

# **“Christian Jews”**



**By**  
**Willie Martin**

# “Christian Jews”

By

Willie Martin

**F**ROM TIME TO TIME IT IS INFORMATIVE TO LOOK AT WRITINGS OF PEOPLE SEVERAL YEARS IN THE PAST.

Such is this one by a so-called (sic) Christian Jew; there is no such thing, for either one is a Jew or he is a Christian, they cannot be both at the same time. For Yahshua said that we could not serve two masters.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." (Matthew 6:24; Luke 16:13)

Our Israel people have been so thoroughly deceived by the Judeo-Christian clergy, trained by Jews in the cemeteries - I mean seminaries that we must repeat the truth so many times in so many different ways that it will finally catch on and become infused in the minds of our Christian Israelites; and therefore they will understand the truth as they see it and not believe all the lies and Jewish fables.

In an article in The Sunday School Times (March 14, 1954) poses the question in its title: "Are the Anglo-Saxons the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel?" The writer was a Dr. Jacob Gartenhaus and the information given in the accompanying editorial note was the he was a Christian Jew who was president of the International Board of Jewish Missions.

The Sunday School Times is obviously capitalizing upon the fact that Dr. Gartenhaus was a Jew (howbeit a Christian), trusting that this in itself would carry sufficient weight to substantiate his assertions. Yet even the editorial staff of The Sunday School Times would not at all agree with the position taken by most Jewish scholars, regardless of their knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, as to the identification of the Messiah, whom they still reject. Might not a Jew be equally mistaken in other Scriptural matters?

Just as Jewry rejected the King of the Kingdom over two thousand years ago, so today the Christian Church is rejecting the actuality of a literal Kingdom over which the King of king is to reign.

It is apparent that Dr. Gartenhaus, upon his conversion to Christianity, has also been indoctrinated with this unscriptural conception of the Kingdom of God. Thus, by repudiating the identity of the people of the Kingdom, he follows a line of false teachings based upon a system of interpretation of the Bible that incorporates the extreme error of "spiritualising" away the truth of its literal statements.

The article by Dr. Gartenhaus begins with the statement that the position we hold "is a strange and fanciful theory that the English-speaking peoples are the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel (actually the English speaking peoples, French, German, and etc., are the descendants of all thirteen tribes of Israel). It is claimed that the British people and their colonial off-shoots, including the United States of America, are the descendants of the so-called lost ten tribes of Israel, which were carried away into Assyria and in the course of time migrated to Europe and settled in England..."

These remarks are succeeded by a sketchy list of facts taken from our tenants of belief, compiled with scant regard for accuracy (typical Jewish). Then Dr. Gartenhaus went on to state:

"From this folk tale, which has not the slightest historical background, we are asked to accept that the British people (actually all of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples) are the descendants of the ten lost tribes."

This is followed by an expression which is always a "give-away" concerning the lack of careful examination and study of our position on the part of those who undertake to condemn it. "Briefly," he says, "we are asked to believe that a great mass of Israelites poured into the British Isles and immediately took on a new physiognomy, customs, names, which have no affinity with the ancient Israelites; all this without a single Scriptural or historical proof. If it can be proved that all of this is contrary to history and the clear teachings of God's Word, then the whole theory of Israelism collapses. This I shall attempt to do in this 'brief' article."

In the first place, the many years of painstaking research in historical records and the Bible by men whose only objective was to learn the truth of God's Word and gain an understanding of His purposes cannot be reduced to brief and careless restatement by those who thereby admit they have given only superficial attention to the subject. Nor can the weight of factual evidence now available be lightly swept aside by a loosely-composed "brief" article which is the product of shallow reasoning.

Dr. Gartenhaus finds it very easy to express his opinion that the fact of the identity of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples with the House of Israel "has not the slightest historical background" and is "without a single Scriptural or historical proof." However, his article reveals at once that he has examined neither the Scriptural nor the historical evidence which is at hand and which proves beyond successful refutation that the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples are indeed the Israel of God in the world today. In other words, like almost all Jews he was a liar.

For example, the assertion that there is no biblical or historical evidence corroborating Jeremiah's flight from Palestine by way of Egypt to the Isles in the West is amply dealt with in the study I sent out on Tea Tephí and Ireland. No opponent of the identity has ever attempted to answer the Scriptural and historical evidence presented. They are quick to deny the validity of the facts presented, but they bring forth no facts which refute the testimony given. They only mouth things that have no bearing on the subject at all.

No accredited researcher who has patiently delved into the records of history to trace the westward trek of the House of Israel through central and southern Europe to the Scandinavian countries and the British Isles ever made the statement that "a great mass of the Israelites 'poured' into the British Isles and 'immediately took on a new physiognomy, customs, names...'"

On the contrary, the trek of the Israel tribes occupied from twelve to fourteen centuries. During this period they dwelt from time to time in various lands, breaking up into smaller segments which took other names and changed their customs to suit new environments. Eventually, as the

narrative of any history book dealing with the period will show, they began to arrive in the British Isles, known only by the new names with which modern history students are familiar; Angles, Jutes, Frisians, Celts, Picts, Scots, Gaels, Saxons and others.

Many books have been written on this phase of the subject alone and the most recent findings of research are presented in the first ten chapters of the book entitled *Chemivision* by Dr. William J. Hale. Also, the end leaf map in the rear of the book, *Primogeneis*, is a clear depiction of the trek of the Israel tribes. The pulse-stirring saga of the travels of the House of Israel after they left their Assyrian captivity and trekked throughout Asia Minor, Europe and finally to the "isles of the sea," where they were regathered and became again one people to fulfill the purpose of God, is summed up in the graphic statement of the Lord, given through Amos:

"For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth." (Amos 9:9)

## **Racial Characteristics**

Dr. Gartenhaus raises the issue of the physiognomy of the people of the House of Israel by his statement quoted above. We assume the Doctor's intimation is that all Israelites should look like Jews. But the people of the House of Israel **WERE NOT JEWS** as we know Jews to be today; therefore, the absurd conclusion he reaches and ridicules; that the Israelites "immediately took on a new physiognomy" is his own, not ours.

The characteristics of the racial type we recognize as that of the Jews today were the result of intermarriages in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. At that time a mutation of the blood stream occurred when many men of the Southern Kingdom, or House of Judah, upon their return to Palestine from Babylon, took wives from among the Hittites and other Canaanitish people in the land for themselves and their sons, while their daughters also married Hittite men. This defection from God's will was strongly condemned and the result of it was the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy: "The shew of their countenance doth witness against them." (Isaiah 3:9)

Dr. Gartenhaus makes a point of the fact that their new names "have no affinity with the ancient Israelites" and others have also raised the objection that the modern House of Israel does not speak the language of their forefathers. However, Isaiah declared:

"For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people."  
(Isaiah 28:11)

It is shown in Strong's Concordance that the expression "stammering lips" can refer to "foreign lips;" that is, speaking in another language. Therefore, to discover modern Israel using a different language than that of their forefathers is actually a proof of identity; not evidence against it.

Many books have been written which prove that the English language had its origin in the ancient Hebrew. One such book is *The Word The Dictionary That Reveals The Hebrew Source of English*, by Isaac E. Mozeson.

