

Deceived By Their Leaders



**By
Willie Martin**

Deceived By Their Leaders

By Willie Martin

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD HAS BEEN DECEIVED BY THEIR LEADERS; the Judeo-Christian Clergy of Organized Religion. This study 5 will show beyond a shadow of a doubt to anyone who will accept a truth that is presented to them, even though it may go against everything they have been taught and believed all their lives. For no man or woman likes to learn they have been deceived, therefore, many will reject the truth of this presentation out of hand; but the truth is the truth and it will never change no matter how many deny it.

“Then said I, Ah, Lord GOD! behold, the prophets say unto them, Ye shall not see the sword, neither shall ye have famine; but I will give you assured peace in this place.

Then the **Lord** said unto me, The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them: they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart.” (Jeremiah 14:13-14)

God has told us in the Scriptures that His people are destroyed for lack of knowledge, and that they actually reject it when presented to them. (Hosea 4:6) The following is found in The Jewish Encyclopaedia:

"Chazars: A people of Turkish origin whose life and history are interwoven with the very beginnings of the history of the Jews of Russia. The kingdom of the Chazars was firmly established in most of South Russia long before the foundation of the Russian monarchy by the Varangians (855).

Jews have lived on the shores of the black and Caspian seas since the first centuries of the common era. Historical evidence points to the region of the Ural as the home of the Chazars.

Among the classical writers of the Middle Ages they were known as the 'Chozars,' 'Khazirs,' 'Akatzirs,' and 'Akatirs,' and in the Russian chronicles as 'Khwalisses' and 'Ugry Byelyye.'

The Armenian writers of the fifth and following centuries furnish ample information concerning this people. Moses of Chorene refers to the invasion by the 'Hkazirs' of Armenia and Iberia (another name for Edom or Edomites) at the beginning of the third century: 'The chaghan was the king of the North, the ruler of the Khazirs, and the queen was the chatoun.' (History of Armenia, ii, 377)

The Chazars first came to Armenia with the Basileans in 198. Though at first repulsed, they subsequently became important factors in Armenian history for a period of 800 years. Driven onward by the nomadic tribes of the steppes and by their own desire for plunder and revenge, they made frequent invasions into Armenia. The latter country was made the battle-ground in the long struggle between the Romans and the Persians.

This struggle, which finally resulted in the loss by Armenia of her independence, paved the way for the political importance of the Chazars. The conquest of eastern Armenia by the Persians in the fourth century rendered the latter dangerous to the Chazars, who, for their own protection, formed an alliance with the Byzantines.

This alliance was renewed from time to time until the final conquest of the Chazars by the Russians. Their first aid was rendered to the Byzantine emperor Julian, in 363. About 434 they were for a time tributary to Attila - Sidonius Apollitatis relates that the Chazars followed the banners of Attila - and in 452 fought on the Catalanian fields in company with the Black Huns and Alans. The Persian king Kobad (488-531) undertook the concentration of a line of forts through the pass between Derbent and the Caucasus.

In order to guard against the invasion of the Chazars, Turks, and other warlike tribes. His son Chosroes Anoshirvan (531-579) built the wall of Derbent, repeatedly mentioned by the Oriental geographers and historians as Bab al-Abwab (Justi, "Gesch. des Alten Persiens," p. 208)

In the second half of the sixth century the Chazars moved westward. They established themselves in the territory bounded by the Sea of Azov, the Don and the lower Volga, the Caspian Sea, and the northern Caucasus. The Caucasian Goths (Tetraxites) were subjugated by the Chazars, probably about the seventh century. (Löwe, "*Die Reste der Germanen am Schwarzen Meere*," p. 72, Halle, 1896) Early in that century the kingdom of the Chazars had become powerful enough to enable the chaghan to send to the Byzantine emperor Heraclius an army of 40,000 men, by whose aid he conquered the Persians (626-627).

The Chazars had already occupied the northeastern part of the Black Sea region. According to the historian Moses Kalonkataci, the Chazars, under their leader Jebu Chaghan (called 'Siebel Chaghan' by the Greek writers), penetrated into Persian territory as early as the second campaign of Heraclius, on which occasion they devastated Albania. ("*Die Persischen Feldzüge des Kaisers Herakleios*," in "*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*," iii. 364). Nicephorus testifies that Heraclius repeatedly showed marks of esteem to his ally, the chaghan of the Chazars, to whom he even promised his daughter in marriage. In the great battle between the Chazars and the Arabs near Kizliar 4,000 Mohammedan soldiers and their leader were slain.

Embraces Judaism: In the year 669 the Ugrians or Zabirs freed themselves from the rule of the Obrians, settled between the Don and the Caucasus, and came under the dominion of the Chazars. For this reason the Ugrians, who had hitherto been called the 'White' or 'Independent' Ugrians, are described in the chronicles ascribed to Nestor as the 'Black,' or 'Dependent,' Ugrians. They were no longer governed by their own princes, but were ruled by the kings of the Chazars.

In 735, when the Arab leader Mervan moved from Georgia against the Chazars, he attacked the Ugrians also. In 679 the Chazars subjugated the Bulgars and extended their sway farther west between the Don and the Dnieper, as far as the head-waters of the Donetz in the province of Lebedia. (K. Grot. "Moravin i Madyary," St. Petersburg, 1881; J. Kanilevski and K. Grot, "O Puti Madyara Urala v Lebediyu," in "Izvyestiya Imperatorskave Russkavo Geograticeskavo Obschestva," xix). It was probably about that time that the chaghan of the Chazars and his grandees,

together with a large number of his heathen people, embraced the Jewish religion. According to A. Harkavy, the conversion took place in 620; according to others, in 740. King Joseph, in his letter to Hasdai ibn Shaprut (about 960), gives the following account of the conversion:

'Some centuries ago King Bulan reigned over the Chazars. To him God appeared in a dream and promised him might and glory. Encouraged by this dream, Bulan went by the road of Darian to the country of Ardebil, where he gained great victories (over the Arabs).

The Byzantine emperor and the calif of the Ishmaelites sent to him envoys with presents, and sages to convert him to their respective religions. Bulan invited also wise men of Israel, and proceeded to examine them all. As each of the champions believed his religion to be the best, Bulan separately questioned the Mohammedans and the Christians as to which of the other two religions they considered the better. When both gave preference to that of the Jews, that king perceived that it must be the true religion. He therefore adopted it.'(Harkavy, "Soobahchenija o Chazarakh." in "Yevreiskaya Biblioteka," vii, 153)

Succession of Kings: This account of the conversion was considered to be of a legendary nature. Harkavy, however, (in "Bilbasov" and "Yevreiskaya Biblioteka") proved from Arabic and Slavonian sources that the religious disputation at the Chazarian court is a historical fact. Even the name of Sangari has been found in a liturgy of Constantine the Philosopher (Cyrill). It was one of the successors of Bulan, named Obadiah, who regenerated the kingdom and strengthened the Jewish religion. He invited Jewish scholars to settle in his dominions, and founded synagogues and schools.

The people were instructed in the Bible, Mishnah, and Talmud, and in the 'divine service of the hazzanim.' In their writings the Chazars used the Hebrew letter. (Harkavy, "Skazaniya," etc., p. 241). Obadiah was succeeded by his son Hezekiah; the latter by his son Manasseh; Manasseh by Hanukkah, a brother of Obadiah; Hanukkah by his son Isaac; Isaac by his son Moses (or Manasseh II); the latter by his son Nisi; and Nisi by his son Aaron II. King Joseph himself was a son of Aaron, and ascended the

throne in accordance with the law of the Chazars relating to succession. On the whole, King Joseph's account agrees generally with the evidence given by the Arabic writers of the tenth century, but in detail it contains a few discrepancies.

According to Ibn Fadlan, Ibn Dastah, and others, only the king and the grandees were followers of Judaism. The rest of the Chazars were Christians, Mohammedans, and heathens; and the Jews were in a great minority. (Frähn, "*De Chazaris*," pp. 13-18, 584-590).

According to Mas'udi, (Les Prairies d'Or, ii. 8) the king and the Chazars proper were Jews; but the army consisted of Mohammedans, while the other inhabitants, especially the Slavonians and Russians, were heathen. From the work 'Kitab al-Buldan.' written about the ninth century, (p. 121; cited by Chwolson in "*Izvyestiya o Chazarakh*," etc., p. 57) it appears as if all the Chazars were Jews and that they had been converted to Judaism only a short time before that book was written. But this work was probably inspired by Jaihani; and it may be assumed that the ninth century many Chazar heathens became Jews, owing to the religious zeal of King Obadiah.

Such a conversion in great masses,' says Chwolson, may have been the reason for the Chazars tot he Byzantine emperor Michael. The report of the embassy reads as follows: 'Quomodo nunc Judæi, nunc Saraceni ad suam fidem eos mollrentur convertere.' (Schlözer, "Nestor," iii. 154).

Internal Administration and Commercial Relations: The history of the kingdom of the Chazars undoubtedly presents one of the most remarkable features of the Middle Ages. surrounded by wild, nomadic peoples, and themselves leading partly a nomadic life, the Chazars enjoyed all the privileges of civilized nations, a well-constituted and tolerant government, a flourishing trade, and a well-disciplined standing army.

In a time when fanaticism, ignorance, and anarchy reigned in western Europe, the kingdom of the Chazars could boast of its just and broad-minded administration; and all who were persecuted on the score of their religion found refuge there. There was a supreme court of justice,

composed of seven judges, of whom two were Jews, two Mohammedans, and two Christians, in charge of the interests of their respective faiths, with one heathen was appointed for the Slavonians, Russians, and other pagans. (Mas'udi, l.c. ii. 8-11).

The Jewish population in the entire domain of the Chazars, in the period between the seventh and tenth centuries, must have been considerable. There is no doubt that the Caucasian and other Oriental Jews had lived and carried on business with the Chazars long before the arrival of the Jewish fugitives from Greece, who escaped (723) from the mania for conversion which possessed the Byzantine emperor Leo the Isaurian.

From the correspondence between King Joseph and Hasdai it is apparent that two Spanish Jews, Judah ben Meir ben Nathan and Joseph Gagris, had succeeded in settling in the land of the Chazars, and that it was a German Jew, Isaac ben Eliezer 'from the land of Nyemetz' (Germany), who carried Hasdai's letter to the king. Saadia, who had a fair knowledge of the kingdom of the Chazars, mentions a certain Isaac ben Abraham who had removed from Sura to Chazaria. (Harkavy, in Kohut Memorial Volume, p. 244)

Among the various routes enumerated by the Arabic geographer Ibn Khurdadhbeh (860-880) as being used by the Rahdanite Jewish merchants, there is one leading from Spain or France, via Allemania, through the land of the Slavonians, close by Atel, the capital of the Chazars, whence they crossed the Sea of the Chazars (Caspian Sea) and continued their voyage, via Raikh, Transoxania, and the land of the Tagasga, to India and China.

