the Hitties and Hurrians. All of these were collectively called Hebrews, a word stemming from Eber.

My opinion is that the temple state of Yehud was set up by the Persians to serve the whole of the Satrapy of Abarnahara, which is the reason all of the governors 'Beyond the River' (it is always translated thus in the Hebrew bible, rather than shown as a place name) had to contribute to its upkeep (see Ezra). The Jews were colonists moved in by the Persians to

maintain the temple state and collect taxes from Abarnahara. They were given privileges over the natives (Israelites, also called Samaritans and Am ha Eretz) and treated as Zoroastrians by the Persians for doing their job effectively.

Again the Jewish scriptures (written in the Phoenician script called Hebrew -- the script adopted for the province, or at least for its holy books) are plain that the Jews were not 'returning' because they despised the local Canaanites and would have nothing to do with them, though the mythology is that they were the Jews that had not been taken into exile, and so the brethren of the 'returners'.

After the conquest of Persia, Judah became a part of the Greek kingdoms and the satrapy divided -- names previously with a distinct meaning were left the property of the temple attendants. The Jerusalem temple became the temple of the Jews, who considered themselves a nation of priests -- because they were, under the Persians.

Nevertheless many people elsewhere had, under Persian patronage, taken to the religion these priests served -- a form of Zoroastrianism, so Jews extended throughout the Persian satraps, and later extended into Rome. They were never a nation until the time of the Maccabees, but were a sect dedicated to a particular god. It is plain that they could not have procreated in such numbers in a short time from a tiny underpopulated country of arid hills, but they multiplied by conversion from a variety of religions considered Daevic by the Zoroastrians.

So, to conclude, you are accepting that Hebrew exclusively means Jew. It does not, but it does quite justifiably mean Phoenician! Or anyone else that lived in Eber-niri. This explains fully why Jews have three names -- Jews, Israelites and Hebrews. What other explanation is there? It is also an explanation of:

Many parts of the Old Testament were plagiarized from Phoenician literature, poetry, and religion, similar to plagiarizing of the Book of Job (for example) from Babylonian tales.

Please consider this a contribution to your discussion about Phoenician matters, if you wish. Mike Magee

The Hidden Jesus: The Secret Testament Revealed 1997

[snip] I am probably guilty myself. I have pages written long ago in which I am sure I will speak of Hebrews, but when we mean Jews we should say Jews. It is because the bible is called the Hebrew bible, because the Judaeo-Christian God is called the Hebrew God and because the bible in places calls the Israelites Hebrews that we continue the habit, but it is an appellation of wider significance.

[snip] Well, quite true, which is it? The Jews were set in place as privileged priests of the Jerusalem temple state. The previous inhabitants were Canaanites who apparently called themselves Israel meaning (as you will know) something like we are the sons (or seed) of El, because their god was El. The Jews were colonists -- an elite, privileged, imposing a new unknown god on the colony to be centred on Jerusalem.

I accept that Yehouah was another local god known as a son of El but the colonists adopted this name as the name of their revised god -- a god based on Ahuramazda. So, even the local people who revered Yehouah found that this Yehouah was not their own. As you point out on your own interesting pages, their Yehouah had a consort, Asherah. The local people never accepted the nation of priests, and the Samaritans (same as the Israelites) and Jews never got on. The Jews called them disparagingly, the Am ha Eretz -- the Men (people) of the Land (peasants) but also probably punning on Mother Earth, because they still revered goddesses (or a goddess).

[snip] It is important for people that think like us, a small minority, should aim to show the other side of the story. The Phoenicians were very great people. It is not a question of seeking to make the Phoenicians replace the Greeks because there is no doubting that Greeks were also great, but debts should be acknowledged. My own particular interest of late has been to show that the Jewish religion was deliberately set up by the Persians to further their foreign policy in Palestine. The links between Judaism and

Zoroastrianism are profound -- and Zoroastrianism came first! You will have read in the item you spoke of on my pages about the Phoenicians that the temple they had in Spain, according to a classic writer, sounded Zoroastrian in its practices. My guess is that the Persians were doing the same in all their satrapies. Their name for believers in other religions was the Juddin! Is that a remarkable coincidence or not?

They apparently had a ministry to set up a common Juddin religion, for the same purpose as the Romans tried to promote syncretism and the cult of the Emperors -- to unite a large and diverse empire. Karen Armstrong, a former nun and now a religious commentator, wrote a book called the 'History of God' in which she mentions Zoroastrianism only three times in the index and does not mention the Persians at all. I find this so bizarre that I am inclined to believe the silence of the biblical scholars is deliberate. The scholars know that much of the Jewish bible is propaganda and mythology, not true history, but few are willing to admit it, for political reasons, and for the sake of their careers#

[snip] It is simple really. The Jews are the believers in Yehouah as the universal God but not his son. They are not a distinct people but a sect, members of whom could be any nationality or ethnic group. They always have been a sect but have sought nationhood through false mythology, surely written mainly in the second century BC when the Jewish state existed briefly under the Maccabees. I mean, of course, the false invasion of Canaan, the false period of Judges (unless it is allegorical), the false kingdom of David and Solomon. Not a jot has ever been found outside the Jewish scriptures, that cannot be disputed, that backs up any of this false history. It is ancient propaganda. The kingdom of David and Solomon is precisely the Persian Satrapy of Abarnahara projected back 500 years.