Stressing the fact that if the Anglo-Saxons are modern Israel, they do not demonstrate it by following the customs of their forefathers, the Doctor again asserts that this disproves the claimed identity. Yet this complete forgetfulness of former customs is exactly what Jeremiah predicted would take place when he addressed a message toward the north, declaring that backsliding Israel had justified herself more than treacherous Judah (note, incidentally, the very definite difference between Israel and Judah). The prophet was told:

"Go and proclaim these words toward the north, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord; and I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger for ever." (Jeremiah 3:12)

Note carefully that the context clearly shows that this message is addressed to the House of Israel and not to the House of Judah. Jeremiah thus makes a definite distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah, Dr. Gartenhaus and the editors of *The Sunday School times* to the contrary notwithstanding.

The objection most often raised is also put forward by Dr. Gartenhaus that, because of the Anglo-Saxons do not practice the ancient custom of circumcision of the flesh, this excludes them from a racial share in the natural promises to Abraham. The answer to this objection was fully set forth in the article, "What Saith the Scriptures," previously referred to, from which the following is quoted:

"Let us pause here a moment and consider what the opponents of the identity of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples with the House of Israel consider to be a major objection. The issue is raised that, because the Anglo-Saxon peoples do not carry out the ritual of circumcision, they cannot be Israel. These critics are overlooking the facts of history in the records of Scripture that, while in exile, the rite of circumcision was not always practiced by God's people. This was the case with Israel during the years they wandered in the wilderness, following their exodus from Egypt. The account states that those who came out of Egypt were circumcised, and goes on to explain:

"But all the people that were born in the wilderness by the way as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had no circumcised. (Joshua 5:5)

"Although the children of Israel were uncircumcised as they journeyed through the forty years in the wilderness, they were still God's people. But even more important is the fact that Moses gave instructions as to the type of circumcision Israel was to practice in the latter days after the Lord God turned back their captivity. He said at that time:

**'THE LORD THY GOD WILL CIRCUMCISE THINE HEART, AND THE HEART OF THY SEED, TO LOVE THE LORD THY GOD WITH ALL THINE HEART,** and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.' (Deuteronomy 30:6)

"Paul designated this type of circumcision as the circumcision of those who were followers of Jesus Christ, stating:

"' Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.' (Romans 2:29)

"He further confirmed this in his Epistle to the Philippians when he said:

"' For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.' (Philippians 3:3)

"The interesting fact here is that Moses declared that Christian circumcision would be in evidence among the seed of Abraham after the Lord turned back their captivity.

Thus, the argument of the opponents that the failure on the part of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to practice circumcision in the flesh is conclusive evidence that they are not the lineal descendants of Abraham and Sarah is not a valid reason for denying that they are the House of Israel in the world today. According to Moses himself they were to be circumcised of heart in the latter days."

Following the usual practice of those who attack the great truths of the identity, Dr. Gartenhaus parrots what many before him have said, that Richard Brothers, of limited mental capacity, was the first modern apostle of this truth. It has been repeatedly shown the fallacy of this assertion, but it seems to be too much to ask these opponents to act in a spirit of fair play to the extent of taking into consideration the facts which have been printed concerning this matter.

The error of this statement was clearly shown in "How Old Is This Anglo-Saxon Truth?," published in *Destiny* for March 1939, September 1941 and November 1949, and other publications of even older dates, the latter under the title, "Strange Error of the Scholars." Not once have the opponents undertaken to answer the evidence presented in these articles. It is nothing short of intellectual dishonesty to repeat charges already answered a hundred or more time while ignoring the answers. Again referring to the above-mentioned material, it was pointed out in *Destiny* for February 1954, page 49:

"Dating from the year 665 A.D., to the year 1634 A.D., over one hundred and fifty references to the identity of the Anglo-Saxon people with ancient Israel have been discovered."

Richard Brothers was active at the end of the eighteenth centuries, so he could not have originated a truth that had already been known long before he was born. The article remarks:

"All of these testimonies antedate the period of poor Richard Brothers. It is not surprising that he, earnest student of the Scriptures that he was, saw the truth also; the mystery is that students more sane than he can miss it."

Prejudice is a powerful influence in preventing the truth from being accepted by those under its sway. Prejudice and the desire not to be upset in their beliefs, not the lack of factual evidence and testimony, motivated the Jews of our Lord's day, leading them to reject Him as their Messiah, and these two influences may be the greater part of the reason why Judeo-Christian leaders in Christendom today oppose the Gospel of the Kingdom that proclaims the identity of the people of the Kingdom as the House of Israel today.

Much is continually made of the idea that the acceptance of the identity fosters an inordinate "pride of race." But we wonder whether it is that they fear this, or that they, subconsciously at least, dare not acknowledge their origin because they must then accept their "responsibility" as God's Chosen Servants and witnesses, with all that this involves.

We are reminded of the nature of God's quarrel with His people of the House of Israel when they first went into Assyrian captivity. He said to them then:

"And when you say, 'We will be like the nations, the races of the land, in serving wood and stone,' what you have in mind shall not be." (Ezekiel 20:32, Smith & Goodspeed Translation)

They were saying then that they preferred to be like the other races even to the adoption of their customs and practices. But god said:

"As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you." (Exodus 20:33)

Apparently some are still reluctant to divorce themselves from thinking they are non-Israelites, but we have God's word for it that He will deal with this. The Lord states:

"And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant." (Ezekiel 20:37)

The flat statement that "the Anglo-Saxons are a mixed race" is another wholly erroneous argument. They are no more "mixed" than were the original sons of Jacob, with their different mothers. This idea smacks of racial mongrelization propaganda which is a subversive endeavor on the part of those leading their influence to it to frustrate God's plan concerning His people

The Jews, on the other hand, are a bastard people; which is the result of the mixing of True Israelites with the other races and peoples of the Earth. Which has been going on since the beginning of time, even before there were Israelites. But for clarity lets start with Esau and his Canaanite wives; Judah and his Canaanite wife; the Israelites who came back from the Babylonian captivity and their non-Israel wives. Therefore, in all honesty, it must be admitted that some Jews have Israelite blood in them, but that does not mean they are Israel. For the Khazars who comprise most of Jewry today are NOT in any way related to the Israelites by blood or any other means.

The records of the early Irish Chronicles disprove the claim that the Coronation Stone which rested in the Coronation Chair in Westminster Abby, until recently, originated in Scotland. It is a known fact of history that this Stone came to Scotland from Ireland and sufficient proof of its antiquity is set forth in the book "The Stone of History," in the Documentary Studies, Vol. 1, pages 265-283. This evidence is ignored by the writer of The Sunday School Times article.

Dr. Gartenhaus bases his refecton of the true origin of this Stone on a microscopic examination of particles of accumulated dust removed from it when it was being cleaned, which seemed to identify it with the territory near Scone in Scotland. We know that the stone did rest for many hundreds

of years in Scotland, having been brought there from Ireland. The articles of dust gathered from the Stone in the process of cleaning it could very readily have for their origin the Scottish location where the Stone had remained for so many centuries.