These merchants, who spoke Arabic, Persian, Greek, Spanish, French, and Slavonic, 'traveled continuously from west to east from east to west by sea and by land.' They carried eunuchs, serving-maids, boys, silks, furs, swords, imported musk, aloes, camphor, cinnamon, and other products of the Far East. (Harkavy, "Skazaniya Musulmanskih Pisatelei o Slavyanakh i Russkikh," pp. 48, 53; "*Journal Asiatique*," 1865)

Hasdai ibn Shaprut, who was foreign minister to Abd al-Rahman, Sultan of Cordova, in his letter to King Joseph of the Chazars (about 960), relates

that the first information about that kingdom was communicated to him by envoys from Khorassan, and that their statements were corroborated by the ambassadors from Byzantium.

The latter told him that the powerful Chazars were maintaining amicable relations with the Byzantine empire, with which they carried on by sea a trade in fish, skins, and other wares, the voyage from Constantinople occupying fifteen days. Hasdai determined to avail himself of the services of the Byzantine embassy to transmit his letter to the king of the Chazars, and with that view he dispatched Isaac ben Nathan with valuable gifts to the emperor, requesting him to aid Isaac in his journey to Chazaria. But the Greeks interposed delays and finally sent Isaac back to Cordova.

Hasdai then decided to send his message by way of Jerusalem, Nisibis, Armenia, and Bardaa, but the envoys of the king of the Gebalim (Boleslav I. of Bohemia), who had then just arrived in Cordova, and among them were two Jews, Saul and Joseph, suggested a different plan.

They offered to send the letter to Jews living in 'Hungarin' (Hungary), who, in their turn, would transmit it to 'Russ' (Russia), and thence through 'Bulgar' (probably the country of the Bulgarians on the Kuban) to its destination (Atel, the capital of Chazaria). As the envoys guaranteed the safe delivery of the message, Hasdai accepted the proposal. He further expressed his thankfulness that God in His mercy had not deprived the Jews of a deliverer, but had preserved the remnant of the Jewish race.

Taking a keen interest in everything relating to the kingdom of the Chazars, Hasdai begs the king to communicate to him a detailed account of the geography of his country, of its internal constitution, of the customs and occupations of its inhabitants, and especially of the history of his ancestry and of the state.

In this letter Hasdai speaks of the tradition according to which the Chazars once dwelt near the Seir (Serir-"And Jacob sent messengers before him to Esau his brother unto the land of Seir, the country of Edom." (Genesis 32:3; see also Genesis 33:16; 36:8-9. And the Enemies of the Israelites were to come from Mount Seir: "And Edom shall be a possession, Seir

also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly." (Numbers 24:18)) Mountains; he refers to the narrative of Eldad ha-Dani, who thought he had discovered the Lost Ten Tribes; and inquires whether the Chazars know anything concerning 'the end of the miracles' (the coming of the Messiah).

As to Eldad ha-Dani's unauthenticated account of the Lost Ten Tribes on the River Sambation, it may be interesting to note that, according to Idrisi, the city of Sarmel (Sarkel-on-the-Don) was situated on the River Al-Sabt (Sambat), which is the River Don.

The name for Kiev, as given by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, is also Sambatas. These appellations of the River Don and of the city of Kiev point evidently to Jewish-Chazar influences. (Westberg, "Ibrahim ibn Ya'kub's Reisebericht über die Slavenlande aus dem Jahre 965," p. 134, St. Petersburg, 1898)

A complete account of the correspondence between Hasdai and King Joseph has been written by A. Harkavy, ("*Yevreiskaya Biblioteka*," viii. 235) one of the leading authorities on the history of the Chazars, from which the following is, in substance, an extract:

The Chazarian Letters: The Chazarian correspondence was first published in the work 'Kol-Mebasser' of Isaac 'Akrish (Constantinople, 1577), into whose hands these documents came while on a voyage from Egypt to Constantinople. He published them with the view of proving that even after the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews still had their own country, in accordance with the well-known passage in Genesis (xlix.10), 'the septer shall not depart from Judah.'

Among European scholars Johann Buxtorf, the son, was the first to become interested in the Chazarian letters, which he printed together with the text of 'Akrish in his Latin translation of 'Cuzari' (Basel, 11660).

Buxtorf believed that the letters themselves and the entire history of the Chazarian kingdom were but fable, for the reason that no seafarers, merchants, or other travellers had brought any information concerning

such a flourishing kingdom as that of the Chazars was reported to be. The learned Orientalist D'Herbelot, ("*Bibliothèque Orientale*," ii. 455, Paris, 1697) misled by a wrong conception of the 'Cuzari' and its relation to the conversion of the Chazars to Judaism, leaves the authenticity of the correspondence an open question.

One of the greatest scholars of the 17th century, Samuel Bochart, in his derivation of the name of the Chazars, introduces the account of Joseph ben Gorion (Yosippon), and in his notes to the 'Yubasin' of Zacuto gives information about the Chazarian kingdom and the Sea of the Chazars obtained from the '*Geographia Nubiensis*' of the Arabian writer Idrisi, (12th century; see "Geographia Sacra," 1646, p. 226).

Bochart's views, however, are not important because he had no knowledge of the 'Cuzari' or of the Chazarian letters. All the skeptics of that time and those mentioned below had no knowledge of the facts concerning the Chazars and Chazazrian Judaism as contained in Slavonic Russian sources, or of the 'Acta Sanctorum,' which discusses those sources.

It is therefore not surprising that the first author of a comprehensive history of the Jews, Basnage, who in his '*Histoire des Juifs*,' v. 336, Rotterdam, 1707, prints the Chazarian letters, has the boldness to declare as idle fancy, not only the kingdom of the Chazars, but even the existence of the Chazarian people, which was invented, he considers, by Jewish boastfulness.

About the same time Dom Augustine Calmet issued his Biblical researches, part of which treats of 'the country whither the Ten Tribes were led away and where the said tribes now live.' Calmet considers Media near the Caspian Sea to be 'the country,' and that it is also identical with 'the country of the Chazars,' which was glorified so much in the rabbinical writings.

According to them the czar of the Chazars adopted the Jewish religion in the eighth century. Calmet, however, considers the whole story a fiction. (Calmet, "*Biblische Untersuchungen*," Ueberstzt von Mosheim," iv. 406-407, Bremen, 1743)

Baratier, 'the remarkable child,' also considered the story of the Chazars to be only a pleasing novel; but it may serve as an excuse for his opinion that when he wrote his work he was only eleven years of age. (Baratter, "Voyage de R. Benjamin Fils de Jona de Tudela," ii. 285, Amsterdam, 1734)

The Danish historiographer Frederick Suhm, who in 1779 wrote a remarkable work, for that time, on the Chazars, and who could not free himself from the view of the Hebraists of the time with regard to the letter of King Joseph, was the first to give a decided opinion in favor of the genuineness of the letter of Hasdai. (Suhm, "Samlede Skrifter.).

The ignorance of these writers is accounted for by the fact that only at the end of the eighteenth century were translations of the old Arabic writers, Mas'udi, Istakhri, Ibn Haukal, etc., on the Chazars, issued. The first to make use of the testimony of the Arabic writers to corroborate the accounts of the Jewish writers on the Chazars, was the Lithuanian historian Tadeusz Czacki, who had the advantage of using copies of the Arabic manuscripts relating to the subject in the Library of Paris. ("*Rosprawa o Zydach*," pp. 68-69, Wilna, 1807).

The Russian historian Karamsin also made use of Mas'udi's information, given in the 'Chrestomathy' of Silvestre de Sacy, and of Abulfeda's researches published in the fifth volume of Busching's 'Historical Magazine.'

The Russian academician Ch. Frähn and the Swedish scholar D'Ohsson collected and published, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, all the Arabic testimony on the subject of the Chazars known at that time. The authenticity of the letter of King Joseph has, however, since been fully established by the very material which those scholars had at their disposal. Frähn acknowledges the genuineness of Hasdai's letter, but not that of King Joseph.

In the same way D'Ohsson, although he found the information of the Arabic and Byzantine writers in conformity with the contents of the Chazar letters, could not help doubting its genuineness. ("Peuples du Caucase,"

p. 205) This may be explained by the fact that as they did not understand Hebrew they did not care to commit themselves on a question which lay outside of their field of investigation.

But the Jewish scholars had no doubts whatever as to the genuineness of the critical school of Rapoport and Zunz. They were made use of by many writers in Spain in the twelfth century; as, for instance, by Judah ha-Levi (1140), who displayed a close acquaintance with the contents of King Joseph's epistle, (Cassel, "*Das Buch Kusari*," pp. 13-14, Leipsic, 1869) and by the historian Abraham ibn Daud of Toledo (1160), who distinctly refers to the same letter. ("*Sefer ha-Kabblah*," p. 46b, Amsterdam, 1711)

Later on, with the persecutions which ended with the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, the Chazarian documents, together with many other treasures of medieval Jewish literature, were lost to the learned, and were not recovered until the end of the sixteenth century, when they were found in Egypt by Isaac 'Akrish.

The Jews of that time took little interest, however, in the history of the past, being absorbed by the cheerless events of their own epoch. The first reference, therefore, to the Chazar letters is by Rabbi Bacharach of Worms, in 1679, who discovered proofs of the genuineness of Hasdai's letter in an acrostic in the poem which served as a preface, and which reads as follows: 'I, Hasdai, son of Isaac, son of Ezra ben Shaprut.' (See "Hut ha-Shani," p. 110b, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1769)

This acrostic, however, again remained unnoticed until it was rediscovered by Frensdorf, independently of Bacharach, in 1836. ("*Zeitschrift für Jüdische Theologie*," ii. 513). Four years later (1840) the genuineness of Hasdai's letter was absolutely proved by Joseph Zedner. He also acknowledged the authenticity of the chaghan's letter, but did not submit proofs, ("*Anawahl Historischer Stücke aus der Jüdischen Literature*," pp. 26-36, Berlin, 1840)

At the same time Solomon Munk gave his opinion in favour of the genuineness of both letters. ("*Orient, Lit.*" i. 136; "Archives Israélites," 1848, p. 343; "*Mélanges de Philonpie Juive et Arabe*," p. 483, Paris,

1859. Since then most of the Jewish scholars have adopted his view, including Lebrecht, 1841; Michael Sachs, 1845; S.D. Luzzatto, 1846-50; Z. Frankei, 1852; D. Cassel and H. Jolovicz, 1853, 1959, 1872; Leop. Löw, 1855-74; Hartog, 1857; Jost, 1858; Steinschneider, 1860; Grätz, 1860 and 1871; Harkavy, beginning with 1864; Geiger, 1865; Kraushar, 1866; D. Kaufmann, 1877; and many others.