[snip] I agree they are all equally crazy -- and liars. It has always baffled me why they think God wants them to lie for him, but they are all too stupid even to realise that they are lying. They obviously think God gave them brains so that they could lie for him, and not so that they could actually think and come to moral decisions about truth and justice. The reason for this is that none of it comes from God but from rulers who want to control the way people think.

[snip] The use of Semite to mean only Jews is another example of the stealing of words, like Hebrew and Israelite. Too many Israelis are themselves anti-Semitic in that they treat the Semitic Palestinians abysmally. Many diaspora Jews, liberal Jews here in the UK and doubtless in the US too, are concerned about the actions of Israeli governments, but out of loyalty, or fear, say nothing.

The curious thing is that the Jews were set up by the Persians in just the situation that they now find themselves. A privileged class able to treat the People of the Land with contempt. Doubtless, I too would be falsely accused of anti-Semitism for making these comments. The nationalities of the Near East are in any case (you might not wish to agree but it is true) are so mixed up, it must be impossible to say that this person is Semitic or not. It was even more the case probably at the time we are speaking of. If the Phoenicians were Canaanites mixed with the People of the Sea, then they were probably themselves of partly Aryan blood.

The Medes and Persians were Aryans. The Assyrians were supposedly Semites and doubtless they were mainly but had already bred with the Kassites and the Mitanni -- Aryans. The Sumerians were not Semites, and not Aryans either! The Hittites were Aryans. The Aramaeans were Semites. All mixed together in the melting pot, as the presence of Aryan words in languages like Akkadian prove. I suppose the reason why Semitic characteristics are prominent today is because of the Arab conquests, but genes do not disappear -- they just dilute! They are still there. Modern Jews, having lived in the west for millennia, are thoroughly mixed genetically.

[snip] Well, I always feel guilty when I am not trying to complete the central investigations of my own sites, like when I write letters like this :), so I must decline your invitation, but if you want to use the material from these letters -- just as direct correspondence, if you like, because you also will not want to waste time by editing -- then fine.

If you have not read it, take a look at 'The Invention of Ancient Israel' by Keith W Whitelam (London 1996). Whitelam is an archaeologist appalled by the dishonesty about Ancient Israel. He is a professor in a Scottish

University. His book is pretty repetitive but perhaps he needed it to get his message over. He is fond of quoting Edward Said.

[snip] There is a funerary inscription of the Sidonian king, Eshmunazer II who reigned in the mid fifth century BC (Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Pars Prima: Inscriptiones Phoenias Continens I (Paris 1881)) in which the king says the Persians allowed the Sidonian king to rule "Dor and Joppa, the mighty lands of Dagon, which are in the plains of Sharon, in accordance with the important deeds that I did. And we added them to the borders of the country, so that they would belong to Sidon forever" (trans F Rozenhal, ANET 662). This shows that the whole of the coastal plain was administered from Phoenicia at about the time the temple state of Yehud was being set up. If the Phoenicians were using their own script at this time and not Aramaic script, then the religious books of the Jews would have been written in the script of the local administration -- Phoenician Hebrew script, the script of the province of Abarnahara. Shortly afterwards, I believe the Persians made Aramaic the official language of diplomacy and Aramaic script will have replaced Hebrew, but evidently not in holy books. It also means of course that half of modern Israel belongs to Lebanon! Apologies if this is not news to you.



Steven Books

**League Enterprises
Suite 3, 3rd. Floor
148 Cambridge Heath Road
London
E1 5QJ**

For books by identity authors –
Kenneth McKilliam, Ria Splinter
and Richard Porter plus many
other subjects and difficult to
obtain books.

<http://www.stevenbooks.co.uk/category/341/Religion>



**The Chronicles Of The
Migrations Of The
Twelve Tribes Of Israel
From The Caucasus
Mountains Into Europe**

**By
Pastor Eli James**

The above PowerPoint presentation is available at Pastor Eli's website:

www.anglo-saxonisrael.com

Parts 1 - 6 plus a short introduction can now be viewed or downloaded - the latest addition part 6 covers the German people in relation to the migrations of the Tribes of Israel.

Contact us for details of audio tapes and articles by:-

Dr. Wesley A. Swift

Rev. Dr. Bertrand Comparet

Rev. William Gale

Captain K. R. McKilliam

Pastor Don Campbell



**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