But there is another fact completely ignored by the Doctor. There are two iron rings connected by short chains fastened to both ends of this Stone. What is the explanation of the fact that these rings are worn very thin as a result of the Stone being carried for a long time, evidently swinging on staves run through them? We know such an extensive journey was never accomplished in Ireland,, Scotland or England where the Stone has been since Jeremiah landed with Tea Tephi on the shores of Ireland, bringing this Stone with them. If this Stone is indeed the Stone of Jacob, then the rings were worn thin during the forty years it was carried in the wilderness journey from Egypt to the Promised Land.

Dr. Gartenhaus takes the position that there is no Scriptural evidence supporting the view of the distinction between the Northern Kingdom, or House of Israel, and the two tribes of the Southern Kingdom, or House of Judah. He says:

"As concerning the claim that there is a distinction between the two and the House of Israel , my reply is that there is not a single Scripture supporting such a view."

Actually to claim there is no evidence in the Bible of a distinction between the House of Israel and the remainder of the tribes of Israel, regardless of whether the name "Judah" or "Israel" was applied to them, demonstrates either ignorance of the facts or a desire to falsify the record. It is a well-known fact of Biblical history that, even when united in Palestine, the distinction between the House of Israel and the rest of Israel was so marked that Biblical writers have found it necessary to take this into consideration.

There was not a ruler in all Israel who did not have to take this distinction into account; otherwise, he would have been confronted with major political difficulties: "Following the death of Saul, the men of Judah came

to David and anointed him king over the House of Judah. Afterward David was informed of what the men of Jabesh-gilead had done in burying Saul and he sent a message to them, commending them for the kindness they had shown toward their former king.

"Another, the captain of Saul's army, took Ish-bosheth, Saul's son, and made him king over eleven tribes (2 Samuel 2:8-10), but the House of Judah pledged their loyalty to David. This distinction between the two houses is clearly marked in the Scriptures long before the time of the division of the Kingdom when the House of Israel revolted from the rule of the House of David after Rehoboam, Solomon's son, came to the throne.

"When Saul was seeking the life of David, the same distinction was made between the armies of Judah and the armies of Israel. This separation between Israel and Judah is further emphasized in the record of the length of David's reign, for the account states that he reigned over the House of Judah for seven years and six months in Hebron and afterward over all Israel for thirty-three year." (2 Samuel 5:5; Promagenesis, p. 443)

Even after David became King of all Israel, he experienced some difficulty in overcoming the prejudices still existing between the two branches of Israel. Eventually, King Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, was unable to heal the breach that led the House of Israel to revolt from his rule.

As an example given by Dr. Gartenhaus on which he lays much stress in an effort to show that all twelve tribes (actually 13, which shows that Dr. Gartenhaus never really studied the scriptures) of Israel returned to Palestine in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah is the sacrifice offered by the remnant that returned. The account states:

"Also the children of those that had been carried away, which were come out of the captivity, offered burnt offerings unto the God of Israel, twelve bullocks for all Israel." (Ezra 8:35)

The Doctor assumes that, because the sacrifice called for a bullock for each one of the twelve tribes, all twelve tribes must therefore be present. The Bible, however, does not sustain such a contention, for when only a

part of Israel offered a sacrifice unto the God of Israel, that sacrifice had to represent every tribe in the offering made even though all the tribes were not present. This was true in the instance above quoted, for Ezra states that present at that sacrifice were the children of those who had been carried away into Babylonian captivity; therefore there were no "tribes" of the House of Israel present other than the tribe of Benjamin.

Chapter 2 of Ezra lists those who returned from Babylon and states in the first verse:

"Now these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of those which had been carried away, **WHOM NEBUCHADNEZZAR THE KING OF BABYLON HAD CARRIED AWAY UNTO BABYLON**, and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every one unto his city."

The House of Israel was carried away into Assyrian captivity, not by Nebuchadnezzar but by Shalmanezar, King of Assyria. That there were no tribes from the ten tribes of the House of Israel in the returning remnant, other than the tribe of Benjamin, is shown by the statement:

"Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple." (Ezra 4:1)

It does not mention adversaries of Ephraim, Manasseh, Gad or any of the other tribes of the House of Israel, for none of these tribes were present. It has been pointed out elsewhere that a few "families" of the Northern Kingdom of Israel did remain with the Southern Kingdom of Judah, but this in no way evidenced a "tribal" return of the House of Israel at that time. As a matter of fact, the article titled "What Saith the Scriptures?" points out why it was absolutely impossible for the House of Israel to return to the land of Palestine.

Dr. Gartenhaus next makes a sweeping statement that the prophets use the terms "Israel" and "Judah" interchangeably and that the terms "Jacob," "Israel" and "Judah" are used synonymously. Here is an example of the necessity to "search the Scriptures," making a "study" of God's Written Word rather than limiting oneself to a cursory reading of the Bible.

What the Doctor overlooks is that the term "Israel" can be applied to all the "tribes" and to each individual "tribe," for all were Israelites. However, the qualification of the name "Israel" by the use of the term "House of" can only be applicable to the Northern Kingdom. In the House of Israel there is no "tribe" of Judah. Nevertheless, Judah can be called Israel without the designation "House of," for Judah is a part of all Israel.

The House of Judah was made up of the remaining Israel tribes which were not included in the House of Israel. Bear in mind that any of the tribes of the House of Israel may be designated as Israel, but no tribe singly can be designated as the "House of Israel," for that term signifies the Northern Kingdom as a specific entity. There is not one instance in the Scriptures where the terms "House of Israel" and "House of Judah" are used interchangeably.

Here Dr. Gartenhaus' "case in point" falls to pieces. He quotes 2 Chronicles 19:1 which states that Jehoshaphat was king of Judah; then 2 Chronicles 21:2 which mentions Jehoshaphat as king of Israel. But let us examine the surrounding verses which form the context of 2 Chronicles 21:2. Just four verses previously, in 2 Chronicles 20:35, this statement is made:

"And after this did Jehoshaphat king of Judah join himself with Ahaziah king of Israel, who did very wickedly."

Were Ahaziah and Jehoshaphat both kings of Israel at the same time? Obviously not, or the above quoted verse makes no sense whatever. What is the correct explanation? Simply this, that Jehoshaphat was King of Judah, but because Judah was a part of all Israel, it could be said that he was an Israelite king. Israel was the all inclusive term; Judah was not.

When studying the Bible the most essential rule of all is to always consider a verse of Scripture in its context. To violate this rule is to invite errors in deduction which may make an accurate understanding of the whole revelation of the Scriptures impossible. When the term "Israel" is used alone, the context will show whether the House of Israel is meant or whether the Biblical writer had Judah as a part of Israel in mind. As a Bible scholar, Dr. Gartenhaus should be aware of these simple rules which

apply in every case where there is a supposed interchange of the names "Israel" and "Judah."