A comparison of Jewish with other sources, especially with Arabic, as far as they were then known, must be credited to E. Carmoly. He began his work with the comparison of the various sources in his 'Revue Orientale' (1840-44). He completed it in 1847. ("*Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte*," pp. 1-110, Brusels, 1847)

Some useful supplements to Carmoly's works were presented by Paulus Cassel in 1848 and 1877. ("*Magyarische Alterthümer*," pp. 183-219, Berlin, 1848; "*Der Chazarische Königsbrief aus dem 10, Jahrhundert*," Berlin, 1877)

The results of these investigations were accepted by the following Christian scholars; Grigoryev, 1834; Schafarik, 1848; Lelevel, 1851-60; Vivien de San Martin, 1851; S. Solovyov, 1851-1874; Byelevski, 1864; Brun, 1866-77; Bilbasov, 1868-71; Kunik, 1874 and 1878; and many others.

Still there were some writers who were misled by the earlier opinions, and on the strength of them spoke skeptically of the documents; as Jacob Goldenthal (1848) Dobryakov (1865); and even the *historna Ilovahki* (1876). (The translation of the letters given by Harkavy is from a manuscript in the St. Petersburg Public Library. The genuineness of the St. Petersburg manuscript has been demonstrated by him (against P. Cassel, Vambéry, etc.), in the "*Russische Revue*" and in "*Meassef Niddahim*," 1., No. 10, pp. 149 et seq)

In 960 Atel (or Itil), at that time the capital of the kingdom of the Chazars, was situated about eight miles from the modern astrakhan, on the right bank of the lower Volga, which river was also called 'Atel' or 'Itil.' The meaning of 'Atel' in the Gothic language is 'father' or 'little father,' that of

'Til' in the Turanian language is 'river;' it is difficult to decide which of these two words gave the river its name. The western part of the city was surrounded by a wall pierced by four gates, of which one led to the river, and by the others to the steppes. Here was situated the king's palace, which was the only brick building in the city. According to Mas'udi, the city was divided into three parts, the palace of the chaghan standing on an island.

The king had twenty-five wives, all of royal blood, and sixty concubines, all famous beauties. Each one dwelt in a separate tent and was watched by a eunuch. The authority of the chaghan was so absolute that during his absence from the capital, even his viceroy, or co-regent (called "isha," or "bek," or "pech"), was powerless. The viceroy had to enter the chaghan's apartments barefooted and with the greatest reverence.

He held in his right hand a chip of wood, which he lit when he saluted the chaghan, whereupon he took his seat to the right of the latter, on the throne, which was of gold. The walls of the palace were also gilded, and a golden gate ornamented the palace.

All the other dwellings of the then populous city were insignificant mud huts or felt tents. The position of the chaghan of the Chazars was evidently similar to that of the former mikados of Japan, while the bek, his military co-regent, corresponded to the shoguns of the latter.

Emperor Heraclius in 626 concluded a treaty with the chaghan of the Chazars, and Constantine Copronymus, in his description of the embassy of the Chazars (834), states that it was sent by the 'chaghan and the pech.' Ibn Fadlan relates that the king of the Chazars was called the 'great chaghan,' and his deputy 'chaghan-bhoa' ("bey," "beg," or "bek").

The bek led the army, administered the affairs of the country, and appeared among the people; and to him the neighbouring kings paid allegiance. It will thus be seen that the extent of the powers of the bek varied with the times.

When the chaghan wanted to punish any one, he said, 'God and commit suicide' - a method resembling the Japanese custom of hara-kiri. The

mother of the chaghan resided in the western part of the city, whose eastern part, called 'Chazaran,' was inhabited by merchants of various nationalities. The city and its environs were heavily shaded by trees. The Turkish and the Chazars languages predominated. The entourage of the chaghan, numbering 4,000 men, consisted of representatives of different nationalities.

The White Chazars were renowned for their beauty; and according to Demidov, the mountaineers of the Crimea contrasted very favourably with the Nogay Tartars, because they were considerably intermixed with the Chazars and with the equally fine race of the Kumans. Besides the White Chazars, there were also Black Chazars (who were almost as dark as the Hindus), Turkish immigrants, Slavonians, Hunno-Bulgars, Jews, who lived mostly in the cities, and various Caucasian tribes, such as the Abghases, Kabardines, Ossetes, Avars, Lesghians, etc.

Trade and Commerce: The Chazars cultivated rice, millet, fruit, grains, and the vine. They had important fisheries on the Caspian Sea, and the sturgeon constituted the main article of food. The Arabic writer Al-Makdisi remarks: 'In Chazaria there are many sheep, and Jews, and much honey. ("Bibl. Geograph. Arabic." iii., Leyden, 1877).

From the upper Volga they brought down from the Mordvines and Russians honey and valuable furs, which they exported to Africa, Spain, and France. They supplied the market of Constantinople with hides, furs, fish, Indian goods, and articles of luxury.

The chaghan and his suite resided in the capital only during the winter months. From the month of Nisan (April) they led a nomadic life in the steppes, returning to the city about the Feast of Hanukkah (December). The estates and vineyards of the chaghan were on the island on which his palace was situated. Another city of the Chazars, Semender, between Atel and Bab al-Abwah, was surrounded by 40,000 vines.

It was identical with the modern Tarku, near Petrovsk, which is now inhabited by Jews and Kumyks. The latter are supposed to be descended from the Chazars. (Klaproth, "Mémoire sur les Khazars," in "Journal

Asiatique," 1823, iii) At the Byzantine court the chaghan was held in high esteem. In diplomatic correspondence with him the seal of three solidi was used, which marked him as a potentate of the first rank, above even the pope and the Carolingian monarchs. Emperor Justinian II., after his flight from Kherson to Doros, took refuge during his exile with the chaghan, and married the chaghan's daughter Irene, who was famous for her beauty (702). (Nicephorus, "Breviarium," ed. Bonn 1837, p. 46).

Emperor Leo IV., 'the Chazar' (775-780), the son of Constantine, was thus a grandson of the king of the Chazars. From his mother he inherited his mild amiable disposition. Justinian's rival, Bardanes, likewise sought an asylum in Chazaria. Chazarian troops were among the body-guard of the Byzantine imperial court; and they fought for Leo VI against Simeon of Bulgaria in 888.

King Joseph in his letter to Hasdai gives the following account of his kingdom:

Chazarian Territories: 'The country up the river is within a four months' journey to the Orient, settled by the following nations who pay tribute to the Chazars: Burtas, Bulgar, Suvar, Arissu, Tzarmius, Ventit, Syever, and Slaviyun. Thence the boundary-line runs to Buarasm as far as the Jordjan. All the inhabitants of the seacoast that live within a month's distance pay tribute to the Chazars. To the south Semender, Bak-Tadlu, and the gates of the Bab al-Abwab are situated on the seashore.

Thence the boundary-line extends to the mountains of Azur, Bak-Bagda, Sridi, Kiton, Zunikh, which are very high peaks, and to the Alans as far as the boundary of the Kassa, Kalkial, Takat, Gebul, and the Constantinian Sea. To the west, Sarkel, Samkrtz, Kertz, Sugdai, Aluss, Lambat, Bartnit, Alubika, Kut, Mankup, Budik, Alma, and Grusin - all these western localities are situated on the banks of the Constantinian (Black) Sea.

Thence the boundary-line extends to the north, traversing the land of Basa, which is on the River Vaghez. Here on the plains live nomadic tribes, which extend to the frontier of the Gagries, as innumerable as the sands of the sea; and they all pay tribute to the Chazars. The king of the Chazars

himself has established his residence at the mouth of the river, in order to guard its entrance and to prevent the Russians from reaching the Caspian Sea, and thus penetrating to the land of the Ishmaelites. In the same way the Chazars bar enemies from the gates of Bab al-Abwab.'

Even the Russian Slavonians of Kiev had, in the ninth century, to pay as yearly tax to the Chazars a sword and the skin of a squirrel for each house. At the end of the eighth century, when the Crimean Goths rebelled against the sovereignty of the Chazars, the latter occupied the Gothic capital, Doros. The Chazars were at first repulsed by the Gothic bishop Joannes; but when he had surrendered, the Goths submitted to the rule of the Chazars. (Braun, "*Die Letzten Schicksale der Krimgothen*," p. 14, St. Petersburg, 1890; Tomaschek, "*Die Gothen in Taurien*," Vienna, 1881)

In the second quarter of the ninth century, when the Chazars were often annoyed by the irruptions of the Petchenegs, Emperoro Theophilus, fearing for the safety of the Byzantine trade with the neighboring nations, dispatched his brother-in-law, Petron Kamateros, with materials and workmen to build for the Chazars the fortress Sarkel on the Don (834). Sarkel ("Sar-kel," the white abode; Russian, "Byelaya Vyezha.") served as a military post and as a commercial depot for the north.

