

# Brit-Am Exposed -

The "Lost Tribes" of Israel Are NOT British.

Among the many myths and the most fanciful conjectures that have been elaborated about the alleged "Lost Tribes" of Israel, there is one that by its fallacious nature goes beyond everyone's wildest imaginings so that it cannot be even regarded as a myth or legend, but a very superstition. This theory is infecting the web in such a way that whoever intends through any search engine to find anything related with the term "Lost Tribes", will get a string of websites promoting this new deception, listed under different names and claiming theological authority: they are all based on a false philosophy usually known as "British-Israelism", "Anglo-Israelism", "Brit-Am", etc. This fallacy has a sectary religious origin but nowadays lays scientific and historic claims so that ignorant people may fall in their snare. Since every learned person understands that all scientific, historical and biblical evidences utterly disavow their alleged "proofs" and that their theory is simply ridiculous, it would not be necessary to disprove it. Notwithstanding, as many people may be searching for the truth and might be caught or have just been caught in their trap, this exposition may help them to acknowledge that the promoters of such superstition are fanatic deceivers as many other lunatic sectarian leaders. Since even including the name "Israel[ism]" in their fallacy sounds offensive, henceforth I will refer to this deceptive theory by the name of one of the sects supporting it, Brit-Am, that does not contain the name of the chosen nation in its denomination, but in this faction I intend to represent all movements supporting the same or similar ideas. Indeed, the Brit-Am sect falsely proposes itself as an "Orthodox Jewish" organization and is apparently led by an alleged "Jew", but its pernicious doctrines are widespread mainly through so-called "Messianic" movements (that have no relationship with the true Messianic Judaism, but they give themselves titles that appear creditable and that do not show their actual ideology). They are neither Jews nor Messianic Jews, nor Christians, but another kind of pseudo-religion that arose from a Christian environment and found a fanciful thing in pretending to be not Jews but "Israelites". They are ultimately anti-Jewish and in their essence they show to be the same as those who believed in the superiority of the so-called "Aryan" race, therefore, they are in contrast also with pure Christian and

Messianic beliefs, that do not accept the idea of a people being better than other. Actually, the only difference between Brit-Am & co. and nazism consists in defining who is the master race. Their leader presents himself as an "Orthodox Jew rabbi" but paradoxically he preaches a deep anti-Judaism and his ideology is utterly the opposite to Judaism! He is not a rabbi at all, but a deceiver!

It is essential to remark that the biblical concept of "Chosen People" that belongs to Israel is purely spiritual and has not racial or discriminatory implications towards any other nation - Judaism does not consider Jews to be better than any other people, but all human beings are equal; the status of Chosen People regards the task of keeping Torah and introducing Torah to the whole mankind and is not connected with ethnicity.

Brit-Am's manifest inferiority complex towards Jews generated the absurd demands to transfer the spiritual status of "Chosen People" that belongs to Israel into an actual ethnic superiority of the Anglo-Saxon peoples over any other, and mainly over Jews, whom they deeply envy and consider to be non-Israelites (in full agreement with the anti-Semites that pass the "Khazar myth" off as a truth and with other preachers of counterfeit stories).

In this essay it is necessary to cover different topics that are indeed not related to each other, but that Brit-Am & co. have gathered in order to make the exact opposite elements to become one and the same thing to support their fallacy. Therefore, since they allegedly found their claims in biblical and scientific so-called "proofs", we have to consider mainly biblical and scientific concepts that prove that their claims are utterly false.

Brit-Am's superstition is thoroughly based on false premises:

- They allege that the whole of the ten Tribes, led by Ephrayim and Menasheh, composed the Northern Kingdom of Israel - that henceforth will be mentioned by its later capital, Samaria - and that only Judah and part of Levi and Binyamin remained in the Kingdom of Judah.

- They allege that when the Kingdom of Samaria was destroyed by the Assyrian kings in 721 BCE, the whole population was sent in exile, therefore, all the alleged ten Tribes were completely relocated somewhere in Northern Assyria.
- They allege that present-day Jews descend exclusively from the Southern Kingdom, namely from the Tribes of Judah, Levi and partially Binyamin, while the other ten Tribes generated, through a mysterious metamorphosis, the Western European nations, and that the two leading Tribes, namely Ephrayim and Menasheh, became specifically the British and Anglo-American peoples!
- They allege that such a transformation began when the Assyrian Empire was weakened by the rising Babylonian power and the ten Tribes allegedly managed to escape away from their captors and suddenly became Cimmerians, Scythians (Saka) and subsequently Celts, Britons and Anglo-Saxons!
- They allege that the ancient Israelites were physically the Nordic type, namely tall people, blue-eyed, fair-haired, and having many other Scandinavian features...

Before going on with the exposition of Brit-Am's false claims, we shall consider the above mentioned assertions in the light of the Scriptures, history and science:

## Scriptural and historical proofs

After King Shlomoh's death, the Kingdom of Israel, whose capital was Jerusalem, was divided into two independent States: Israel and Judah. Jerusalem, being in territory of Binyamin, became the residence of the Kings of Judah, while the Northern Kingdom kept the name Israel but had to choose a new capital, that was Tirzah (in Menasheh's territory) until King Omri built Samaria (in Ephrayim's territory) to be the definitive royal residence (1Kings 16:23-24). Until the

secession of the Northern Tribes, the Israelites were unified mainly by the observance of Torah, that established the celebration of the national festivals at the Temple in Jerusalem. This fact troubled the founder of the Northern Kingdom, as we read:

"Yarov'am said in his heart: 'Now the reign shall return to the House of David. If these people go up to worship in the House of HaShem at Yerushalaym, then the heart of this people shall turn back to their master, Rehav'am king of Yehudah...' So the king took counsel and made two golden calves, and said to the people: 'It is too much for you to go up to Yerushalaym. See, your mighty ones, O Yisrael, who brought you up from the land of Egypt!'" (*1Kings 12:26-28*)

Consequently, the Northern Kingdom distinguished from Judah also by religious establishment, rejecting the Commandments and representing their God in the fashion of the Egyptians, by a golden calf, in the same way they did at the foot of Mount Sinai when Mosheh was receiving Torah. This apostasy was not accepted by faithful believers within the ten Tribes, and many of them left their new Kingdom and settled in Jerusalem and Judah as well as the Levites that were excluded from their appointed ministry by Yarov'am (2Chronicles 11:14-16). Also during the reign of Asa, King of Judah, many of the Northern Israelites passed to the Kingdom of Judah:

"He gathered all Yehudah and Binyamin, and those who sojourned with them out of Ephrayim and Menasheh, and out of Shim'on: for they fell to him out of Yisrael in great number, when they saw that Adonay his God was with him". (*2Chronicles 15:9*)

The Scriptures clearly declare that all the twelve Tribes were represented in the Kingdom of Judah even after the fall of Samaria and after the return from the Babylonian exile, as the Scriptures say:

"Hizkiyahu sent to all Yisrael and Yehudah, and he also wrote letters to Ephrayim and Menasheh, to come to the House of HaShem at Yerushalaym to celebrate Passover... For if you turn back to HaShem, your brothers and your children shall be shown compassion by their captors, even to return to this

land... And the messengers passed from city to city throughout the land of Ephrayim and Menasheh, as far as Zevulun... some from Asher and Menasheh and from Zevulun humbled themselves and came to Yerushalaym... many of the people, many from Ephrayim and Menasheh, Yisaskar and Zevulun had not been cleansed, yet they celebrated Passover..." (*2Chronicles 30:1,9,10,11,18*)

This happened after the fall of Samaria and the exile of the "whole" of the ten Tribes. Hizkiyahu (Hezekiah) was the King of Judah when SargonII concluded the deportation of the Northern Israelites, and the evidence that this Passover took place after that event is given in verse 30:9 - "For if you turn back to HaShem, your brothers and your children shall be shown compassion by their captors, even to return to this land" - It is clear that the "brothers and children" are the Israelites in exile, and it is also evident that many of them, those whom Hizkiyahu was speaking to, were still dwelling in the land.

Seventy-five years after the death of Hizkiyahu, another King of Judah, Yoshiyahu (Josiah) celebrated Passover with all the Tribes of Israel. It was during the 18th year of his reign (2Kings 23:23):

"And the children of Israel who were present performed the Passover at that time... And none of the Kings of Israel had celebrated a Passover as Yoshiyahu performed with the Kohanim and the Levites, and all Yehudah and Yisrael who were present, and the inhabitants of Yerushalaym". (*2Chronicles 35:17-18*)

Notice that the King of Judah assumed the title of "King of Israel", since all the Tribes were subject to him. The emphasis of the expression "all Judah and Israel" implies that both Houses, that is the Southern Tribes and the ten Northern Tribes, were present. In the previous chapter, some of the Northern Tribes are mentioned by name:

"And in the cities of Menasheh, and Ephrayim, and Shim'on, as far as Naphthali... And they went to Hilqiyahu, the Kohen haGadol, and they gave the silver that was brought into the House of Elohim, which the Levites who kept the door had gathered from the hand of Menasheh and Ephrayim, and from all

the remnant of Yisrael and from all Yehudah and Binyamin, and which they had brought back to Yerushalaym". (*2Chronicles 34:6, 9*)

How could Josiah have gathered silver from a people that was no longer dwelling there?... This is an overwhelming scriptural proof that the Northern Israelites were under Judah's rule after the destruction of their Kingdom. Indeed, it was their State that was destroyed, not their people. They had no longer their own kings, but had the kings of Judah as their own sovereigns.

Prophet Yehezqel (Ezekiel) was one of the exiles of Judah carried to Babylon in the second deportation by King Nebukhadnetzar, about 140 years after the fall of Samaria. He addressed his prophecy to the "House of Israel" in exile (Ezekiel 3:1, throughout the whole book). This means that the Judahites met their former neighbours in roughly the same area or else that the Prophet was sent to the regions where the Northern Israelites were settled: in either situation, it is clear that they did not escape as the Brit-Am fanatics allege, but they were still there, in the land of their exile, within the borders of the Assyrian/Babylonian Empire, since the Prophet was allowed to meet them!

Prophet Hoshea attests that the Ephrayimites, far from escaping from Assyria, they agreed in serving their masters by sealing a covenant with them and engaged in trading with Egypt:

"Ephrayim is feeding on wind, and pursuing the east wind. He continually multiplies lies and desolation. They make a covenant with Ashur, and oil is carried into Egypt". (*Hoshea 12:1*)

Then, Babylon fell under King Koresh (Cyrus) and the Israelites were allowed to return back to their homeland. Yerushalaym and the Temple were rebuilt. The return is recorded by Ezra and Nehemyah, and the twelve Tribes are present:

"Then the children of Yisrael, the Kohanim and the Levites, and the rest of the sons of the captivity, kept the dedication of this House with joy, and offered ... as a sin offering for all Yisrael twelve male goats, according to the number of the Tribes of Yisrael". (*Ezra 6:16,17*)

"The sons of the exile, who had come from the captivity, brought burnt offerings to the Elohim of Yisrael: twelve bulls for all Yisrael,... and twelve male goats as a sin offering". ([Ezra 8:35](#))

The returning people are called both Jews and Israelites, and there is no dispute that they are the ancestors of the present-day Jews. If those Jews were only the Tribes of Judah, Levi and Binyamin as the Brit-Am supporters allege, why are they called "all Israel" and did they offer twelve bulls and twelve goats for the twelve Tribes of Israel?

Therefore, it is proven fact that all the twelve Tribes and Levi are still represented by the Jewish people.

Usually, the Assyrian rulers did not take into captivity the common people, but only the ruling class and the notables and those who were skilled in sciences, artists, craftsmen and warriors, in order to appoint them to serve the Empire. Indeed, King Sargon II, who actually completed the siege of Samaria after the death of Shalmaneser V, declared that he deported only 27,290 people from Israel (according to the inscription found at Khorsabad, his capital). We know that the ancient kings were not modest at all in recording their achievements, on the contrary, they rather tried to enhance them, and the particular arrogance of the Assyrian monarchs is well represented in the event of the siege of Jerusalem (2Kings 18:17-37). Consequently, we should consider Sargon's figures very realistic and trustworthy. Is it possible that the whole Kingdom of Israel had only 30,000 inhabitants by that time? Absolutely not. Three centuries before, the ten Northern Tribes counted ten times that number when King Shaul mustered them in Bezeq (1Shmuel 11:8); about one century before, King Amatzياهو of Judah hired 100,000 warriors from King Yehoash of Israel (2Chronicles 25:6). We can deduce that the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Samaria may have been more than a half million by the time of Shalmaneser V.

Excerpts of the annals of Sargon:

*"I besieged and occupied the town of Samaria, and took 27,290 of its inhabitants captive. I took from them 50 chariots, but left them the rest of their belongings. I*

*placed my lieutenants over them; I renewed the obligation imposed upon them by one of the Kings who preceded me".*

The Assyrian king declared: *"I left them the rest of their belongings"* – this means that he did not carry into exile the whole population, but left people in the land, to whom he left their belongings. He also said: *"I placed my lieutenants over them"* – it is evident that he would have not appointed lieutenants to govern over an empty land, but they replaced the deposed monarch and ruled in behalf of the King of Assyria over the Israelites that remained. He added: *"I renewed the obligation imposed upon them by one of the Kings who preceded me"* – the king "renewed" the tribute imposed by his predecessor, probably Tiglath-Pileser III; and a tribute cannot be renewed if not towards the people to which it was imposed before and that are still dwelling in their land.