Because Dr. Gartenhaus maintains that there is no Scriptural distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Isaiah makes it very clear that there is such a separation when he addresses a people dwelling in the "isles." Whether those isles are coastlines or not begs the question; it is obvious that the people who are to receive the message are dwelling in a place far removed from where Isaiah was when he prophesied to them, for he designates them as "ye people from far:"

"Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken ye people from far—Thou art my servant, O Israel, in which I will be glorified." (Isaiah 49:1, 3)

Here we have a part of Israel addressed as His servants but dwelling in a distant land designated as the isles. That these people are not Jews is made clear by the prophet in his counsel to them:

"Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." (Isaiah 51:1)

The prophet's message is to a section of Israel who have lost the knowledge of their identity and are unaware of their origin. Let it be noted, however, that Isaiah is describing a people who are seeking the Lord and endeavoring to perform works of righteousness. He is calling upon them to recognize who their ancestors are, for he continues:

"Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you." (Isaiah 51:2)

This is not a message addressed to the Jews, for they have never forgotten their origin, nor allowed world to forget either, nor the fact that they "have Abraham to their father." (Matthew 3:9) Which is true, but at the same time they are a bastard mixed up people who are the result of miscegenation. That this portion of Israel addressed as His servants are not Jews is shown further by Isaiah's contrast of the blessings that would

come upon these servants of the Lord with the curses that would come upon the Jews.

Let the critic who insists the Jews represent all of Israel explain how Isaiah the Prophet, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, could make such a contrast between the servant race and the Jews. But because the Jews had forsaken the Lord, Isaiah prophetically declared:

"Therefore will I remember you (the Jews) to the sword, and ye shall bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted to. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, my servants (Israel) shall eat, but ye (the Jews) shall be hungry: behold, my servants (Israel) shall drink, but ye (the Jews) shall be ashamed: Behold, my servants (Israel) shall sing. for joy of heart, but ye (the Jews) shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye (the Jews) shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen (Israel): for the Lord God **SHALL SLAY THEE**, and call his servants (Israel) by another name (Christians)." (Isaiah 65:12-15)

There is not a statement in the Bible showing any more clearly than this the contrast between the Jews, who rejected Yahshua, and the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples, the modern House of Israel in the world today, who accepted Him as their Redeemer and have been called by a name other than that of Israel, for they are now known as a Christian people. Dr. Gartenhaus objects to the identified by name, but here is definite Scriptural evidence that the name by which modern Israel was to be called would bear no relationship to that by which their forefathers were known.

Hosea the Prophet confirmed the fact that such a change would take place when he said of latter-day Israel:

"And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people (as it is being said of the Anglo-Saxons, Germanic, Celtic and kindred peoples today by the Editors of The Sunday School Times and Dr. Gartenhaus), there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God (a Christian people)." (Hosea 1:10)

The statement is made that the prophets made no distinction between the House of Judah and the House of Israel; "nor in their future destinies," says the doctor, "which are identical." Yet Jeremiah declared that God divorced Israel and not Judah, a fact that cannot be highly set aside if one is to understand the significance of the "redemption" of Israel (not Judah):

"And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, and went and played the harlot also."  
(Jeremiah 3:8)

If words mean anything at all, it is certain that Jeremiah makes a distinction here, as he does frequently throughout his book. So do the rest of the prophets when the context is taken into consideration. This identification by context, in order that the people addressed may be properly established, is mandatory if the term "Israel," as used in the Scriptures, is to convey the proper meaning.

When the Doctor states that nowhere in the Bible is there any evidence that the House of Israel became lost to their origin and identity, Isaiah's call to them to awaken to the knowledge of their ancestry becomes meaningless. However, when Yahshua commissioned His disciples to go **"TO THE LOST SHEEP OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL"** (Matthew 10:6) He said this because Judah had not been divorced and sent away, that mission was not completed in Palestine, but after the death and resurrection of Yahshua, the disciples did go to the British Isles and there founded the first Christian Church at Glastonbury. This was two or three years after the crucifixion. Thus, at the very beginning of the Christian Era the Gospel was literally taken **TO THE LOST SHEEP OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.**

The Jews had rejected Yahshua and refused to accept the Gospel. The Galileans, who were Benjamintes and therefore a tribe of the House of Israel, accepted Christianity and from this tribe came all of our Lord's disciples except one, Judas the Jew, who betrayed Him. This move on the part of the disciples to take the Gospel to the Isles fulfilled our Lord's prediction, for, as a result of His rejection by the Jews, He said to them:

"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matthew 21:43)

Dr. Gartenhaus accuses us of saying the Jews were disinherited, but it was Yahshua who pronounced this verdict upon them for their rejection of Him, thus fulfilling Daniel's prophecy (Daniel 9:26) as it is given in the alternative translation of the passage in the margin of the King James Version:

"'And (the Jews) they shall be no more his people' or 'and the prince's (Messiah's ) future people.'"

Dr. Gartenhaus' controversy is not with us when we state the Jews ceased to be a part of the chosen people and to possess the Kingdom as a result of their rejection of Christ as their Messiah. His controversy is with Daniel the Prophet and with Christ Himself who declared that the Kingdom would be taken from them and given to a nation that would bring forth the fruits of that Kingdom (and Christ called the Jews the children of the devil in John 8:44) justice, equity, peace and righteousness in administration. As a Christian people that is precisely the mission of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic nations, and would have been had it not been for the Jews treachery and treason behind the scenes.

They have not attained perfection in this, largely because of the failure to awaken to the knowledge of their identity and to the necessity to restore the perfect administration of the Law of the Lord. All of this will be overcome, however, when Christ returns as King to reign over His Kingdom. We have the more sure word of prophecy that this is a certainty:

"The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1:32-33)

Actually the opposition is chargeable with the responsibility they must take for retarding the national spiritual awakening that will come when His people eventually become aware of these great truths. In the concluding paragraph of his article, Dr. Gartenhaus makes an observation

which is strangely expressed. He states, "but whether or not the Anglo-Saxons, Germanic, Scandinavian, Celtics are the Israelites is of little significance." Is there an intimation here that the Doctor is far from sure of the soundness of the position he has taken?

The Bible makes no provision for such an indifferent attitude toward the revelation of the identity of the House of Israel. The Prophet Ezekiel alone declares the importance of the revealing of the House of Israel to the world, at which time God will move to sanctify them in the sight of many nations:

"Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there. Neither will I hide my face any more from them: for I have poured my spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God." (Ezekiel 39:28-29)

Yet we have no quarrel with Dr. Gartenhaus' concluding remarks, for he says:

"The important question is, Are they with our without Christ? If they are with Christ, they are a holy nation and as such belong to the royal priesthood: 'But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.' (1 Peter 2:9) If they are without Christ, they are sinners and lost, as are any others without Christ: 'For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'" (Acts 4:12)

That Salvation is through Christ is in no way detracts from the essential fact of the redemption of Israel so that the Kingdom may be established upon the earth in perfecting. Its righteous rule will remove forever from the earth poverty, distress, sorrow, sickness; all the direct results of maladministration. To say that this latter fact is of no significance is to contradict the statement of Christ (Matthew 6:33\_) who said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

The things to be added are the essential needs of life which will bring peace, well-being and happiness to all the people. Dr. Gartenhaus may

consider this to be an unimportant aspect of the Gospel, but we doubt that those who are suffering because of the lack of righteousness in administration will agree with him.

Rather than follow the dictums of men, we prefer to believe the words of the inspired writers of the Scriptures that, when the House of Israel is revealed to the world and to themselves, there will come about such a spiritual awakening that the knowledge of the goodness of the Lord and His great works will be recognized not only among His people but by the nations around the earth as well. This revelation will establish the validity and accuracy of the Word of God and the statements of all His prophets, with the electrifying result that will fulfil Paul's appraisal (Romans 11:15) that the restoration of Israel will be as life from the dead.