In the second half of the ninth century the apostle of the Slavonians, Constantine (Cyril), went to the Crimea to spread Christianity among the Chazars. (Tomaschek, l. c. p. 25) At this time the kingdom of the Chazars stood at the height of its power, and was constantly at war with the Arabian califs and their leaders in Persia and the Caucasus. The Persian Jews hoped that the Chazars might succeed in destroying the califs' country. (Harkavy, in Kohut Memorial Volumen, p. 244)

The high esteem in which the Chazars were held among the Jews of the Orient may be seen in the application to them - in an Arabic commentary on Isaiah ascribed by some to Saadia, and by others to Benjamin Nahawandi - of Isaiah xlvi.14: 'The Lord hath loved him.' 'This,' says the commentary, 'refers to the Chazars, who will go and destroy Babel' - i.e., Babylonia - a name used to designate the country of the Arabs. (Harkavy, in "Ha-Maggid," 1877, p. 357)

The Chaghan of the Chazars, in their turn, took great interest in and protected their coreligionists, the Jews. When one of the Chaghan received information (c. 921) that the Mohammedans had destroyed a synagogue in the land of Babung (according to Harkavy the market of Camomile in Atel is meant), he gave orders that the minaret of the mosque in his capital should be broken off, and the muezzin executed. He declared that he would have destroyed all the mosques in the country had he not been afraid that the Mohammedans would in turn destroy all the synagogues in their lands. (Ibn Fadlan, in Frähn, "De Chazaris," p. 18)

In the conquest of Hungary by the Magyars (889) the Chazars rendered considerable assistance. They had, however, settled in Pannonia before the arrival of the Magyars. This is evident from the names of such places as Kozar and Kis-Kozard in the Nógrad, and Great-Kozar and Ráczkozar in the Baranya district. (Karl Szabó, "*Magyar Akadémiai Ertesítő*," i. 132, cited by Vambéry in his "*Ursprung der Magyaren*," p. 132; compare Kohn, "*A Zsidók Története Magyarországon*" - The History of the Jews in Hungary - i. 12 et seq)

Mas'udi relates the following particulars concerning the Chazars in connection with Russian invasions of Tabaristan and neighboring countries:

‘After the 300 of the Hegira (913-914), five hundred Russian [Northmen's] ships, every one of which had a hundred men on board, came to the estuary of the don, which opens into the Pontus, and is in communication with the river of the Chazars, the Volga. The king of the Chazars keeps a garrison on this side of the estuary with efficient, warlike equipment to exclude any other power from its passage. The king of the Chazars himself frequently takes the field against them if this garrison is too weak.

When the Russian vessels reached the fort they sent to the king of the Chazars to ask his permission to pass through his dominions, promising him half the plunder which they might take from the nations who lived on the coast of this sea. He gave them leave.

They entered the country, and continuing their voyage up the River Don as far as the river of the Chazars, they went down this river past the town

of Atel and entered through its mouth into the sea of the Chazars. They spread over the coast of Jordan, the Naphtha country, and toward Aderbijan, the town of Ardobil, which is in Aderbijan, and about three days' journey from the sea.

The nations on the coast had no means of repelling the Russians, although they put themselves in a state of defence; for the inhabitants of the coast of this sea are well civilized. When the Russians had secured their booty and captives, they sailed to the mouth of the river of the Chazars and sent messengers with money and spoils to the king, in conformity with the stipulations they had made.

The Larissians and other Moslems in the country of the Chazars heard of the attack of the Russians, and they said to their king: 'The Russians have invaded the country of our Moslem brothers; they have shed their blood and made their wives and children captives, as they are unable to resist; permit us to oppose them.'

The Moslem army, which numbered about 15,000, took the field and fought for three days. The Russians were put to the sword, many being drowned, and only 5,000 escaping. These were slain by the Burtas and by the Moslems of Targhiz. The Russians did not make a similar attempt after that year.' (Mas'udi [tr. by Sprenger], in "*historical Encyc.*," pp. 416-420)

Notwithstanding the assertions of Mas'udi, the Russians invaded the trans-Caucasian country in 944, but were careful in this expedition to take a different route. This seems to have been the beginning of the downfall of the Chazar kingdom. The Russian Varangians had firmly established themselves at Kiev, while the powerful dominions of the Chazars had become dangerous to the Byzantine empire and Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in his instructions on government written for his son, carefully enumerates the Alans, the Petchenegs, the Uzes and the Bulgarians as the forces on which he must rely to check the influence of the Chazars.

Decline and Fall of the Chazars: Five years after the correspondence between the king of the Chazars and Hasdai ibn Sharprut (965) the Russian

prince Swyatoslaw made war upon the Chazars, apparently for the possession of Taurida and Taman. The Russians had already freed from the rule of the Chazars a part of the Black Bulgars, and had established a separate Russian duchy under the name of 'Tmutrakan;' but in the Crimean peninsula the Chazars still had possessions, and from the Caucasian side the Russian Tmutrakan suffered from the irruption of the Kossogian and Karbardine princes, who were tributary to the chaghan of the Chazars.

The fortress of Sarkel and the city of Atel were the chief obstacles to Russian predatory expeditions on the Caspian Sea. After a hard fight the Russians conquered the Chazars. Swyatoslaw destroyed Sarkel (Alans), and so strengthened the position of the Russian Tmutrakan. They destroyed the city of Bulgar, devastated the country of the Burtas, and took possession of Atel and Semender.

Four years later the Russian conquered all the Chazarian territory east of the Sea of Azov. Only the Crimean territory of the Chazars remained in their possession until 1016, when they were dispossessed by a joint expedition of Russians and Byzantines.

The last of the Chaghan, George Tzula, was taken prisoner; some of the Chazars took refuge in an island of the Caspian, Slahcouye; others returned to the Caucasus; while many were sent as prisoners of war to Kiev, where a Chazar community had long existed.

Many intermingled in the Crimea with the local Jews; the Krimtschaki are probably their descendants - perhaps some of the Subbotniki also. ("Voskhod," 1891, iv.-vi) Some went to Hungary, but the great mass of the people remained in their native country. Many members of the Chazarian royal family emigrated to Spain. Until the thirteenth century the Crimea was known to European travelers as 'Gazaria,' the Italian form of 'Chazaria.'"

Kimyarite King Adopts Judaism and Converts His Army and People:
"Kimyarite (Himyarite) see Sabeans (Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 403)
Sabeans: The inhabitants of the ancient kingdom of Sheba in southeastern Arabia, known from the Bible, classical writers, and native inscriptions.

The genealogies of Genesis give three pedigrees for Sheba, the eponymous ancestor of the Sabeans, who is variously termed:-

(1) the son of Raamah and the grandson of Cush, (Genesis 10:7; 1 Chronicles 1:9; comp. Ezekiel 27:22; 38:13)

(2) the son of Joktan and a great-great-grandson of Shem, (Genesis 10:28; 1 Chronicles 1:22) and,

(3) the son of Jokshan and a grandson of Abraham by Keturah. (Genesis 25:3; 1 Chronicles 1:32)

There seem, therefore, to have been three stocks of Sabeans: one in Africa (comp. the Ethiopian city of Saga mentioned by Strabo, 'Geography,' p. 77), and the other two in Arabia.

Of the latter one is connected with the story of Abraham, and the other with that of the kingdom localized by Genesis 10:30, including the Joktanites generally, and extending 'from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east.'

In Job 6:19 the Sabeans are mentioned in close association with the Temeans, an Ishmaelite stock (Genesis 25:15) that dwelt in Arabia. (Isaiah 21:14, comp. Jeremiah 25:23-24)

The Psalms and the prophetic books lay special emphasis upon the wealth and commercial activity of the Sabeans. The gifts of the kings of Sheba and of Seba to Solomon are noted in Psalm 62:10, gold being especially mentioned among these presents (Psalm, 62:15)

In both these passages the Septuagint, followed by the Vulgate, identifies Sheba with Arabia Isaiah 60:6 adds incense to the gifts which these countries were to bring. (comp. Jeremiah 6:20)

'Despite the collocation with Dedan in Genesis 10:7, 1 Chronicles 1:9 and Ezekiel 38:13, the merchants of Sheba, whom Ezekiel addressed in the words 'occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices, and with all precious

stones, and gold...' (Ezekiel 27:22) were doubtless Sabeans; but the reference in the following verse to the 'merchants of Sheba,' together with Haran, Canneh, Eden Asshur, and Chilmad, who by implication would be Asiatics, is probably a mere dittography, and is rightly omitted in the Septuagint.

The wealth of Sheba is indicated also by the list of the gifts brought by its queen to Solomon, and which were 'a hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones: there came no more such abundance of spices as these which the Queen of Sheba gave to King Solomon.' (1 Kings 10:10; 2 Chronicles 9:1-9); see Sheba, Queen Of).

The only mention of the Sabeans in a warlike connection is in Job 1:15, where they are described as attacking and killing the servants of Job to rob them of cattle; but according to Joel 3:8 ASV they dealt in slaves, including Jews.

In the New Testament there is a reference to the kingdom of Sheba in the allusion to 'the queen of the south.' (Matthew 12:42; Luke 11:31) Sheba must be carefully distinguished from the Cushite or African Seba, (Genesis 10:7; 1 Chronicles 1:9) as is shown by the discrimination between the 'kings of Sheba and Seba.' in Psalm 72:10, and by the collocation of Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba in Isaiah 43:3, 45:13.

Strabo, basing his account for the most part on Eratosthenes, an author of the third century B.C., gives considerable information of value concerning the Sabeans (Geography, ed. Müller, pp. 768, 778, 780). Their territory was situated between those of the Mineans and Cattabanians; and their capital, Mariaba, stood on the summit of a wooded hill.

The country, like those adjoining, was a flourishing monarchy, with beautiful temples and palaces, and with houses which resembled those of the Egyptians. The mode of succession to the throne was peculiar in that the heir apparent was not the son of the king, but the first son born to a noble after the monarch's accession. The king himself was also the judge; but he was not allowed to leave the palace under penalty of being stoned to death by the people.

Inscriptions of the Sabeans are numerous, but the information which these records furnish is comparatively meager. They cover, it is true, a period of about 1,300 years, ceasing only with the extinction of the kingdom in the sixth century A.D.; but only of the period just before and just after the beginning of the present era are they sufficiently abundant to allow even an approximation to a coherent history. The earliest inscription known is one containing the name of Yetha-amara, who has been identified with the 'Ithamara the Sabean' of an inscription of Sargon dated 715 B.C.

Besides the epigraphical remains, there is a large number of coins, dating chiefly from 150 B.C. to 150 AD. These are of special value for the history of the nation, even during its period of decline, since they bear both the monograms and the names of numerous kings.

The Sabean inscriptions are dated by eponymous magistrates previous to the introduction of an era which has been identified with the Seleucidan (312 B.C.), and which has also been fixed by other scholars as beginning in 115 B.C., although there are traces of other chronological systems as well. These texts frequently allude to commerce, agriculture, and religion—

Among the Sabean gods the most important were Almakah ('the hearing god?'), Athtar (a protective deity and the male form of 'Ashtaroth,' to whom the gazel seems to have been sacred), Haubas (possibly a lunar deity), Dhu Samawi ('lord of heaven'), Hajr, Kainan, Kawim ('the sustaining'), Sin (the principal moon-god), Shams (the chief solar deity), Yata', Ramman (the Biblical Rimmon), El ('God' in general), Sami' (the hearing'), Shem (corresponding in functions to the general Semitic Ba'al), Hobal (possibly a god of fortune), Homar (perhaps a god of wine), Bashir (bringer of good tidings), Rahman (the merciful), Ta'lab (probably a tree-god), and Wadd (borrowed from the Mineans).