Notwithstanding, it is likely that the population of the Kingdom of Samaria was decreasing since the first invasion of the Assyrians under Tiglath-Pileser III, who performed the first deportation - that did not affect the tribes of Ephrayim and most of Menasheh (2Kings 15:29). The Northern Israelites were overtaxed by their puppet-kings appointed by the Assyrian rulers and the complete fall of their nation was impending, therefore many Israelites left their country in search of a better life. Where could they go? To the neighbour Kingdom of Judah, of course, where they found their own people, culture and language, and better kings. Archaeology reveals that indeed, since the death of King Shlomoh until the period previous to the fall of Samaria, Jerusalem did not grow very much, but that the city expanded four times all at once in those years. Such a phenomenon is explainable only by mass immigration. Besides Jerusalem, several areas of Judah that were deserted until then became populated by that time. Shim'on, one of the "lost" Tribes, resettled in Edom during the reign of Hizkiyahu (that is, by the time of the fall of Samaria) and some of them went farther southwards, killed the Amalekite dwellers and took their land. An account of this resettlement is recorded in 1Chronicles 4:41-43, written by Ezra, who attests that they were still living there when he wrote, that means that they have never been deported at all!

It is quite evident that Brit-Am's assertions are groundless. There are overwhelming scriptural, archaeological and historical proofs that the Northern Israelites sent to exile by the Assyrians were not the whole population, and not even most of them.

It is also clear that among those who returned back to the Land of Israel all the twelve Tribes were present. Those of the Northern Tribes may have been the descent of those already dwelling in Judah before the deportation to Babylon, but they may have been also among the exiles of the Kingdom of Samaria. They were the Jews mentioned by Ezra, their descendants were the Jews of the Roman times and are Jews today.

These facts do not imply that the "lost Tribes" do not exist: in fact, most of the exiles did never return back to the Land of Israel, not only among those of the former Kingdom of Samaria, but also most of the Judahites chose to remain in their new settlements. Babylon was the largest Jewish city for centuries; in Roman times there were much more Jews in Babylon than in Juda, and even today most of the Mizrachim are still considered "Babylonian Jewry".

Many of the exiles were assimilated and lost their Hebrew identity. Therefore, there are indeed Israelites among the "Goyim" (non-Jews) now, of all the twelve Tribes, and even some Levites. It would be correct to say "lost Israelites" or "lost Jews" rather than "lost Tribes". But they are not to be identified with any modern organized nation. There are peoples that keep many features and have enough historical background to claim Israelite ancestry, mainly in Asia and Africa, and some of them are being recognized by the State of Israel. These peoples have spiritual and cultural features, history and traditions that allow to perform a scientific research in order to acknowledge their origins\*, but the Nordic and Western Europeans have not any of these features or historical background, neither any genetic link with any Semitic people.

\* Research essays about them are available [here](#) and [here](#).

Brit-Am's fairy tale alleges that the Israelites exiled by the Assyrians escaped from their captors and became the Cimmerians and Scythians of history! What a

nonsensical, demential claim! Undoubtedly, such assertions are the product of an insane mind. Besides the fact that such mass escape is not recorded anywhere but is a pure invention, it is unthinkable that the Assyrians were so stupid as to let them go. Assyria's policy to guard the imperial borders was extremely efficient; permanent control over the boundaries was kept because of plunderers that used to perform sudden raids and withdraw, and for this task the Assyrian kings recruited the "Askuzi" (from whom the Scandinavians descend - see [here](#)) to fight the Scythians and other invaders on the field, without need of employing their own army. The conjecture that they took advantage of the weakening of the Assyrian power previous to the fall of Nineveh to escape is groundless. The Babylonians were the same people and the collapse of the Northern Assyrian rule did not affect the whole Empire but it should be rather considered a kind of civil war produced by the Southern emerging power within the Assyrian realm - in the same way as Judah and Samaria were two entities of the same people, not two different nations, and were often in war between them. Babylonians were interested in keeping the whole Empire, not in destroying it to build another. There was not any convenience in doing again the work already done by the preceding power. This is what the successive empires did: the Persians took Babylon and overnight they found themselves masters of the whole Babylonian Empire; then Alexander inherited the Persian domains. The Scriptures also attest that the Kingdom of Judah did not get complete independence after the fall of Nineveh, but passed under Babylonian hegemony.

Besides this, there is documentary evidence that the Northern Israelites were still in the land where the Assyrians settled them centuries after the fall of Babylon, and in Roman times. They did not undergo any miraculous metamorphosis to become an "Aryan" people as the Cimmerians, Scythians, Anglo-Saxons and others are. They did not settle in Britain, nor in Gaul.

## Literary proofs

Among the many evidences concerning the sojourn of the Northern Israelites in Mesopotamia in Roman times we may consider also the literary proofs: some books known as "Apocrypha", which of course are not to be regarded as authoritative Scripture but only as history or even fiction, were written by exiles

of the Kingdom of Samaria. Even though not trustworthy from a historical viewpoint, the composition date and other elements are important to acknowledge the historical context surrounding their authors. Most of these books were written after the 3rd century BCE.

- The Story of Shoshanah (Susanna): Probably existing as an oral tale, it was composed in the later half of the 2nd century bce and added to the Book of Daniel by the Hellenists. The author indicates us that the exiles of Samaria were still in Mesopotamia in Daniel's time, and apparently the differences between both groups still existed, as the following verses show:

"So he put him aside, and commanded to bring the other, and said unto him, O thou seed of Chanaan, and not of Judah, beauty hath deceived thee, and lust hath perverted thine heart. Thus have ye dealt with the daughters of Israel, and they for fear companied with you: but the daughter of Judah would not abide your wickedness". (*Susanna, v 56-57*)

The story presents the behaviour of the two licentious elders as typical of the Northern Israelites, in opposition to the virtue of those of the House of Judah. Beyond the historicity of the account, it is clear that the author had complete awareness of the presence of Northern Israelites in the Babylonian exile and that there was contact between them and the exiles of Judah.

- The Book of Tobith (Tobiyahu): The protagonist of the story belongs to the Tribe of Naphtali, and is one of the exiles in Assyria, apparently until the reign of Assarhaddon. The author of the book probably wanted to keep some record of the Northern Israelites in exile, likely being himself of the Tribe of Naphtali. Even though the story may have historical background, it is clear that it was written some centuries after the time of the events, probably under Macedonian rule. It is evident that the author belonged to the Northern Tribes because there are some superstitious elements that could have not been conceived by a Jewish writer, but may very well

reflect the ideas of the Northern Israelites, that after centuries of exile in Media (one of the lands where the Assyrians settled them) had received the influence of the Zoroastrian cult. The main character indeed travels to Media - not to Europe! Before his death, Tobith summoned Tobiyahu and his seven grandsons and advised them to leave Nineveh and move to Media, reminding them of Nahum's prophecy concerning the coming destruction of Nineveh. Tobiyahu and his family settled in Ecbatana and witnessed the fall of the Assyrian Empire - There is not the slightest hint of a suggestion that any mass escape of the Israelites occurred, and the place where they moved was not northwards but eastwards.