From time to time it is informative to look at writings of people several years in the past. Such is this one by a so-called (sic) Christian Jew; there is no such thing, for either one is a Jew or he is a Christian, they cannot be both at the same time. For Yahshua said that we could not serve two masters.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." (Matthew 6:24; Luke 16:13)

Our Israel people have been so thoroughly deceived by the Judeo-Christian clergy, trained by Jews in the cemeteries - I mean seminaries that we must repeat the truth so many times in so many different ways that it will finally catch on and become infused in the minds of our Christian Israelites; and therefore they will understand the truth as they see it and not believe all the lies and Jewish fables.

In an article in The Sunday School Times (March 14, 1954) poses the question in its title: "Are the Anglo-Saxons the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel?" The writer was a Dr. Jacob Gartenhaus and the information given in the accompanying editorial note was the he was a Christian Jew who was president of the International Board of Jewish Missions. The Sunday School Times is obviously capitalizing upon the fact that Dr. Gartenhaus was a Jew (howbeit a Christian), trusting that this in itself would carry

sufficient weight to substantiate his assertions. Yet even the editorial staff of The Sunday School Times would not at all agree with the position taken by most Jewish scholars, regardless of their knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, as to the identification of the Messiah, whom they still reject. Might not a Jew be equally mistaken in other Scriptural matters?

Just as Jewry rejected the King of the Kingdom over two thousand years ago, so today the Christian Church is rejecting the actuality of a literal Kingdom over which the King of king is to reign. It is apparent that Dr. Gartenhaus, upon his conversion to Christianity, has also been indoctrinated with this unscriptural conception of the Kingdom of God. Thus, by repudiating the identity of the people of the Kingdom, he follows a line of false teachings based upon a system of interpretation of the Bible that incorporates the extreme error of "spiritualising" away the truth of its literal statements.

The article by Dr. Gartenhaus begins with the statement that the position we hold "is a strange and fanciful theory that the English-speaking peoples are the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel (actually the English speaking peoples, French, German, and etc., are the descendants of all thirteen tribes of Israel). It is claimed that the British people and their colonial off-shoots, including the United States of America, are the descendants of the so-called lost ten tribes of Israel, which were carried away into Assyria and in the course of time migrated to Europe and settled in England..."

These remarks are succeeded by a sketchy list of facts taken from our tenants of belief, compiled with scant regard for accuracy (typical Jewish). Then Dr. Gartenhaus went on to state:

"From this folk tale, which has not the slightest historical background, we are asked to accept that the British people (actually all of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples) are the descendants of the ten lost tribes."

This is followed by an expression which is always a "give-away" concerning the lack of careful examination and study of our position on the part of those who undertake to condemn it. "Briefly," he says, "we are asked to believe that a great mass of Israelites poured into the British Isles

and immediately took on a new physiognomy, customs, names, which have no affinity with the ancient Israelites; all this without a single Scriptural or historical proof. If it can be proved that all of this is contrary to history and the clear teachings of God's Word, then the whole theory of Israelism collapses. This I shall attempt to do in this 'brief' article."

In the first place, the many years of painstaking research in historical records and the Bible by men whose only objective was to learn the truth of God's Word and gain an understanding of His purposes cannot be reduced to brief and careless restatement by those who thereby admit they have given only superficial attention to the subject. Nor can the weight of factual evidence now available be lightly swept aside by a loosely-composed "brief" article which is the product of shallow reasoning.

Dr. Gartenhaus finds it very easy to express his opinion that the fact of the identity of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples with the House of Israel "has not the slightest historical background" and is "without a single Scriptural or historical proof." However, his article reveals at once that he has examined neither the Scriptural nor the historical evidence which is at hand and which proves beyond successful refutation that the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples are indeed the Israel of God in the world today. In other words, like almost all Jews he was a liar.

For example, the assertion that there is no biblical or historical evidence corroborating Jeremiah's flight from Palestine by way of Egypt to the Isles in the West is amply dealt with in the study I sent out on Tea Tephi and Ireland. No opponent of the identity has ever attempted to answer the Scriptural and historical evidence presented. They are quick to deny the validity of the facts presented, but they bring forth no facts which refute the testimony given. They only mouth things that have no bearing on the subject at all.

No accredited researcher who has patiently delved into the records of history to trace the westward trek of the House of Israel through central and southern Europe to the Scandinavian countries and the British Isles ever made the statement that "a great mass of the Israelites 'poured' into the British Isles and 'immediately took on a new physiognomy, customs, names...'"

On the contrary, the trek of the Israel tribes occupied from twelve to fourteen centuries. During this period they dwelt from time to time in various lands, breaking up into smaller segments which took other names and changed their customs to suit new environments. Eventually, as the narrative of any history book dealing with the period will show, they began to arrive in the British Isles, known only by the new names with which modern history students are familiar; Angles, Jutes, Frisians, Celts, Picts, Scots, Gaels, Saxons and others.

Many books have been written on this phase of the subject alone and the most recent findings of research are presented in the first ten chapters of the book entitled Chemivision by Dr. William J. Hale. Also, the end leaf map in the rear of the book, Primogeneis, is a clear depiction of the trek of the Israel tribes. The pulse-stirring saga of the travels of the House of Israel after they left their Assyrian captivity and trekked throughout Asia Minor, Europe and finally to the "isles of the sea," where they were regathered and became again one people to fulfill the purpose of God, is summed up in the graphic statement of the Lord, given through Amos:

"For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth." (Amos 9:9)

## **Racial Characteristics**

Dr. Gartenhaus raises the issue of the physiognomy of the people of the House of Israel by his statement quoted above. We assume the Doctor's intimation is that all Israelites should look like Jews. But the people of the House of Israel WERE NOT JEWS as we know Jews to be today; therefore, the absurd conclusion he reaches and ridicules; that the Israelites "immediately took on a new physiognomy" is his own, not ours.

The characteristics of the racial type we recognize as that of the Jews today were the result of intermarriages in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. At that time a mutation of the blood stream occurred when many men of the Southern Kingdom, or House of Judah, upon their return to Palestine from Babylon, took wives from among the Hittites and other Canaanitish people

in the land for themselves and their sons, while their daughters also married Hittite men. This defection from God's will was strongly condemned and the result of it was the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy:

"The shew of their countenance doth witness against them." (Isaiah 3:9)

Dr. Gartenhaus makes a point of the fact that their new names "have no affinity with the ancient Israelites" and others have also raised the objection that the modern House of Israel does not speak the language of their forefathers. However, Isaiah declared:

"For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people." (Isaiah 28:11)

It is shown in Strong's Concordance that the expression "stammering lips" can refer to "foreign lips;" that is, speaking in another language. Therefore, to discover modern Israel using a different language than that of their forefathers is actually a proof of identity; not evidence against it.

Many books have been written which prove that the English language had its origin in the ancient Hebrew. One such book is *The Word The Dictionary That Reveals The Hebrew Source of English*, by Isaac E. Mozeson.