A number of goddesses are mentioned, among them Dhat Hami (lady of Hami), Dhat Ba'dan (lady of Ba'dan), Dhat Gadran (lady of Gadran), and Tanuf (lofty). It becomes clear, even from this scanty information, that the religion was in the main a nature-cult, like the other Semitic religions; and this is borne out by a statement in the Koran (sura 27:24) that the Sabeans worshiped the sun. Few details of the cult are given, although

there are frequent mentions of gifts and sacrifices, as well as of 'self-presentation,' a rite of doubtful meaning, but one which evidently might be performed more than once.

Ritual purity and abstinence of various forms also seem to have formed part of the Sabean religion, and the name of the month Dhu Hijjat or Mahijjat, the only one retained by the Arabs (Dhu'l-Hijja, the twelfth month), implies a custom of religious pilgrimage to some shrine or shrines.

To the account of the government as described by Strabo the Sabean inscriptions add little. The word for 'nation' is 'khums' (fifth), which apparently implies an earlier division of Arabia or of a portion of it into five parts; and the people were divided into tribes (shi'b), which, in their turn, were composed of 'tenths' or 'thirds.'

The kings at first styled themselves 'malik' (king) and, possibly later, 'mukarrib,' a term of uncertain meaning, while they afterward were called 'kings of Saba and Dhu Raidan,' and finally monarchs of Hadramaut and Yamanet as well. There were likewise kings of a number of minor cities.

From a late text which mentions a king of Himyar and Raidan and of Saba and Silhin, it has been inferred that the capital of Sheba was later removed to Raidan while the actual palace remained at Himyar, and that from this circumstance the dynasty and all that it ruled were formerly called Himyaritic (the 'Homeritae' of Ptolemy and of Christian ecclesiastical authors), a designation now generally discarded.

The state of society in Sheba seems to have been somewhat feudal to character. The great families, which evidently possessed large landed estates, had castles and towers that are frequently mentioned in the inscriptions; and remains of some of these buildings are still extant. The status of woman was remarkably high.

The mistress of a castle is mentioned in one inscription, and the epigraphical remains represent women as enjoying practical equality with men, although a few passages imply the existence of concubinage. The Sabean language belonged to the Semitic stock. While some of the

inscriptions differ little from classical Arabic, most of them show a close affinity with Ethiopic. The weak letters occasionally possessed their consonant value as in Ethiopic, although they have become vowels in Arabic. On the other hand, the article is affixed as in Aramaic, instead of being prefixed as in Arabic, and certain syntactic phenomena recall Hebrew rather than the South-Semitic dialects.

The alphabet, which, like all the Semitic systems except Ethiopic, represents the consonants only, is plausibly regarded by man as the earliest form of Semitic script." (Jewish Encyclopaedia, pp. 608-610)

Throughout Biblical history there have been numerous conflicts between the children of the flesh born in juxtaposition to children of the promise, and some are listed below:

Abel vs. Cain;
Shem vs. Ham (Canaan);
Isaac vs. Ishmael;
Israel vs. Moabites/Ammonites (Lot's children);
Jacob vs. Esau/Edomites;
Israel vs. Amalakites, and
Pharez and Zerah vs. Shelahites.

These conflicts between the children of the Promise and the children of the Flesh are later described in Scripture as being conflicts between the good seed and the tares. Scripture records a strange story in the events surrounding the births of each of these children.

Without getting into a lengthy discussion, Cain and Abel were born subsequent to the fall and of course Cain slew Abel; Canaanites were cursed because Ham uncovered the nakedness of his father, yet Noah cursed Canaan - not Ham; Moabites/Ammonites due to an incestuous relationship between Lot and his two daughters;

Esau is recorded as fighting with his twin brother Jacob in the womb of his mother; Amalakites {of Esau} from the relationship between a concubine and Esau's son born of Esau's Hittite wife; and Shelah born of a Canaanite wife of Judah.

The Shelah Connection

To understand that the Pharisees at the time of Christ and those of Jewry in the 20th century are at least partial descendants of the children of the flesh, we must go back and begin with Judah, Jacob's 4th son of Leah and his descendants. The story of Judah's marriage and descendants is recorded in Genesis, Chapter 38.

Genesis, Chapter 37 ends with Joseph being sold into Egypt and the story of Joseph starts again in Chapter 39. It is both interesting and strange that Chapter 38 should be placed at this particular place in the Scriptures about a subject totally unrelated to the former and latter chapters.

We are told in verse 1 that Judah "went down from his brethren." This appears to have been an act of poor judgement such as later Dinah exhibited and was raped due to her poor judgement. We are not told the reason for Judah's poor judgement but it begins the history of conflict between Judah and his brothers which will continue till the later separation of the nation into the House of Israel and the House of Judah.

Judah, being separated from his family ties, could and did fall prey to the women in the land who were not his kinsmen according to the flesh. We are told that Judah: "...saw there a daughter of a certain Canaanite, whose name was Shuah; and he took her, and went in unto her." (Genesis 38)

This connection was contrary to the will of God and Judah should have known better from his upbringing if not the example of his fathers. His indiscretion or poor judgement in forming an alliance with the people in the land was a crime that produced bastard children. If this bastardization of Israel was to continue the chosen people would soon be assimilated into surrounding heathenism and would no longer be God's chosen people. Thus we see the necessity for God to separate His people from these heathen peoples.

In any event Judah took a Canaanite for a wife and had three bastard sons {sons born from mixed seed}: Er, Onan, and Shelah. We say bastard sons because in the Old Testament a bastard was a child born from a mixed

marriage with an Israelite and another race (see Strong's Concordance). When the time came that Er, Judah's eldest son, was to have a wife, Judah obtained for him a woman named Tamar.

We are not told how or why, but Er was "wicked in the sight of the Lord" (Gen. 38:7) and the Lord slew him. We are not told what this wickedness was but the word used here also means evil and mischief and these definitions lead many to believe this evil had something to do with the law. Being raised by his Canaanite mother, he would have become indoctrinated in the ways of the pagan Canaanites - not the ways of the Lord.

According to the law, Onan, Er's younger brother, had to marry Tamar and raise up seed to his elder brother, Er. However, Onan was wicked also, and refused to do this, spilling his seed on the ground (Gen. 38:9). This was probably because of the threat of losing the inheritance {that is, he would be raising up seed for his brother}, again, possibly from the training he received from his Canaanite mother.

In any event, God also slew Onan. Once again, according to the law Tamar should have been given to the third son, Shelah, that he might raise up sons for his elder brother. However, by this time Judah must have been just a little bit concerned.

After all, Tamar had already been the wife of two of his sons and both had been killed by the Lord. Thus it is easy to understand his reluctance. Scripture tells us that Judah told Tamar to wait until Shelah was older; however, when he got older Judah failed or refused to give Tamar to Shelah. Tamar waited and waited but Shelah eventually took another for a wife, apparently with his father's blessing.

It is recorded in the 45th chapter of the book of Jasher that Tamar was a daughter from the genealogy of Elam, the son of Shem. That she was a daughter of Shem makes sense in view of what Judah said when he found out she was pregnant with child. Scripture records that it was reported to Judah that: "Tamar thy daughter in law hath played the harlot; and also behold, she is with child by whoredom. And judah said, Bring her forth,

and let her be burnt." (Genesis 38:24) Stoning was the normal mode of capital punishment at that time in history - death by fire was not the normal procedure used to execute someone. Therefore it is significant that Judah pronounced death by burning for that was reserved for priests' daughters who brought disgrace upon the sacred office. The law states: "And the daughter of any priest, if she profane herself by playing the whore, she profaneth her father: she shall be burnt with fire." (Leviticus 21:9)

Since Judah pronounced death by fire we are able to conclude that she must have been the daughter of a priest. However, one would think that if she was, she should be aware of the law prohibiting mixed marriages. But perhaps that was not the case.

Tamar could have been imported from another geographical area as was Rebecca for Isaac. Thus at the time of her arrival and marriage to Er and Onan she could have been unaware of the covenant God had made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob/Israel. Not being aware of the covenant she would not know that the two men she married were half Canaanite and half Israelite and not legitimate heirs to the promise.

By the time Shelah had taken another wife, Tamar was probably educated in the covenant relationship with God and realized that even if she was given to Shelah, any sons from that union would not produce a bloodline heir. This is about the only logical reason for her to play the harlot, entrapping Judah to become the father of her children (Pharez and Zerah) at the risk of being put to fiery death. It would also partially explain Judah's response when he found out that he was the father and stated: "She is more righteous than I; forasmuch as I gave her not to Shelah my son." (Genesis 38:26)

Although Judah may not have totally understood or admitted that his marriage to a Canaanite was in violation of the law, he is, at least, acknowledging that Tamar should have been the mother of children of the birthright. He must have understood this birthright problem sooner or later, as the sceptre was not passed to Shelah, Judah's third and only surviving son from Shuah, but to Judah's firstborn son from Tamar who was named Pharez. This is evidenced by the fact that Pharez's name appears in the

genealogies of Christ in Matthew 1:3 and Luke 3:23. The union of Judah with Tamar produced the twin births of Pharez and Zerah, and once again Judah had three sons: 1). Shelah, who was a bastard {1/2 Canaanite & 1/2 of Judah} by his Canaanite wife; 2). Pharez; and 3). Zerah, the latter two both from Tamar. Pharez and Zerah being the sons of Judah, the son of Jacob/Israel, and Tamar the daughter of the genealogy of Shem, were full-blooded Israelites even though they were born out of wedlock.

The whole story is recorded in Genesis 38. These births produced three descendant lines from Judah which we will call Pharez-Judah, Zerah-Judah, and Shelah-Judah.

The question now becomes, what happened to the three descendants of Judah: Pharez, Zerah and Shelah? It will simply be stated at this point in the study that Pharez and Zerah were children of the promise whereas Shelah was a child of the flesh and destined to become the father of the Pharisees. This study will not be concerned with Pharez and Zerah - only the family of Shelah will be addressed.