- The Book of Judith: Even though this book does not mention the exiled Tribes, internal evidence shows that it was written by one of the Northern Israelites dwelling in the Diaspora and having almost no knowledge of the Land of Israel and the history of the Jewish People. It is anachronistic and plenty of geographic and historic inaccuracies that a Jewish writer would have not committed, and there are many elements that suggest a Northern Israelite author in the later Seleucian period:
  - Judith's Tribe is not well defined, and in spite of her name she apparently belongs to Shim'on.
  - The city of Bethulia did never exist. A Jewish author living in Israel would have not written a story based on a non-existent place unless he intended to write a fiction novel.
  - The fact that "Nebukhadnetzar" is called "King of Assyria" and that his residence was Nineveh and not Babylon shows that the author did not find any difference between the Northern Assyrian and the Babylonian Assyrian kings because his ancestors were already in exile when King Nebukhadnetzar ruled, and at the time he wrote he was unable to distinguish between the first and the second Assyrian Empires. In fact, Nebukhadnetzar was king some years after the destruction of Nineveh. A Judahite writer would have not mentioned Nineveh as the royal residence, but a Northern Israelite

would remember that city as the ruling power when they were deported.

- The "King Nebukhadnetzar" of this book cannot be identified with the Babylonian king either because the supposed events of Judith's account happened after the Temple in Jerusalem was rebuilt.
- The chief captain of the Assyrian army, who was killed by Judith, has a Parthian name. Such a thing is quite unlikely, because the Parthians appeared on the historical scene some centuries later, during the Seleucian rule.
- There is not any historicity regarding "Arpakshad, King of Media" or "Ariokh, King of Elam" - by that time, Elam was no longer a kingdom but an Assyrian and later Persian province. Both names have been taken from the Book of Genesis (10:22; 14:1) and have not any relationship with the lands which they are supposed to rule. Perhaps the name "Arpakshad" was roughly assimilated to "Artachshashta" (Artaxerxes), name of Persian kings.
- The whole story is inspired in some biblical accounts, mixing Avraham's victory over the Elamites, Sennakherib's unexpected withdrawal from the siege of Jerusalem, Yael murdering Sisera, etc., within a context reflecting the Seleucian/Parthian wars.
- The pseudoepigraph book 2 Barukh 78:1 addresses a letter "to the nine and a half Tribes, which are across the river Euphrates". The book was of course not written by Barukh, but by somebody else using his name in the later 1st century CE. Yet, the "nine and half Tribes" are acknowledged to be still by the eastern side of the Euphrates. The historian Josephus in the same period wrote: "the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude, and not to be estimated by numbers" (Antiquities XI, V, 2). In Josephus' time the Gaul and Britain were under Roman rule, yet he does not mention any of the Tribes settled in those lands.

One of the books quoted by the followers of the Brit-Am heresy is 2 Ezra, or 4 Ezra (such is the precision regarding that book), since they pretend to find any support for their thesis in the following verses:

"And as for your seeing him gather to himself another multitude that was peaceable, these are the nine Tribes that were taken away from their own land into exile in the days of King Hoshea, whom Shalmaneser, king of the Assyrians, made captives; he took them across the river, and they were taken into another land. But they formed this plan for themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the nations and go to a more distant region, where no human beings had ever lived, so that there at least they might keep their statutes that they had not kept in their own land. And they went in by the narrow passages of the Euphrates river. For at that time the Most High performed signs for them, and stopped the channels of the river until they had crossed over. Through that region there was a long way to go, a journey of a year and a half; and that country is called Arzareth". (*2Esdras 13:39-45*)

The land of Arzareth is unidentifiable. The book is a pseudoepigraphic work without any historical value, an account of visions allegedly given to Ezra concerning apocalyptic matters. In any case, the verses quoted above do not prove anything about where the nine Tribes supposedly went, and the purpose of their resettlement to "keep their statutes that they had not kept in their own land" has not been accomplished by the Western European peoples. There is not any historical evidence that the Celts or the Anglo-Saxons had ever been circumcised, observed Shabbath, kashrut, purity laws or any other Mosaic precept, and that they worshipped One God before their conversion to Christianity. Regarding the reliability of 2Ezra, it is subject to discussion; it is actually a composite work made up of three separate writings: 5Ezra (chapters 1-2), 4Ezra (chapters 3-14), and 6Ezra (chapters 15-16), written between the end of the 1st century CE and the mid 2nd century CE by three different authors, two of them were Christians (5&6 Ezra). The writers seem not to have a deep historical knowledge but are interested only in visions and allegories, in fact, the author of the verses quoted above introduces

himself as follows: "In the thirtieth year after the destruction of the city [Jerusalem], I was in Babylon - I, Salathiel, who am also called Ezra" (2Esdras 3:1). It is obvious that thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem Ezra had not yet been born, but about a century later. Therefore, the book cannot be taken seriously concerning historical accuracy.

## Semitic and Japhetic peoples

The Israelites are a Semitic people like the Assyrians - indeed, both of them were Akkadian in origin. The Europeans are *Japhetic* peoples, a term not so widely used in the common nomenclature but usually replaced by "Indo-European" in opposition to Semitic, though the definition "Indo-European" is restrictive, since the Japhetic group covers a larger spectrum of peoples. They are quite different from the Semites by history, culture, spiritual and physical features, genetics and in almost every other aspect. The nations which the Brit-Am supporters claim to be Semitic are undoubtedly the ones that are most distant from being Semitic within the wide range of the Japhetic stock, as it will be shown in this section.

- Cimmerians and Celts: According to the biblical account these peoples descend from Gomer (Genesis 10:2), and this identity is also reported by the Assyrian chronicles, concerning a very primitive people settled in the area of Asia Minor whom they called Gimirrai and known in secular history as Kimmerii or Cimmerians. While Shalmanesser V was besieging Samaria, the Cimmerians were in war against Rusa, king of Urartu (ancient Armenia), before the deportation of the Israelites in 721 BCE. This chronological proof should be enough to discard any possibility of identification between Israelites and Cimmerians, yet, it is interesting to consider other aspects regarding this people:
  - The Cimmerians did not leave any written record of themselves, as they were nomadic and illiterate, so the first mention we have of them after the Bible is in Assyrian chronicles. Their language was completely alien for the Assyrians (who spoke Aramaic, closely related to Hebrew). Would the Israelites completely forget the art of writing in few years

and become even unable to speak their own language? Would they ignore their past and not leave the slightest trace of themselves if they were able to escape their captors and reorganize as a nation? It is utterly impossible!