Stressing the fact that if the Anglo-Saxons are modern Israel, they do not demonstrate it by following the customs of their forefathers, the Doctor again asserts that this disproves the claimed identity. Yet this complete forgetfulness of former customs is exactly what Jeremiah predicted would take place when he addressed a message toward the north, declaring that backsliding Israel had justified herself more than treacherous Judah (note, incidentally, the very definite difference between Israel and Judah). The prophet was told:

"Go and proclaim these words toward the north, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord; and I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger for ever." (Jeremiah 3:12)

Note carefully that the context clearly shows that this message is addressed to the House of Israel and not to the House of Judah. Jeremiah thus makes a definite distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah, Dr. Gartenhaus and the editors of The Sunday School times to the contrary notwithstanding.

The objection most often raised is also put forward by Dr. Gartenhaus that, because of the Anglo-Saxons do not practice the ancient custom of circumcision of the flesh, this excludes them from a racial share in the natural promises to Abraham. The answer to this objection was fully set forth in the article, "What Saith the Scriptures," previously referred to, from which the following is quoted:

"Let us pause here a moment and consider what the opponents of the identity of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples with the House of Israel consider to be a major objection. The issue is raised that, because the Anglo-Saxon peoples do not carry out the ritual of circumcision, they cannot be Israel. These critics are overlooking the facts of history in the records of Scripture that, while in exile, the rite of circumcision was not always practiced by God's people. This was the case with Israel during the years they wandered in the wilderness, following their exodus from Egypt. The account states that those who came out of Egypt were circumcised, and goes on to explain:

"But all the people that were born in the wilderness by the way as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had no circumcised. (Joshua 5:5)

"Although the children of Israel were uncircumcised as they journeyed through the forty years in the wilderness, they were still God's people. But even more important is the fact that Moses gave instructions as to the type of circumcision Israel was to practice in the latter days after the Lord God turned back their captivity. He said at that time:

**"THE LORD THY GOD WILL CIRCUMCISE THINE HEART, AND THE HEART OF THY SEED, TO LOVE THE LORD THY GOD WITH ALL THINE HEART,** and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.' (Deuteronomy 30:6)

"Paul designated this type of circumcision as the circumcision of those who were followers of Jesus Christ, stating:

"' Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.' (Romans 2:29)

"He further confirmed this in his Epistle to the Philippians when he said:

"' For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.' (Philippians 3:3)

"The interesting fact here is that Moses declared that Christian circumcision would be in evidence among the seed of Abraham after the Lord turned back their captivity. Thus, the argument of the opponents that the failure on the part of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to practice circumcision in the flesh is conclusive evidence that they are not the lineal descendants of Abraham and Sarah is not a valid reason for denying that they are the House of Israel in the world today. According to Moses himself they were to be circumcised of heart in the latter days."

Following the usual practice of those who attack the great truths of the identity, Dr. Gartenhaus parrots what many before him have said, that Richard Brothers, of limited mental capacity, was the first modern apostle of this truth. It has been repeatedly shown the fallacy of this assertion, but it seems to be too much to ask these opponents to act in a spirit of fair play to the extent of taking into consideration the facts which have been printed concerning this matter.

The error of this statement was clearly shown in "How Old Is This Anglo-Saxon Truth?," published in *Destiny* for March 1939, September 1941 and November 1949, and other publications of even older dates, the latter under the title, "Strange Error of the Scholars." Not once have the opponents undertaken to answer the evidence presented in these articles. It is nothing short of intellectual dishonesty to repeat charges already answered a hundred or more time while ignoring the answers. Again referring to the above-mentioned material, it was pointed out in *Destiny* for February 1954, page 49:

"Dating from the year 665 A.D., to the year 1634 A.D., over one hundred and fifty references to the identity of the Anglo-Saxon people with ancient Israel have been discovered."

Richard Brothers was active at the end of the eighteenth centuries, so he could not have originated a truth that had already been known long before he was born. The article remarks:

"All of these testimonies antedate the period of poor Richard Brothers. It is not surprising that he, earnest student of the Scriptures that he was, saw the truth also; the mystery is that students more sane than he can miss it."

Prejudice is a powerful influence in preventing the truth from being accepted by those under its sway. Prejudice and the desire not to be upset in their beliefs, not the lack of factual evidence and testimony, motivated the Jews of our Lord's day, leading them to reject Him as their Messiah, and these two influences may be the greater part of the reason why Judeo-Christian leaders in Christendom today oppose the Gospel of the Kingdom that proclaims the identity of the people of the Kingdom as the House of Israel today.

Much is continually made of the idea that the acceptance of the identity fosters an inordinate "pride of race." But we wonder whether it is that they fear this, or that they, subconsciously at least, dare not acknowledge their origin because they must then accept their "responsibility" as God's Chosen Servants and witnesses, with all that this involves.

We are reminded of the nature of God's quarrel with His people of the House of Israel when they first went into Assyrian captivity. He said to them then:

"And when you say, 'We will be like the nations, the races of the land, in serving wood and stone,' what you have in mind shall not be." (Ezekiel 20:32, Smith & Goodspeed Translation)

They were saying then that they preferred to be like the other races even to the adoption of their customs and practices. But god said:

"As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you." (Exodus 20:33)

Apparently some are still reluctant to divorce themselves from thinking they are non-Israelites, but we have God's word for it that He will deal with this. The Lord states:

"And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant." (Ezekiel 20:37)

The flat statement that "the Anglo-Saxons are a mixed race" is another wholly erroneous argument. They are no more "mixed" than were the original sons of Jacob, with their different mothers. This idea smacks of racial mongrelization propaganda which is a subversive endeavour on the part of those leading their influence to it to frustrate God's plan concerning His people

The Jews, on the other hand, are a bastard people; which is the result of the mixing of True Israelites with the other races and peoples of the Earth. Which has been going on since the beginning of time, even before there were Israelites. But for clarity lets start with Esau and his Canaanite wives; Judah and his Canaanite wife; the Israelites who came back from the Babylonian captivity and their non-Israel wives. Therefore, in all honesty, it must be admitted that some Jews have Israelite blood in them, but that does not mean they are Israel. For the Khazars who comprise most of Jewry today are **NOT** in any way related to the Israelites by blood or any other means.

The records of the early Irish Chronicles disprove the claim that the Coronation Stone which rested in the Coronation Chair in Westminster Abby, until recently, originated in Scotland. It is a known fact of history that this Stone came to Scotland from Ireland and sufficient proof of its antiquity is set forth in the book "The Stone of History," in the Documentary Studies, Vol. 1, pages 265-283. This evidence is ignored by the writer of The Sunday School Times article. Dr. Gartenhaus bases his refutation of the true origin of this Stone on a microscopic examination

of particles of accumulated dust removed from it when it was being cleaned, which seemed to identify it with the territory near Scone in Scotland. We know that the stone did rest for many hundreds of years in Scotland, having been brought there from Ireland. The articles of dust gathered from the Stone in the process of cleaning it could very readily have for their origin the Scottish location where the Stone had remained for so many centuries.

But there is another fact completely ignored by the Doctor. There are two iron rings connected by short chains fastened to both ends of this Stone. What is the explanation of the fact that these rings are worn very thin as a result of the Stone being carried for a long time, evidently swinging on staves run through them? We know such an extensive journey was never accomplished in Ireland,, Scotland or England where the Stone has been since Jeremiah landed with Tea Tephi on the shores of Ireland, bringing this Stone with them. If this Stone is indeed the Stone of Jacob, then the rings were worn thin during the forty years it was carried in the wilderness journey from Egypt to the Promised Land.