Shelah-Judah

We need to keep in mind the fact that a strict genealogy was kept on each tribe. Even though Shelah was a bastard son of Judah, his genealogy is given in Scripture and his descendants can be traced to the city of Elath. In Chronicles it is recorded: "The sons of Judah; Er, and Onan, and Shelah: which three were born unto him of the daughter of Shua the Canaanite. And Er, the firstborn of Judah, was evil in the sight of the LORD; and he slew him. And tamar his daughter in law bare him Pharez and Zerah.

All the sons of Judah were five. The sons of Pharez; Hezron, and Hamul. And the sons of Zerah; Zimri, and Ethan, and Heman, and Calcol, and Dara: five of them in all. And the sons of Carmi; Achar, the troubler of Israel, who transgressed in the thing accursed. And the sons of Ethan; Azariah." (1 Chronicles 2:8)

Verse 3 is unusual, as once a name is dropped from the promised seed line it usually does not appear in later genealogies. For example the

descendants of Cain do not appear in the genealogies of Adam in Genesis, Chapter 5, or Matthew 1 or Luke 3. It is difficult to determine exactly when the Book of Chronicles was written, however verse 1 of chapter 9 states: "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies; and, behold, they were written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah, who were carried away to Babylon for their transgression." (1 Chronicles 9:1)

Since the first 8 chapters deal with the genealogies of Adam to this statement in verse 1 of chapter 9, which refers to the Babylonian captivity, it seems apparent that this portion of Chronicles was not recorded until sometime after the Babylonian captivity (600 B.C.) - perhaps by Ezra or Nehemiah.

Again, all of Judah's sons must be important or they would not be recorded in Scripture, especially since the descendants of Shelah were not children of the promise. It should be noted that verses 5 and 6 list the descendants of Pharez and Zerah, and verse 8 begins with Ethan, a son of Zerah.

What is missing here are the sons of Shelah. But verse 7 seems to be completely out of place as it lists the genealogy of a person named "Carmi."

Carmi is not one of the five sons of Judah, nor is he listed in the Genealogies of Pharez or Zerah. The name also appears in 1 Chr. 4:1, but it is still unclear whose son he was. However, it is most interesting that his son "Achar" is referred to as "the troubler of Israel, who transgressed in the thing accursed." (You can read the story about the thing accursed in Joshua 6:18) While it appears impossible to prove it, it is suggested that "Carmi" and his son "Achar," the troubler of Israel, were in the genealogy of Shelah.

We mentioned that these names were also listed in Chronicles, chapter 4, as follows: "The sons of Shelah the son of Judah were, Er the father of Lecah, and laadah the father of Maresbah, and the families of the house of them that wrought fine linen, of the house of Ashbea, And Jokim, and the men of Chozeba, and Joash, and Saraph, who had the dominion in Moab, and Jashubilehem. And these are ancient things. These were the

potters, and those that dwelt among plants and hedges; thee they dwell with the king for his work." (1 Chronicles 4:21-23)

Again there is no mention of "Carmi" nor his son "Achar," but here we have a reference to these descendants of Shelah being "men of Chozeba." Chozeba was a town in southwestern Judah and is also the town of Chezib of Gen. 38:5 and Achzib of Joshua 15:44.

The words Chezib, Achzib or Chozeba mean "lying," "deceptive," "disappointing," or "failing." It is also interesting that Shelah-Judah was born in Chezib (Gen. 38:5) and it appears that his descendants centuries later inherited this same city.

In Joshua we find that: "This then was the lot of the tribe of the children of Judah by their families; even to the border of Edom the wilderness of Zin southward was the utter most part of the south coast. And Keilab, and Achzib, and Mareshah; nine cities with their villages." (Joshua 15: 1, 44)

Thus we see that the town of "Achzib" was given to some descendants of Judah. Achzib or Chozeba was located in the valley of Elath. Elath was in Old Edom in the valley of Elath and north of Adullam. The word "Adullam" should ring a bell as that was the place where Judah went down from his brothers and took a Canaanite for a wife. This was on the extreme southern border of the Southern Kingdom of Judah at the northern end of the Gulf of Aquabah.

In fact most scholars seem to be in agreement that this area was actually outside the land inherited by Judah. This would make some sense as we know that a bastard could not even enter the congregation, even unto the tenth generation; (Deuteronomy 23:2) therefore it would also make sense that these Shelahites, being bastards, could not inherit land belonging to the children of the promise.

But this does not mean that they could not be given land on the southern border of Judah. The city of Elath was next to Ezion-geber, which would later become Solomon's seaport. Remember now that these Shelahites are 1/2 Canaanite, and the word Canaanite is defined in Strong's Concordance

as merchants and traders. Doesn't it seem logical that merchants and traders would congregate in the cities, and especially in and around a busy seaport where they could engage in trade, commerce, and industry?

There is another reference to this city named "Achzib" in the Book of Micah where it states: "The house of Achzib shall be a lie to the kings of Israel." (Micah 1:14)

Is it just a coincidence that Shelah was born at "Chezib" which is basically the same word as Achzib? Is it coincidence that the word "Achzib" so closely resembles and has the same meaning as "Achar," the troubler of Israel? Remember these words mean "lying," "deceptive," "disappointing," or "falling." Was it not a lie that Shelah was a true child of the promise? Would not their existence next to and/or as a part of Israel make any claim they would make as being a descendant of Abraham, (John 8) entitled to receive the promises, a lie or at the least a clever deception?

Jews From Elath

Elath or Eloth was a part of the land of Edom belonging to the descendants of Esau who were called Edomites and later Idumeans. Apparently Elath and Ezion-geber came under the control of Israel in 1040 B.C. by David's conquest of Edom as recorded in 2 Samuel 8:13-14. This land is also mentioned as being under the rule of Solomon in approximately 1000 B.C. (1 Kings 9:26; 2 Chronicles 8:17)

The land passed back into Edomite control in 890 B.C. during the days of Jehoarm, king of Judah. (2 Kings 8:20-22) 80 years later in 810 B.C., the city of Elath was rebuilt under the kingship of Azariah or Uzziah. (2 Kings 14:21-22 and 2 Chronicles 26:1-2)

This historical background brings us to the time of the "Jews from Elath" as recorded in 2 Kings, Chapter 16, which states: "In the seventeenth year of Pekah the son of Remaliah Ahaz the son of Jotham king of Judah began to reign. Then Rezin king of Syria and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel came up to Jerusalem to war; and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him. At that time Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria,

and drave the Jews from Elath..." (2 Kings 16:1, 5-6) Keep in mind that the time frame is approximately 750 B.C., which is around 200 years after the split of Israel into the Houses of Judah and Israel in 975 B.C., and just before the beginning of the Assyrian captivity in 721-745 B.C. By this time Jotham was the king of Judah (the two southern tribes of Judah and Benjamin}), and Pekah was the king of Israel (the 10 northern tribes).

It is the king of Syria, and Pekah, the king of Israel {not Judah}, who formed an alliance and went to war against the House of Judah. During that war they were unable to take Jerusalem, but Rezin, king of Syria, was able to recover the city of Elath and "drave the Jews from Elath."

As previously stated, Elath was far south of the area inherited by Judah and was given to Shelah as an inheritance. Again this was probably done because as a bastard, he could not enter the congregation of Israel nor inherit with the children of Israel. Remember, these people were part Canaanite, and in Strong's Concordance the word "Canaanite" means merchants and traders. Merchants cannot be merchants except in populated areas and therefore would have a propensity to migrate towards the cities, so it is logical to conclude that they were the ones who resided in Elath and were driven there-from.

It was from this area called Elath, and this area alone, that Rezin "drave the Jews." Ahaz, king of Judah {Southern Kingdom}, was still in Jerusalem and was never defeated nor was he driven anywhere. Pekah, king of Israel {Northern Kingdom}, apparently returned home. Therefore, whatever "Jews" were driven from Elath were only a small portion of people located South of Judah - not all of the House of Judah, and none of the House of Israel.

Therefore, the word "Jews," as used in this verse does not include any people from the House of Israel and probably none from the House of Judah. This limits the use of the word "Jew" in the Old Testament to a very small group of people who resided in the town of Elath, who were most likely descendants of Shelah. Scripture does not tell us where these so-called "Jews from Elath" went after being driven from Elath, but being traders and merchants they would be city dwellers, and it is probably safe

to assume that they moved north to the walled city of Jerusalem. After Rezin "drave the Jews" from Elath the area was again populated but this time by Edomites.

The word "Jews" is used for the first time in Scripture in the King James Authorized (KJA) version in this verse. If you own a 1592 copy of the Geneva Bible, or a 1611 King James version and will open it to this verse you will not find the word "Jew".

According to the Jewish Encyclopedia: "Up to the seventeenth century this word was spelled in the Middle English in various ways:—Ieue, Ieu, Iwe, Iewe, Iue... corresponding to the Hebrew...a gentile adjective from the proper name 'Judah' seemingly never applied to member of the tribe {of Judah}, however, but to members of the nationality inhabiting the South of Palestine. It appears to have been afterward extended to apply to Israelites in the North..." (The Jewish Encyclopaedia, Vol. VII, p. 174)

If you will once again look at 2 Kings 16:6 in an original 1611 KJA version, you will find one of these words - You will not find the word "Jews." And probably more interesting in this quote is the fact that the word "Ieue," etc., was never applied to the tribe of Judah but to a nationality "inhabiting the South of Palestine." The encyclopaedia fails to point out who these people were but it has previously been shown that the land South of Judah was occupied by the Shelah branch of Judah - a bastard son from his Canaanite wife.