- The Cimmerians are described by the Assyrians as "red-haired", an unusual feature that caught their attention, while the Israelites were hardly distinguishable from the Assyrians, both represented in the ancient documents as normally having olive complexion as most Semites are still today. Would the Israelites achieve such an ability of camouflage so that they became unrecognizable, changing their hair colour and becoming very pale? Not even modern surgery has reached such a prodigy!
- The Cimmerians' social system was disgusting even for the Assyrians, as for any civilized people of the Middle East. They did not know the family as it was structured in Semitic cultures, but were arranged by clans, sharing the women and children (whose father was not always known - in fact, children belonged to the clan, not to their parents). They also practised prostitution and children sacrifice.
- Far from "keeping their statutes that they had not kept in their own land", if the Israelites were the Cimmerians, they became even worse than what they were in Kanaan! Exile was the consequence of their having followed the customs of the Kanaanites concerning religious practices, yet they did not lose their social structure and family values. The exile would have improved their behaviour, because Assyrians were bellicose but not immoral like the Kanaanites, and did not perform the abominable sacrifices that the Kanaanites included in their rituals. The Assyrian idolatry was rather "moderate".
- Definitively, the alleged transformation of the Israelites into Cimmerians is completely contrary to Scriptures, history, genetics and mental health, being a conception of somebody suffering of irreversible insanity.

The Cimmerians were ethnically related to the Celts, that in those times were already dwelling in central and western Europe. Traces of the Celts are found in Europe since some centuries before the Cimmerians appeared in the Ararat and Asia Minor areas. The Celts called themselves "Cymry", a term that recalls their kin people in Anatolia and their ancestor Gomer. This is the word still used to indicate Wales. The term "Celt", "Celtic" derives from "Keltói", as Greeks called them. Romans knew them as "Galli" (Gauls), and "Britanni", a Roman name applied to some Celtic groups. Such word is not at all related to the Hebrew "B'rit", as Romans did not speak Hebrew, and Britons did never call themselves that way. The alleged meaning of "Brit-ish" as the Hebrew "covenant-man" is utterly ridiculous and shows that who has suggested such a simplistic equation has no knowledge of Hebrew language nor the slightest idea of philology. It is well established by history that the term "Briton" is a Latin word and was adopted only in modern times, when the English language took a definitive shape strongly influenced by Latin and the Roman culture (even the kilt, a "typical Celtic", Scottish garment, is indeed a derivation of the Roman soldiers' suit). The Celts of Great Britain still call their land "Cymru", not Britain - a word that sounds foreign to them.

The Celts were present in Europe since early times: in the late Bronze Age around the year 1200 BCE they were in the area of present-day Germany, and settled in the British Isles around the 9th century BCE. There is no need to explain that in those times the Israelites were dwelling in Kanaan, not in exile. Therefore, the chronology once again absolutely disavows Brit-Am's theories. What about the Celtic society? Let us have an overview:

- Most of the information we have about the Celts was not written by themselves because, as well as the Cimmerians, they were unable to write, and only in a later period they developed a sort of elementary script. It is unlikely that a people that allegedly had knowledge of the Aramaic and Phoenician alphabets in the 8th century bce had completely lost the ability of reading and writing! This means that the Celts had never known any alphabet of their own.

- The Celtic peoples were the most Aryan of the Europeans, namely, they were a branch of the same Aryans that invaded India and imposed the Vedic culture - hence comes the denomination "Indo-European" applied to the Japhetic peoples and used also to replace the term "Aryan" that by obvious reasons has fallen into disrepute. Archaeological and other documentary proofs link the Celts with the Vedic culture as having the very same origin:
  - The Celts had a well defined caste system, in which the druids were at the top level, immediately followed by the warriors, and then a "working class", exactly in the same way as brahmins, kshatryas and vaisyas in the Vedic society. The druids and the Indian brahmins have quite similar characteristics: The druids usually wore simple clothes; Pliny the Elder portrayed them wearing loose white robes and cutting mistletoe with a golden sickle - How different from the Hebrew Kohanim, whose clothing was rather sophisticated! Among their practices, the druids performed ritual baths in the rivers early in the morning, at sunrise - exactly as brahmins do until today.
  - The privileges and rules of the brahmin caste and the druids are quite similar, so that some scholars assert that both priesthoods do not only resemble to each other, but that they are exactly the same.
  - Both the Celts and the Aryans believed in the transmigration of souls, a concept that is completely alien to all Semitic cultures. The early Celts burned their dead as well as the Aryans, while the Israelites bury them.
  - Not only the Celts' religion was identical to the Aryans' Vedic one, but also their laws, institutions, traditions, myths, etc. Both peoples venerated the oak, considered a sacred tree. The oak worship was indeed practiced by all the branches of the Aryan stock and by most European cultures, including Greeks and Romans. Even the term "druid" seems to be related with the name of the oak tree.
  - Besides the oak, all the most significant symbols of Aryans and Celts are the same, like the swastika and the sunwheel, commonly known as

"Celtic cross" - it is difficult to imagine that they may have any relationship with the Jewish Nation.

- Concerning the Celtic and Vedic pantheons, they are quite similar - and very different from the Semitic and Kanaanite deities. It is interesting to mention one of the most relevant myths of the Celtic tradition that is completely ignored by the Brit-Am fellows, because they like to find apparent linguistic coincidences to support their hallucinations without taking account of the real origin of the words. This myth regards the Celtic/Indo-Aryan goddess Danu, neglected by them in order to transfer all the elements linked with her to the Tribe of Dan! In fact, one of their raving theories connects the Tuatha-de-Danann with the mentioned Israelite Tribe, just because the syllable "Dan" is in the name of that ancient Irish people (whose history is uncertain and perhaps fully legendary). According to the official chronology, if the Tuatha-de-Danann really existed, they ruled Ireland before Dan, son of Israel, was born! The actual meaning of that name is "Folk of the goddess Danu". This idol was common to Celts and Indo-Aryans, and in both mythologies there are similar battles connected with her that may recall an ancient war within the Aryans that determined the migration of the Celts westwards, as the roles of Danu and her followers are reversed: in the Vedic version, the Adityas, led by Indra, defeated the Danavas, the children of the goddess Danu, that represented the evil forces, while in the Celtic version, Danu symbolized the good and the light, and her people, the Tuatha-de-Danann, achieved victory over their rivals, the Faoi-Mhuir. If these traditions have a historic background, the logical conclusion is that the Haryana (Aryans) were divided in two groups, one that worshipped Indra and the other Danu, the first group won and the later had to emigrate, keeping each one their own version of the facts.
- Both the Vedic and the Celtic religions considered the rivers to be sacred, and the best places of worship. The Celtic Danu was the goddess of the rivers and the divine waters, and it is plausible that many of the European rivers are named after her during the migration

of the Celts from India to Europe, such is the case of the Danuvius (Danube), Rodanus (Rhône), Eridanus (Po), Don, Donetz, Dniepr, Dniestr, etc., names that the Brit-Am folks ascribe to Dan (a Tribe that actually had nothing to do with rivers, not even with the Jor-dan!).