Dr. Gartenhaus takes the position that there is no Scriptural evidence supporting the view of the distinction between the Northern Kingdom, or House of Israel, and the two tribes of the Southern Kingdom, or House of Judah. He says:

"As concerning the claim that there is a distinction between the two and the House of Israel , my reply is that there is not a single Scripture supporting such a view."

Actually to claim there is no evidence in the Bible of a distinction between the House of Israel and the remainder of the tribes of Israel, regardless of whether the name "Judah" or "Israel" was applied to them, demonstrates either ignorance of the facts or a desire to falsify the record. It is a well-known fact of Biblical history that, even when united in Palestine, the distinction between the House of Israel and the rest of Israel was so marked that Biblical writers have found it necessary to take this into consideration. There was not a ruler in all Israel who did not have to take this distinction into account; otherwise, he would have been confronted with major political difficulties:

"Following the death of Saul, the men of Judah came to David and anointed him king over the House of Judah. Afterward David was informed of what the men of Jabesh-gilead had done in burying Saul and he sent a message to them, commending them for the kindness they had shown toward their former king.

"Another, the captain of Saul's army, took Ish-bosheth, Saul's son, and made him king over eleven tribes (2 Samuel 2:8-10), but the House of Judah pledged their loyalty to David. This distinction between the two houses is clearly marked in the Scriptures long before the time of the division of the Kingdom when the House of Israel revolted from the rule of the House of David after Rehoboam, Solomon's son, came to the throne.

"When Saul was seeking the life of David, the same distinction was made between the armies of Judah and the armies of Israel. This separation between Israel and Judah is further emphasized in the record of the length of David's reign, for the account states that he reigned over the House of Judah for seven years and six months in Hebron and afterward over all Israel for thirty-three year." (2 Samuel 5:5; Promagenesis, p. 443)

Even after David became King of all Israel, he experienced some difficulty in overcoming the prejudices still existing between the two branches of Israel. Eventually, King Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, was unable to heal the breach that led the House of Israel to revolt from his rule.

As an example given by Dr. Gartenhaus on which he lays much stress in an effort to show that all twelve tribes (actually 13, which shows that Dr. Gartenhaus never really studied the scriptures) of Israel returned to Palestine in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah is the sacrifice offered by the remnant that returned. The account states:

"Also the children of those that had been carried away, which were come out of the captivity, offered burnt offerings unto the God of Israel, twelve bullocks for all Israel." (Ezra 8:35)

The Doctor assumes that, because the sacrifice called for a bullock for each one of the twelve tribes, all twelve tribes must therefore be present.

The Bible, however, does not sustain such a contention, for when only a part of Israel offered a sacrifice unto the God of Israel, that sacrifice had to represent every tribe in the offering made even though all the tribes were not present. This was true in the instance above quoted, for Ezra states that present at that sacrifice were the children of those who had been carried away into Babylonian captivity; therefore there were no "tribes" of the House of Israel present other than the tribe of Benjamin.

Chapter 2 of Ezra lists those who returned from Babylon and states in the first verse:

"Now these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of those which had been carried away, **WHOM NEBUCHADNEZZAR THE KING OF BABYLON HAD CARRIED AWAY UNTO BABYLON**, and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every one unto his city."

The House of Israel was carried away into Assyrian captivity, not by Nebuchadnezzar but by Shalmanezar, King of Assyria. That there were no tribes from the ten tribes of the House of Israel in the returning remnant, other than the tribe of Benjamin, is shown by the statement:

"Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple." (Ezra 4:1)

It does not mention adversaries of Ephraim, Manasseh, Gad or any of the other tribes of the House of Israel, for none of these tribes were present. It has been pointed out elsewhere that a few "families" of the Northern Kingdom of Israel did remain with the Southern Kingdom of Judah, but this in no way evidenced a "tribal" return of the House of Israel at that time. As a matter of fact, the article titled "What Saith the Scriptures?" points out why it was absolutely impossible for the House of Israel to return to the land of Palestine.

Dr. Gartenhaus next makes a sweeping statement that the prophets use the terms "Israel" and "Judah" interchangeably and that the terms "Jacob," "Israel" and "Judah" are used synonymously. Here is an example of the

necessity to "search the Scriptures," making a "study" of God's Written Word rather than limiting oneself to a cursory reading of the Bible.

What the Doctor overlooks is that the term "Israel" can be applied to all the "tribes" and to each individual "tribe," for all were Israelites. However, the qualification of the name "Israel" by the use of the term "House of" can only be applicable to the Northern Kingdom. In the House of Israel there is no "tribe" of Judah. Nevertheless, Judah can be called Israel without the designation "House of," for Judah is a part of all Israel.

The House of Judah was made up of the remaining Israel tribes which were not included in the House of Israel. Bear in mind that any of the tribes of the House of Israel may be designated as Israel, but no tribe singly can be designated as the "House of Israel," for that term signifies the Northern Kingdom as a specific entity. There is not one instance in the Scriptures where the terms "House of Israel" and "House of Judah" are used interchangeably.

Here Dr. Gartenhaus' "case in point" falls to pieces. He quotes 2 Chronicles 19:1 which states that Jehoshaphat was king of Judah; then 2 Chronicles 21:2 which mentions Jehoshaphat as king of Israel. But let us examine the surrounding verses which form the context of 2 Chronicles 21:2. Just four verses previously, in 2 Chronicles 20:35, this statement is made:

"And after this did Jehoshaphat king of Judah join himself with Ahaziah king of Israel, who did very wickedly."

Were Ahaziah and Jehoshaphat both kings of Israel at the same time? Obviously not, or the above quoted verse makes no sense whatever. What is the correct explanation? Simply this, that Jehoshaphat was King of Judah, but because Judah was a part of all Israel, it could be said that he was an Israelite king. Israel was the all inclusive term; Judah was not.

When studying the Bible the most essential rule of all is to always consider a verse of Scripture in its context. To violate this rule is to invite errors in deduction which may make an accurate understanding of the whole revelation of the Scriptures impossible. When the term "Israel" is used

alone, the context will show whether the House of Israel is meant or whether the Biblical writer had Judah as a part of Israel in mind. As a Bible scholar, Dr. Gartenhaus should be aware of these simple rules which apply in every case where there is a supposed interchange of the names "Israel" and "Judah."

Because Dr. Gartenhaus maintains that there is no Scriptural distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Isaiah makes it very clear that there is such a separation when he addresses a people dwelling in the "isles." Whether those isles are coastlines or not begs the question; it is obvious that the people who are to receive the message are dwelling in a place far removed from where Isaiah was when he prophesied to them, for he designates them as "ye people from far:"

"Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken ye people from far...Thou art my servant, O Israel, in which I will be glorified." (Isaiah 49:1, 3)

Here we have a part of Israel addressed as His servants but dwelling in a distant land designated as the isles. That these people are not Jews is made clear by the prophet in his counsel to them:

"Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." (Isaiah 51:1)

The prophet's message is to a section of Israel who have lost the knowledge of their identity and are unaware of their origin. Let it be noted, however, that Isaiah is describing a people who are seeking the Lord and endeavouring to perform works of righteousness. He is calling upon them to recognize who their ancestors are, for he continues:

"Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you." (Isaiah 51:2)

This is not a message addressed to the Jews, for they have never forgotten their origin, nor allowed world to forget either, nor the fact that they "have Abraham to their father." (Matthew 3:9) Which is true, but at the same

time they are a bastard mixed up people who are the result of miscegenation. That this portion of Israel addressed as His servants are not Jews is shown further by Isaiah's contrast of the blessings that would come upon these servants of the Lord with the curses that would come upon the Jews.