According to Biblical scholar Alexander Schiffner: "The first reference to any Jews in Scripture is found in 2 Kings 16:6. The name was applied to a remnant of Judah's descendants of the Shelah Branch. Shelah-Judah was born in Chezib (Genesis 38:5) and his descendants centuries later inherited his territory. (Joshua 15:1, 13, 44) Remember a strict genealogy was kept of each tribe and branch. (2 Kings 16:5-7; 1 Chr. 2:1-15; Ezra 2:59, 62, 64; Matthew 1:1-25; Luke 3:23-38)

Chezib, (Genesis 38:5) Achzib (Joshua 15:44) and Chozeba (1 Chronicles 4:21-22) refer to one and the same place. it was a town in the lowlands of western Judah and was given to the Shelah branch of Judah for their inheritance. (Joshua 15:1, 13, 44)'

This then was the lot of the tribe of the children of Judah by their families.' The word Chezib, Achzh or Chozeba means 'deceptive' or 'failing' and the place received its name from a winter spring or brook, which failed in the summer heat. {Symbolic of the failing of the Shela branch of Judah under trial}. It was the place where Judah was at the time of the birth of his half-breed son, Shelah. (Genesis 38:5)

In 1 Chr. 4:21-22 it is called 'Chozeba.' it is in the valley of Elath and north of Addulum. Note 2 Kings 16:6 - the first reference to this branch of Judah; 'the Jews of Elath.' The Jews are the remnant' of 'Yehudim' of Judah. This branch of Judah rejected Christ. They are the open witness, 'The shew of their countenance doth witness against them - their tongue and their doings are against the Lord - they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not (Isiah 3:8-9)." (From the "Five Sons of Judah," written by Alexander Schiffner, editor, Prophetic Herald, Spokane, WA)

James Fox, the author of several books, wrote of Shelah: "The reason for the divergence of facial appearance between the true Hebrew or Abrahamic White-Race Men, and the Jews, is that the patriarch Judah disobeyed God's will at the outset by marrying a Canaanitish woman called 'Shua,' (Genesis 38:1-5) producing descendants all half-castes, later known as 'Jews.' (The Glorious Majesty of His Kingdom, J.S. Fox, 1 st ed., 1958, p. 10)

According to these authors, the "Jews of Elath" were the 'remnant' of 'Yehudim' of Judah, and verses 5 and 6 of 2 Kings, chapter 16, are the first reference to the mongrel Canaanite branch of Judah where they are referred to as "Jews." (Actually "Ieue," etc., in the 1611 KJA Version) The use of the word "Jews" in 2 Kings 16:6 rather than "Ieues" has added to the misconception that the Jews are all of Israel, when it is obvious that in this verse only a small group of people were implied - those living in Elath - which omits the entire northern ten tribes and the majority of the House of Judah.

The major problem with the Jew in Any-town USA's conversations is that the word carries so many definitions and so few seem very want to know fully what he is really talking about or referring to when he uses the term

"Jew." Most so-called (c)hristians of today, even those who are of Israelite stock, and are not aware of it, don't want to hear the words, concepts and truth contained in this study.

Those of Israelite heritage may find some fulfilment in Jeremiah's words, found in Chapter 5:30-31 which sound all too familiar: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

Some think that the King James Version is the only correct version. This version was written in 1611, but it for sure contains some errors. Look at John 4:22, where Christ tells the woman of Samari: "Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." This is a primary script for the problem we face today, for any discerning true Christian Israelite should see this is not a true statement, but rather a false one based on its own merits.

Any Christian should realize the truth that salvation does not come through any religion or any race of people, but through Jesus the Christ. The Ferrar Fenton version, which comes from the original Greek text, says: "the salvation comes from among the Judeans" Now which way should we Israelites come to know fully the truth of this verse? If Christ came out of the region of Judea and the Hebrew tribe of Judah, then He is the way, the truth and the life. (John 14:6)

Paul planted the first Christian Church in Corinth, teaching that Christ is the Salvation for HIS people. But we hear the resounding common statement, but Pontius Pilate said that He was "King of the Jews." But did he really say that as most, deceived, Judeo-Christians believe?

There are some who say, "Thank God! My Savior Was Not A Jew!," that there is a historical record found in the Achoko Volume in the Congressional Library in Washington, D.C., containing an official record of one of Pilate's correspondences. He states on pages 137-139: "The Archoko record gives an eye-witness account from Pontius Pilate, who testified that Jesus did not look like, or act like a Jew. Here is the account

as it appears in this official record: To Tiberius Caesar, Emperor of Rome Noble Sovereign, Greetings: 'Among various rumours that came to my ears there was one in particular that came to my attention. A young man it was said, had appeared in Galilee, preaching with noble unction a new law in the name of the God who sent him. At first I was apprehensive that his design was to stir up the people against the Romans, but my fears were soon dispelled.

Jesus of Nazareth spoke rather as a friend of the Romans than of the Jews. One day in passing by the place of Siloe, where there was a great concourse of people, I observed in the midst of the group a young man who was leaning against a tree, calmly addressing the multitude. I was told it was Jesus. This I could easily have suspected, so great was the difference between him and those who listened to him. His golden colored hair and beard gave to his appearance an almost celestial aspect. He appeared to be about thirty years of age. Never have I seen a sweeter or more serene countenance. What a contrast between he and his hearers with their black beards and tawny complexions!...

Never have I heard in the words of the philosopher, anything that can compare with the maxims of Jesus. One of the rebellious Jews, so numerous in Jerusalem, asked Jesus if it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar, he replied: 'Render unto Caesar the things which belong to Caesar, and unto God the things which are God's...

I wrote to Jesus requesting an interview with him at the praetorium and he came." (Think now for a moment on your own, without having some Judeo-Christian preacher tell you that this is fantasy. What would be so strange in this? Even though this meeting is not recorded in the Gospels, we know that most of what Christ did during His three years of public ministry was never recorded. (See John 21:25)

Pilate's report to Caesar continues: 'You know that in my veins flows the spanish mixed with Roman blood—When the Nazarene made his appearance, I was walking in my basilic, and my feet seemed fastened with an iron hand to the marble pavement, and I trembled in every limb as does a guilty culprit, though the Nazarene was as calm as innocence

itself. When he came up to me and stopped, and by a signal sign seemed to say to me, 'I am here!' though he spoke not a word. For some time I contemplated with admiration and awe, this extraordinary type of man, a type unknown to our numerous painter--There was nothing about him that was repelling in its character and I felt awed and tremulous to approach him.

Jesus, I said to him at last, 'Jesus of Nazareth, for the last three years I have granted you ample freedom of speech (It is not recorded anywhere, either in the Gospels, or Roman historical records, that the Romans ever attempted to suppress Christ's ministry) nor do I regret it. Your words are those of a sage. I know not whether you have read Socrates or Plato, but this I know, there is in your discourse a majestic simplicity that elevates you above those philosophers--'your blood shall not be spilled,' I said, with deep emotion, 'you are more precious in my estimation on account of your wisdom than all the turbulent and proud Pharisees who abuse the freedoms granted them by Rome. T

hey conspire against Caesar, and convert his bounty into fear, impressing on the unlearned, that Caesar is a tyrant who seeks their ruin...i will protect you against them. My praetorium shall be an asylum both day and night.' I am our obedient servant, Pontius Pilate."

You can accept this letter, as we do, since it makes sense, or dismiss it as most of your Judeo-Christian preachers and church Bible scholars will do. But, think for yourself! Doesn't it make sense to you that the Jews would try and suppress this truth?

There is one point in the aforementioned passage of Acts 18 that most folks seem to over look. Paul came to Corinth and planted the first Christian Church with the True Israelite inhabitants who apparently were worshipping Judaism out of ignorance.

With little success at first, but as a rational, as well as spiritual preacher, Paul reasoned with all Jews (Both non-Israel and True Israel) not with force or violence but by fair arguing he won some over to his own opinion. In verses 9 and 10, Paul had a vision. Each of us ought to know fully this

vision and effectively grasp its meaning in our lives, today, as White Israelites. We read in the King James Version: "Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace: For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city."

We should renew our own commission "be not afraid of the Jews." That means be not afraid of the magistrates of the city, county, state or federal for they have no power against you but what is given them from above. We are pleading, like Paul, the cause of heaven and we need to do it boldly. We should not be afraid of their words, nor dismayed at their quirky looks and fraudulent judgments. At the right times we should speak, and not hold back.

We should let no opportunity slip by without speaking in defence of Christianity and in opposition to the Jews and their hideous Judaism. We should not speak shyly or with caution, but up front, plainly and fully and with courage. We need to speak out in the liberty of the Spirit that becomes an ambassador for Christ.

Paul did speak up and the "Jews" rose up against him, but the Lord went to court with him and threw out his accusers by the hand of a person in high position.

In this city that "Jews flocked to" you must remember that Corinth was a very profane and wicked city, full of impurity of all kinds and idols of all kinds. Yet in this great evil heap, with all its contempt for White Christian Israelites, i.e., the wheat, it sure seemed to human knowledge that the chaff would over come, but in this ore that seems to be all dross, there is gold.

Even in Corinth, Christ had much people. So we need to unseat this "fear of the Jews syndrome" and expose their evil, wicked plot to destroy all Christianity. This needs to be done today, before time runs out. Have you come "to know fully" the truth about Judaism and Christianity?

In verses 12-17 of Acts, Chapter 18, we find another of Paul's many trying times with the Jews {worshippers of Judaism - Traditions of the Elders}.

Paul is accused by member of this Jewish sect before the Roman Governor, Gallio. Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, that is he was the proconsul for this province of the Roman Empire. In modern words this Jewish sect filed a frivolous complaint in a Roman court against Paul and Gallio was to be the presiding judge.

Paul was rudely apprehended with violence and fury in broad day light. These Jews cared little for public peace and justice, so they made insurrection. To me this means that they used disturbance of the public peace and force, i.e., vi et armis, to apprehend Paul. They had little concern for his welfare or the safety of others.

They, as they do today, already had pronounced Paul guilty in the media of their day. Just as they had at the trials of Christ. These enforcers hurried Paul off, probably in chains, to the judgment seat before Gallio. Paul was allowed no time, whatsoever, to prepare for his trial. Sounds like a familiar patriot scenario of arrest today, does it not?

Paul, much like Christ, is falsely accused before Gallio (v. 13). What was the formal charge? "This fellow persuades men to worship God contrary to the law." My what a crime! Paul must have been "anti-semitic." These Jews could not charge him with persuading men not to worship God at all or to worship other Gods. (See Deuteronomy 13:2) So the only trumped up charge they could accuse him of breaking was "that he was attempting to persuade men to worship God in a way contrary to the law."

Now what in the world would you consider as being "contrary to the law." Does this sound a familiar alarm today? Sure it does! If you act "contrary" to the "law" of Title 26, your state motor vehicle "laws," or your property appraisal and collection "laws," see how fast you will be jerked up before some judgment seat and be made to pay for your "crimes."

The Romans allowed the Jews in all their provinces the observation of their own law. But, remember in verse 2, it is recorded, that Jews had been commanded to leave Rome. I wonder why? Did they have a Jewish problem in the society of that day? But who would enforce Jewish law in such a city of idols and corruption? Should all persons therefore be

prosecuted as criminals, who worship God in any other way than that prescribed by the tenets of Judaism? The big question before Gallio is, "Does Roman toleration include a power of imposition?" Could Roman law force Paul or anyone to stop practicing any activity contrary to what the "Jews" call their law?