- Another purely Aryan element that is found in the Celtic Europe and the Indian subcontinent are the megaliths - there is no need to mention Stonehenge and others to show that they exist in Europe, but perhaps many people do not know about their existence in India, and they are not few. Misra writes: "A variety of megalithic monuments, erected as burials or memorials, are found in the northern Vindhyas in southern Uttar Pradesh, Vidarbha region of Maharashtra and over most parts of south India. These monuments include cairns, stone circles, dolmens, dolmenoid cists, port-hole cists, menhirs, and rock cut caves, the last confined to Kerala" (Krishnaswami 1949; Gururaja Rao 1972; Sundara 1975). At several places in the northern Vindhyas, Vidarbha and south India, there are large megalithic fields containing several hundred burial monuments. Also in Palni Hills and Kodaikanal, near Madurai, archaeologists have found remains of hundreds of prehistoric dolmens, stone circles, pillars, megalithic tombs, etc. Similar structures exist also in Ceylon, Indonesia and Madagascar.
- The European megaliths are of Japhetic production, not Israelite. They are similar to those of the Indian subcontinent and the road to Stonehenge is marked from Southern India throughout Central Asia, not from Kanaan. It is idle that the Brit-Am deceivers invoke the "signposts and landmarks" of Jeremiah 31:21, as it is idle their attempt to postdate the European megaliths to the age they want. Archaeology, history and science utterly disavow their claims.
- What about the Galilean megaliths? Archaeology has proven that they belong to the pre-Israelite period, and are not menhirs but "nuraghi", structures that are found only in Galilea and Sardinia. They were built by the Shardana (what a coincidence, the syllable "dan" is present also in this name...), one of the Sea Peoples, related to the Philistines. In the

isle of Sardinia not only the megaliths have a connection with those in Kanaan, but also other structures like the "tophet" - still called by that Hebrew name - that are remains of ancient burials for burnt children, and the "tombs of the giants", where uncommonly tall people - like the biblical Anakim and some Philistines - have been buried. These facts are neglected by the Brit-Am fanatics because the Sardinians are too dark-skinned for their racist standards, indeed, they look much more Semitic than European.

- There are still hundreds of overwhelming evidences against Brit-Am's fables concerning the Celts but it is not necessary to mention all of them. Just to conclude with the comments about this fully Aryan people, we can say that there is not any hint that may suggest that the Celts ever practised circumcision, kept the Shabath, abstained from impure food or observed any of the Mosaic laws - which they completely ignored, since they were even unable to read...
  
- Scythians (Saka) and Saxons: A huge difficulty that the Brit-Am deceivers encountered is the presence of Magog in the Anglo-Saxon and Irish genealogies. The appearance of Magog's name in the Milesian ancestry is of great significance, since Magog was the forefather of the Scythian peoples, and the early Irish chroniclers were emphatic in their claim that the Irish were descended from Scythian stock. This claim is confirmed in many points, not the least of which is the fact that "Scot" and "Scythian" share the same etymological root, and the early Irish were originally known as Scots, that later left Ireland and settled in the country that still bears their name (Scotland), displacing and subduing the native Picts. The Scythians were a complex of nomadic peoples that wandered throughout Eurasia and were assimilated into different other peoples that defeated and absorbed them, like Sarmatians, Goths, Aryans, Saxons, etc., including the Celts of Ireland. Since the Scythian presence in the British ethnogenesis is undeniable, why not claim that they are also an Israelite "lost" Tribe, without mentioning Magog? A ridiculous stratagem was concocted in order to justify such an

awkward presence, once again resorting to impossible apparent linguistic links and a Brit-Am invented etymology: The term Scythian comes from the Greek *skythai*, while their Persian name was "saka". According to the above mentioned fanatics, the name "saka" was not Persian but a self-given name of the alleged Israelites, taking the ending of the name of their ancestor Isaac (eliding the initial "i"). Therefore, the Saxons are "Isaac's sons" - whoever having a little idea of linguistics may wonder how could the Israelites speak English soon after their deportation in Assyria... because "sons" is not in Hebrew, but in English! Yet, that is not all: the name of Isaac is also in English, because in Hebrew has nothing to do with an ending "sak", neither the first syllable is a vowel, but it is written Yitzhaq (or Yitzchaq, to emphasize a very strong "h" sound), therefore, it may be split as Yitz-chaq, that is absolutely different to I-sak! Indeed, if the Israelites had by chance the idea of changing their ancestral identity from Children of Israel to Children of Isaac, they would not have been called "[I]sak's sons" but "B'ney Yitzchaq"! It is manifest that Brit-Am's thesis is untenable. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "Saxon" comes from the old English "Saexan", this from the old High German "Sahsun" and this from the Greek "saxones"; the term may be derived from "saho", the name of the weapon used by the Saxons. If the Saxons were as alleged Isaac's offspring, why not the Germans? The whole Germany is still called "Saksa" in Finnish language, as the Finns call countries by their main historic **ethnicity**.

Another mystery concerning Brit-Am's Saxons is that only those that migrated in England are allegedly Israelites, while their kindred people in Germany are not! It is well-known that Saxony (Sachsen) is a historic region of Germany, and that it is from there that the Angles and Saxons had set out on their invasion of England. According to Brit-Am, it is possible for a people to be, to cease being and to be again... because the Scythian/Saka allegedly were Israelites, then they became heathen Saxons while they stayed in Germany, to be Israelites again once they set foot on the sacred land of England! Demential, ain't it?

The matter regarding the Saka/Saxons does not end here. Brit-Am has already identified the Cimmerians and Celts/Gauls/Britons as the lost Tribes, now they identify also their enemies with the lost Tribes! Because the Scythians fought the Cimmerians and displaced them from Anatolia, so the Cimmerians were forced to emigrate northwards to the present-day Ukraine. Some time later, the Scythians were expelled from Anatolia by other peoples and invaded Ukraine, forcing the Cimmerians to move again somewhere else! The Scythians were in turn overwhelmed by the Sarmatians and their history in Europe came to an end. Almost the same thing happened in Britain: the Anglo-Saxons invaded and subdued their Celtic "brothers", imposing their rule over them until today. It appears like a series of civil wars within Brit-Am's brotherhood!

The Scythians were quite distinguishable from any Semitic people by their cultural, spiritual and physical features. Their religion was shamanism and involved ecstasy produced by smoking hemp (cannabis); they had no temples and worshipped the forces of nature and were very superstitious, believing in witchcraft and talismans. Their shamans, called enaree, were effeminate. Herodotus reports that among the Scythians there were many eunuchs, who spoke with high-pitched voice and were engaged in female works; many of them were shamans. Such kind of religion was not that of the Kanaanites, nor that of the Assyrians or any other people with which the Israelites had contact. The Scythians - as well as the Celts - were known by their custom of imprinting marks throughout their bodies, a practice forbidden by Torah (Wayyiqra 19:28) and that was not usual within any Semitic people, neither was common in the ancient Middle East - it was almost exclusive of the Scythians and the Celts.

The Scythians obviously had not the slightest knowledge about Mosaic rules, neither practised circumcision, nor kept Shabath or kashrut, nor any other Israelite custom. Besides this, it is historically attested that the Scythians were wandering in the Middle East while the Kingdom of Samaria was still in existence, and the Assyrians displaced the Scythians outside their boundaries before they conquered Israel. As always, the chronology (as every other aspect) is fatal to the fantastic theories of the Brit-Am fellows.