Let the critic who insists the Jews represent all of Israel explain how Isaiah the Prophet, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, could make such a contrast between the servant race and the Jews. But because the Jews had forsaken the Lord, Isaiah prophetically declared:

"Therefore will I remember you (the Jews) to the sword, and ye shall bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted to. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, my servants (Israel) shall eat, but ye (the Jews) shall be hungry: behold, my servants (Israel) shall drink, but ye (the Jews) shall be ashamed: Behold, my servants (Israel) shall sing. for joy of heart, but ye (the Jews) shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye (the Jews) shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen (Israel): for the Lord God **SHALL SLAY THEE**, and call his servants (Israel) by another name (Christians)." (Isaiah 65:12-15)

There is not a statement in the Bible showing any more clearly than this the contrast between the Jews, who rejected Yahshua, and the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic peoples, the modern House of Israel in the world today, who accepted Him as their Redeemer and have been called by a name other than that of Israel, for they are now known as a Christian people. Dr. Gartenhaus objects to the identified by name, but here is definite Scriptural evidence that the name by which modern Israel was to be called would bear no relationship to that by which their forefathers were known.

Hosea the Prophet confirmed the fact that such a change would take place when he said of latter-day Israel: "And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people (as it is being said of the Anglo-Saxons, Germanic, Celtic and kindred peoples today by

the Editors of The Sunday School Times and Dr. Gartenhaus), there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God (a Christian people)." (Hosea 1:10)

The statement is made that the prophets made no distinction between the House of Judah and the House of Israel; "nor in their future destinies," says the doctor, "which are identical." Yet Jeremiah declared that God divorced Israel and not Judah, a fact that cannot be highly set aside if one is to understand the significance of the "redemption" of Israel (not Judah):

"And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, and went and played the harlot also." (Jeremiah 3:8)

If words mean anything at all, it is certain that Jeremiah makes a distinction here, as he does frequently throughout his book. So do the rest of the prophets when the context is taken into consideration. This identification by context, in order that the people addressed may be properly established, is mandatory if the term "Israel," as used in the Scriptures, is to convey the proper meaning.

When the Doctor states that nowhere in the Bible is there any evidence that the House of Israel became lost to their origin and identity, Isaiah's call to them to awaken to the knowledge of their ancestry becomes meaningless. However, when Yahshua commissioned His disciples to go **"TO THE LOST SHEEP OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL"** (Matthew 10:6) He said this because Judah had not been divorced and sent away, that mission was not completed in Palestine, but after the death and resurrection of Yahshua, the disciples did go to the British Isles and there founded the first Christian Church at Glastonbury. This was two or three years after the crucifixion. Thus, at the very beginning of the Christian Era the Gospel was literally taken **TO THE LOST SHEEP OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.**

The Jews had rejected Yahshua and refused to accept the Gospel. The Galileans, who were Benjamintes and therefore a tribe of the House of

Israel, accepted Christianity and from this tribe came all of our Lord's disciples except one, Judas the Jew, who betrayed Him.

This move on the part of the disciples to take the Gospel to the Isles fulfilled our Lord's prediction, for, as a result of His rejection by the Jews, He said to them:

"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matthew 21:43)

Dr. Gartenhaus accuses us of saying the Jews were disinherited, but it was Yahshua who pronounced this verdict upon them for their rejection of Him, thus fulfilling Daniel's prophecy (Daniel 9:26) as it is given in the alternative translation of the passage in the margin of the King James Version:

"'And (the Jews) they shall be no more his people' or 'and the prince's (Messiah's ) future people.'"

Dr. Gartenhaus' controversy is not with us when we state the Jews ceased to be a part of the chosen people and to possess the Kingdom as a result of their rejection of Christ as their Messiah. His controversy is with Daniel the Prophet and with Christ Himself who declared that the Kingdom would be taken from them and given to a nation that would bring forth the fruits of that Kingdom (and Christ called the Jews the children of the devil in John 8:44) justice, equity, peace and righteousness in administration. As a Christian people that is precisely the mission of the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Celtic nations, and would have been had it not been for the Jews treachery and treason behind the scenes.

They have not attained perfection in this, largely because of the failure to awaken to the knowledge of their identity and to the necessity to restore the perfect administration of the Law of the Lord. All of this will be overcome, however, when Christ returns as King to reign over His Kingdom. We have the more sure word of prophecy that this is a certainty: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1:32-33)

Actually the opposition is chargeable with the responsibility they must take for retarding the national spiritual awakening that will come when His people eventually become aware of these great truths. In the concluding paragraph of his article, Dr. Gartenhaus makes an observation which is strangely expressed. He states, "but whether or not the Anglo-Saxons, Germanic, Scandinavian, Celtics are the Israelites is of little significance." Is there an intimation here that the Doctor is far from sure of the soundness of the position he has taken?

The Bible makes no provision for such an indifferent attitude toward the revelation of the identity of the House of Israel. The Prophet Ezekiel alone declares the importance of the revealing of the House of Israel to the world, at which time God will move to sanctify them in the sight of many nations:

"Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there. Neither will I hide my face any more from them: for I have poured my spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God." (Ezekiel 39:28-29)

Yet we have no quarrel with Dr. Gartenhaus' concluding remarks, for he says:

"The important question is, Are they with our without Christ? If they are with Christ, they are a holy nation and as such belong to the royal priesthood: 'But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.' (1 Peter 2:9) If they are without Christ, they are sinners and lost, as are any others without Christ: 'For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'" (Acts 4:12)

That Salvation is through Christ is in no way detracts from the essential fact of the redemption of Israel so that the Kingdom may be established upon the earth in perfecting. Its righteous rule will remove forever from the earth poverty, distress, sorrow, sickness; all the direct results of maladministration. To say that this latter fact is of no significance is to contradict the statement of Christ (Matthew 6:33\_) who said, "Seek ye

first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

The things to be added are the essential needs of life which will bring peace, well-being and happiness to all the people. Dr. Gartenhaus may consider this to be an unimportant aspect of the Gospel, but we doubt that those who are suffering because of the lack of righteousness in administration will agree with him.

Rather than follow the dictums of men, we prefer to believe the words of the inspired writers of the Scriptures that, when the House of Israel is revealed to the world and to themselves, there will come about such a spiritual awakening that the knowledge of the goodness of the Lord and His great works will be recognized not only among His people but by the nations around the earth as well. This revelation will establish the validity and accuracy of the Word of God and the statements of all His prophets, with the electrifying result that will fulfil Paul's appraisal (Romans 11:15) that the restoration of Israel will be as life from the dead.



## **Steven Books**

**League Enterprises  
Suite 3, 3<sup>rd</sup>. 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 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**