You must remember that the Jewish religion hates Christ and all goyium, i.e., White People. This is why the Jews of Corinth were so uptight against Paul for he was preaching Salvation through the Blood of Christ. This tenet of Israelite Christianity is unacceptable then and today for the Jews of this Pharisaism, i.e., Judaism.

How the so-called (c)hristian of today can use the term Judeo-Christian is a gigantic mystery to many. When will the little "c" Christians come "to know fully" that these are two diametrically opposites. Just like black against white, not verses cold and light verses dark?

Paul was charged unjustly. Are White Israelite patriots ever charged unjustly, for violating some phantom law? Do they have ample opportunity to be tried in courts of certified common law venue where justice, fairness and real law prevails? Rarely, if ever, not since about 1861 have justice been had in such courts.

Paul had a different circumstance at this hearing than most patriots are usually afforded today. Gallio had a sweet nature and was sympathetic and apparently a stickler for the letter of the law. For Gallio reasoned that the Jews in their own law, had in it a promise of a Prophet whom God would raise up to them, and they should listen to him and/or hear him. And Paul only persuaded people to believe in this Prophet, who was to come and to hear Him, which was all according "to the law." For this Prophet came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. Paul's teaching contradicted Judaism, partially the idea of Christ being the Messiah.

At the first hearing or, perhaps, a better way to put it, is no hearing at all, for Gallio dismisses the cause and states that he will not take any cognizance of the issue, at all (v. 14-15). Paul was just about to make his defence which he apparently became so eloquently accustomed to doing.

(See Acts 24-26) Paul was about to present evidence that would prove that he did not teach men to worship contrary to the law, when Gallio rules that he will not be troubled with this case and will not pass sentence upon it nor even allow himself the trouble of examining it.

He, Gallio, was very capable of doing the part of a judge in any matter properly placed before him to take cognizance of. He said to the Jews, that were the prosecutors, "If it were a matter of wrong, or wicked lewdness," if you could charge the prisoner with theft or fraud, with murder or plunder or any act of immorality.

We would be bound to hear you with your complaint or accusations. Just because these Jews were loud and noisy and rude petitioners of this court, there was no valid reason to give them a hearing in any obvious unjust case. If the petitioner's cause had been just then it would have been the duty of Gallio or any magistrate to cause justice to be done. That means redress the injured party to be afforded his right(s).

Then Gallio would pass comment and give the court's sentence upon the party causing the injury. If the complaint had merits even though not made with all the decorum of a judicial case, Gallio would have felt bound to hear the petitioner, no matter how rude and noisy they were in presenting it. But Gallio will not and did not allow these Jews a chance to make a complaint to him for something not within his jurisdiction (v. 15). Oh, if we had a few judges and magistrates today of the calibre to determine rightful venue and jurisdiction.

This Jude would not allow the Jews to burden his patience by hearing it nor would he burden his conscience with passing judgment upon this matter. And when the Jews hollered and screamed more and more, he found them in contempt of "his" court and drove them from the seat of judgment (v. 16). Then he called the next cause. Bravo, Bravo!!!

This passage makes one think that Gallio conducted himself in a dignified and honourable mode. If only we had judges today who possessed this character. He did not want to, nor even pretend to judge spiritual things that he did not really understand. This judgment would be left to the Jews

in matters regarding their religion of Judaism. Yet he would not allow, the Jews to make him {Gallio} their instrument or tool of malice and pretend to pass judgment against Paul {he was following the example Pilate showed when he washed his hands of the matter concerning Christ, and told the Jews to do what they would, but he would have nothing to do with killing Christ}. Gallio looked upon this matter as not within his venue and jurisdiction and he did not intend to meddle in this affair anymore than a dismissal.

Gallio seems to have understood the law better than he did religious and/or worship. Whether Christ was the Messiah and of God, was not the issue before his court and he felt no need to take "judicial notice" of the law of any God. Whether the Gospel teachings of Christ the Messiah was of divine origin or not as these were not questions of words and names (v. 15) as Gallio scornfully and profanely called them.

These are valid concerns for Christianity and Judaism but not for a Roman Court, and he felt because of his ignorance of Judaism and Christianity, he did not want to inquire very far into them.

"In 1923, Trotsky, and Lunatcharsky presided over a meeting in Moscow organized by the propaganda section of the Communist party to judge God. Five thousand men of the Red Army were present. The Accused [Almighty God] was found guilty of various ignominious acts and having had the audacity to fail to appear, He [God] was condemned in default." (Ost Express, January 30, 1923. Cf. Berliner Taegeblatt May 1, 1923. See the details of the Bolshevik struggle against religion in The Assault of Heaven by A. Valentinoff (Boswell); The Secret Powers Behind Revolution, by Vicomte Leon De Poncins, p. 144-145)

Then like today, a great contempt was placed upon the court by the Jews and/or Greeks. For they took Sosthenes and beat him in open contempt of Gallio's dismissal of the case against Paul. Look what happened, recently, in California and other places. If the Jews of Judaism can't have it their way against Christians, they will take it out in some other manner. They were enraged against not only Paul, but also against Gallio and his court of justice. They wanted to be their own prosecutors and if Gallio

would not rule in their favour, they would become their own judges and executioners. Apparently the contempt showed what the Jews did, and it did not come before Gallio's court. Gallio cared for none of those things (v. 17) is a puzzling concept of a man who somehow tried to help Paul for whatever reason.

If we can presume that this means that this judge is calloused against the things that bad men do to good men, except when brought into his jurisdiction, we find a flaw in the character of this Roman judge. As a judge he should have protected Sosthenes as much as he did Paul. But the facts point out that he did not. This kind of indifference carries just-us attitudes that compliments tyranny. His do-nothing attitude is evidence of one of Isaiah's writings: "that truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter, and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey[1]." [Sounds like modern day news reporting, doesn't it?

Our courts today appear to adhere to the concept that justice somehow means just-us and all outsiders (non-Jews) will fall in line under its power to be administered by our controlled and/or deceived judges. So ask yourself, is there a "Jew" word problem; or a society "Jew" problem? Can I come "to know fully" the difference between Jewish Judaism and real true Israelite Christianity: The mixing of the two religions don't mix anymore than trying to mix oil and water.

Those who are truly seeking truth have at one time or another had a man/woman sent from God to witness of the Identity Movement and usually they simply ignored it the first time. Then God in His wisdom would send another. This time the messenger would be so convincing that the Truth Seeker would set out to prove him (or the material if it were a book or some other written information) wrong.

To prove it a false concept. Then they found that the more they studied and learned they found that they have been lied to and deceived by a lot of so-called Christian folks. They came to believe that this was more out of ignorance on their part than deliberate, for they are deceived and content, most of them, to live therein. But when the Lord reveals much more of His Word to them, they decide to re-educate themselves and find

that the process is a never ending one. Because as they learn more, God will reveal more - making the Scriptures "seek and ye shall find" ever more true. They soon found that the Identity teachings were more on line than fundamental Christianity as taught in the churches, on TV and radio today.

It appears to them that the more they study, research and meditate, the more the world pulls at their time just to make ends meet. So they know how the world will pull at you as you attempt to learn the truth. The Jew today still works as they did in the hay-day of Corinth to keep True Israelite Christians so busy that they don't have time to stop and smell the roses and find real truth.

It will only be with the help of YHWH {Almighty God} that the financial prison most of us fined ourselves caged in, will open and free us, swinging open the doors of liberty. Such liberty produces the time and resources needed to wage successful campaigns against the onslaught of deceit, lies and deception in today's (c)hristian parishes or folds. Corinthians were famous for their cleverness, inventiveness and artistic sense.

They prided themselves in the embellishment of their city and in the adornment of their heathen temples. But, not a single Corinthian ever distinguished himself in literature. Sound Jewish?

The Adamic Man, White People of Israelites i.e., Hebrew stock, are the chosen seed of Israel's race. They need to come to know fully who they are, and what they are. Their heritage demands fulfillment here in this American land, the New Jerusalem as spoken of in the Scriptures. Jesus the Christ, the Salvation of Israel, did not come to the Jewish people. in fact He came against almost everything they stand for. He came to the White Israelites, Matthew 15:24 states: "I am not sent, but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." [2]

Under the heading of "A brief History of the Terms for Jew" in the 1980 Jewish Almanac is the following: "Strictly speaking it is incorrect to call an Ancient Israelite a 'Jew' or to call a contemporary Jew an Israelite or a Hebrew." [3]

The World Book omits any reference to the Jews, but under the word Semite it states: "Semite—Semites are those who speak Semitic languages. In this sense the ancient Hebrews, Assyrians, Phoenicians, and Cartaginians were Semites. The Arabs and some Ethiopians are modern Semitic-speaking people.

Modern Jews are often called Semites, but this name properly applies only to those who use the Hebrew Language. The Jews were once a sub-type of the Mediterranean race, but they have mixed with other peoples until the name 'Jew' has lost all racial meaning."

Who are the Jews and where is the proof of their existence today? The Jewish Encyclopedia states: "Edom is in modern Jewry." [4] There is only one nation in the world that can prove ancestral ties with Edom, and the Jews themselves claim that dubious distinction. To help answer this question further, we refer you to the excellent book (which should be required reading) entitled "Who is Esau-Edom?" [5] This little book cover the life, history, genealogy, prophecy, predestination and modern identity of Biblical Esau.

Another excellent booklet by Pastor Bob Hallstrom is entitled "Who Are the Pharisees, and the "Jew" Are they Israel?" [6] If you don't understand the information in these two books, you will be unable to properly understand the central focus of the Scripture.

The Dake Annotated Reference Bible, while being a scholarly effort, it provides annotations and perspectives which suffer from the authors lack of an informed basis regarding the true identity of the "Jews," Pharisees, Hebrews, and Israel. In the last century Bram Stoker wrote the book Dracula and in his book he was describing the Jews from the very beginning of their drive to "occupy" our bodies and souls from the very beginning of the Luciferian infiltration of our society.



Notes

[1] Isaiah 59:14-15.

[2] See James 1:1; John 10:14 & 27.

[3] 1980 Jewish Almanac, p. 3.

[4] The Jewish Encyclopedia, 1925 edition, Vol. 5, p. 41.

[5] By Charles A. Weisman, copyright 1991, 2nd Edition: May 1992, paperback 128 pages, approx. \$8.00. Order from Weisman Publications, 11751 W. Riverhills Dr. #107D, Burnsville, MN 55337.

[6] Order from: The Gospel of the Kingdom, % P.O. Box 9411, Boise, Idaho 83707, Phone (208) 375-3425.



**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