Concerning the Angles and Saxons, they were Germanic peoples without any Semitic link in their origins or culture. Their religion was polytheistic, having a Greek-style pantheon, plenty of deities subject to human passions and lust, unable to stay in peace without making war (even in their paradise!) and also inclined to drunkenness - what seems to be a relevant social problem in the British Isles until today. They did never practise circumcision, neither abstained from eating pork or kept Shabath. It is interesting to notice that among all the European languages, the only ones in which the seventh day of the week is not called by a name recalling the Hebrew Shabath are the Nordic and Western-European languages, just those allegedly Israelites! That day was dedicated to Saturn or its equivalent in the Nordic mythology in English, Dutch, German and the Scandinavian languages, while in French it is an undefined word, but in the other "non-Israelite" nations of Europe, it is called *sábado* (Spanish, Portuguese), *sabato* (Italian), *subota* (Russian, Serbian), *sobota* (most Slavic languages), *szombat* (Hungarian), *simbata* (Romanian), etc. - A list of the weekday names in European languages is available [here](#). It is very unlikely that the Israelites, even in exile and heathenism, had completely forgotten their own culture and traditions, not keeping even the smallest hint of their past but becoming all the opposite of what they were - mainly considering that other non-Hebrew peoples have adopted many features or at least names from the Israelites.

One of Brit-Am's many assertions that are against ethnology and genetics is that the ancient Israelites were physically the Nordic type, namely tall people, blue-eyed, fair-haired, and having many other Scandinavian features... They actually ignore how a pure Semite looks like - but it would be enough to visit Israel and see how most of the Jews are like; considering that a large group of Ashkenazim have been intermarried with Russian, Hungarian, German and other Europeans, still the major number of Jews have an olive-complexion. Except many Ashkenazim, among the other Jewish groups (Sephardic, Mizrahi, Teymani, etc.) one would hardly find a blond, Nordic-looking person. Ethnically, the Jews' closest people are the Assyrians, who are the most genuine Semitic people, having undergone less intermarrying than Jews along the centuries - that is how a pure Semite looks like, and how the ancient Israelites' aspect was. Of course,

the Brit-Am fanatics do not know that the Assyrians still exist and so they have transformed them into Germans! (So, as they cannot deny that Assyrians are Semites, they must be blond, too, but wicked, not holy like the Brits...). How can Germans, namely the true original Saxons, not to be related with their English descendants? It is quite an unsolvable mystery... Anyway, the Assyrians have nothing to do with them. Whoever wants to get informed about the present-day Assyrians may visit one of their websites [here](#). Oh, yes, I have met some of them, in Germany! But they are not Germans, they are Assyrians, speak Aramaic, call themselves "Ashshur" and look very Semitic; they are refugees from the Middle Eastern Islamic regimes because they are Christians, converted during the Apostolic times. A group of them lives in the Old City Jerusalem, in the Christian district, and usually have Bible verses in Aramaic on their homes' walls.

## Ephrayim and Menasheh

Now we can introduce Brit-Am's main false premise:

They allege that the Tribes of Ephrayim and Menasheh are represented today by Great Britain and the USA - of course, their attempts to prove such a blasphemy are idle and plenty of contradictions.

Let us consider first the physical aspect of Avraham and Israel's family and then that of the two sons of Yosef that generated the mentioned Tribes:

Avraham was an Akkadian (Chaldean) and married his stepsister, who was of his own kin. Yitzhaq married within Avraham's family, and so did Yakov Israel. They were ethnically pure Akkadian, namely, pure Semites. Yet, endogamy ended with Israel's sons; eleven of them did not take wives from Assyria (where Avraham's family lived) but from Kanaan, therefore, they mixed with the Kanaanites. To have an idea of how do Kanaanites look like, just consider their most direct descendants, the Lebanese people. They are not the Nordic type, are they? Kanaanites were not very different from Hebrews, both having similar skin colour, that is a predominant olive complexion - like present-day Israelites and Lebanese. Israel's remaining son, Yosef, married an Egyptian woman with whom he had Ephrayim and Menasheh. Would by chance these two sons look Nordic?

It is quite unlikely, since their Egyptian mother should have been rather dark-skinned. Indeed, they should have been the darkest of all the Tribe founders! Ethnically they were like Israel's uncle Yishmael, whose mother was an Egyptian. Yishmael is considered the forefather of the Arabs (though actually only a branch of them) - do Arabs look Nordic? They hardly do. Ephrayim and Menasheh were in fact half-Hamitic.

After they settled in Egypt, all the twelve sons of Israel dwelled in that land, and so did their children, and all the Israelites during four centuries - whom did they marry? Either among themselves, or had to take Egyptian spouses, so the possibilities that their skin got white were very scarce... Therefore, we have eleven patriarchs generating half-Akkadian and half-Kanaanite children, and two patriarchs being themselves half-Akkadian and half-Egyptian; all thirteen generated the people of Israel, an ethnic blend resulting 50% Akkadian, 42.3% Kanaanite and 7.7% Egyptian, that in four centuries had two possibilities of reproduction: either keeping this ratio by strict endogamy or increasing the Egyptian rate. It is more than likely that the Egyptian component of the Israelites increased. Mosheh himself took an Ethiopian wife (Bemidbar 12:1). Moreover, the Brit-Am deceivers do not know or if they do they deny that in the ancient Israel the dark complexion was symbol of beauty (Shir haShirim 1:5-8) - that is why some Rabbis interpret that the term "Kushite" applied to Mosheh's wife did not refer to her nationality but it was a way to say that she was too beautiful. Consequently, according to history and genetics, the alleged Nordic likeness of the Israelites is a fairy tale without any scientific support - also the Japanese cartoons have wide round eyes...

Nevertheless, there was somebody in Avraham's family who was red-haired, the only person of whom the Scriptures attest having such a colour, as a rarity - otherwise, it would not have been emphasized, as it is not written which hair colour had Yitzchak or Yakov or Yehudah or Yosef or any other -. That individual was Esau! (Genesis 25:25). He is the only one from whom any Irish-looking people might claim a descent with a "biblical support". Why not to assert that the British are Edomites? Esau married Hittite women (Genesis 26:34), and it is documented that the main branch of the Hittites settled in Anatolia, exactly where the Cimmerians dwelled later. Edom means "red" in Hebrew. Perhaps the

Edomites fled the Assyrian expansion and moved northwards to become Cimmerians... According to these "proofs", anybody would be entitled to allege an Edomite origin of the British, with much more authority than the Brit-Am fanatics have in what they allege. Of course, I would not assert such a thing just because Esau-Edom was red-haired! The Edomites disappeared from history as an identifiable people and were assimilated by some Arab groups - that is their actual history.

The fallacies that the Brit-Am fellows call "proofs" are in many cases based on misinterpretations of Bible verses, which they use blasphemously to support their nonsensical theories, and concerning Ephrayim and Menasheh they say:

"And Yosef said to his father, 'Not so, my father: for this one is the firstborn; put thy right hand upon his head'. But his father refused, and said, 'I know, my son, I know: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations'. And he blessed them that day, saying, 'In thee shall Yisrael bless, saying, Elohim make thee as Ephrayim and as Menasheh': and he set Ephrayim before Menasheh". ([Genesis 48:18-20](#))

As Ephrayim was foretold that would have become "great" and "a multitude of nations" - term that many fanatics like to translate "a commonwealth of nations" -, and Great Britain has the adjective "great" included in her name and is (was) the head of a community of nations, therefore, Ephrayim must be Great Britain! Simple, ain't it? That is how Brit-Am interpret the prophecies! Perhaps they ignore that there is an identical prophecy concerning another person:

"And as for Yishmael, I have heard you. See, I shall bless him, and shall make him bear fruit, and greatly increase him. He is to bring forth twelve princes, and I shall make him a great nation". ([Genesis 17:20](#))

"Arise, lift up the boy and hold him with your hand, for I make a great nation of him". ([Genesis 21:18](#))

Why not consider Yishmael instead of Ephrayim as the ancestor of the British? Which is the difference between one and the other? Both were half-Hebrew and

half-Egyptian, both were promised to become "a great nation" and the head of many princes and peoples. Why the British cannot be Ishmaelites, then? They must ponder seriously this possibility in order to keep their legitimate right to exist as a nation, because being Ephrayim, they cannot:

"Ephrayim shall be broken that it be not a people". (*Isaiah 7:8*)

Prophet Yeshayahu foretold Ephrayim that after the national destruction and exile, would never again exist as a separate nation. Ephrayim could survive only as one of the Tribes in the restored Israel, not as an independent state, not any longer after the Assyrian exile.

The Brit-Am deceivers not only pretend to be Ephrayim but also arrogate the right of the first-born, as they assert that it belongs to Ephrayim and not to the Jews (whom they call "Judah"). Let us see what do the Scriptures say:

"Then He [Elohim] rejected the tent of Yosef, and did not choose the Tribe of Ephrayim, but chose the Tribe of Yehudah, Mount Tzion, which He loved; and He built His Temple like the heights, like the Earth He founded it forever".  
(*Psalm 78:67-69*)

It is clear the election of God was Judah and not Ephrayim. It does not appear in any prophecy that God has changed His mind yet... His election is established forever, according to the Scriptures.

Do you think that the ability of the Brit-Am folks to invent miraculous metamorphosis of peoples ended with the Celts/Scythians/Saxons & co.? Not at all! There is another one: They claim that England is the Tribe of Ephrayim and that the USA are the Tribe of Menasheh - this means that the Brits, only by crossing the Ocean on the Mayflower have changed their whole ancestry and tribal membership! They were Ephrayimites, now they are Manashites - but their relatives who remained in Britain are still Ephrayimites... A real mystery of genetics! Besides this, they had lost category, passing from the most important Tribe to a lesser one. What is more, the Americans, a mixture of Anglo-Saxons, Africans, Latinos, Asiatic, Italians, Jews, Melungeons, Irish, Arabs, etc. are all of them of one single Tribe! Fantastic!

One of the most blatant contradictions supported by Brit-Am is that Ephrayim (England) is the younger and the greater, while Menasheh (the USA) is the older and the lesser. Is it necessary to explain which is the incoherence? I am getting tired of writing, please, think by yourselves a little, it is easy to know the answer...

I actually took a rest before going on; yesterday I did not write anything concerning this essay. I hope you have found the answer. Obviously, the USA can never be the older brother of the British, unless you take account of the non-British Natives that inhabited the New Continent centuries before the first European had set foot there. England was already a world power when they established the colonies that in the later 18th century ce became the USA. What about the peoples of Asia, from whom the genuine "Americans" (the Native Nations) were originated? What Tribe are they? Would the Brit-Am fanatics declare Israelites the whole Siberian and the other Asian peoples who inhabited North America before the Celts reached the British Isles? (Maybe they became Israelites only after having settled in the "Promised Land", but before they were just heathen...). That would be the only way to make the USA older than England! Indeed, the first Nordic peoples of whom there is documented knowledge that have sailed up to North America were the Norse Vikings since the end of the 9th century CE, when Bjarni Herjolfsson is supposed to have reached Greenland. Perhaps it was in 997 CE that the first Anglo-Saxons arrived in the present-day Canadian Islands with the Norsemen led by Thorgils Orrabeinsfostri, that according to the accounts regarding a shipwreck, had some "Westmen" slaves with them - that was how the Norse called the inhabitants of the British Isles - it is known that the Vikings used to take Anglo-Saxons as slaves in that period, therefore, the first Englishmen arrived in America were most likely slaves, not glorious conquerors. Then came also Erik Thorvaldsson "the Red", his sons Leif and Thorvald Eriksson, Thorfinn Karlsefni and other Scandinavian colonizers. The Norwegian/Icelander Vikings sailed to America for about five centuries, until the end of the 14th century CE, when they abandoned their colonies leaving there some of their people that intermarried with the "Skrolingar" (Native Nations). No British seafarer is recorded as leading any colonization if not after the Italian Columbus officially discovered the New Continent (though apparently he did

never know). Yet, not only did the Norse reached America before Columbus, but also the Phoenicians, probably also the Greeks, and surely the Chinese, that established a colony in present-day British Columbia since 1405 CE. Chinese artefacts discovered in America suggests some of the Chinese fleet landed on both the east and west coast of the continent.

If it is impossible for Brit-Am to explain in which way the USA are older than Britain, it is also untenable their thesis that the United Kingdom is greater than the USA, either in territory, population or power. Maybe the US Army must resign the leadership of all their outposts worldwide to Her Majesty's Royal Army in order to accomplish Brit-Am's will...

In fact, the so-called "Triumph Prophetic Ministries" (Church of God), one of the cults that follow this lunatic idea - but at least they do not have the impudence to declare themselves "Orthodox Jews" as the Brit-Am leader does -, has reversed the theory by alleging that it is Great Britain to be identified with Menasheh and the USA with Ephrayim. This review does not change the essence, anyway. All their claims are based on Celtic fairy tales and mediaeval legends, not on documented history.

## Fairy tales and distorted interpretations of prophecy

Brit-Am & co resort to Celtic legends (most of them related with magic and sorcery), mediaeval chivalric tales and the most ridiculous stories involving non-existing characters to which they credit historicity, connect them with some true historic facts that they are forced to postdate of some centuries, and then they take some prophetic verses of the Scriptures in a blasphemous way to make a mishmash of mythology and misinformation. All these elements combined with artificial similarities between English and Hebrew names and words - similarities that may appear as such to those who do not know Hebrew as they are transliterated in Latin characters, but not apparent at all if one knows the actual terms as they are in Hebrew, and less if one knows the true etymology of the English words. We have already shown two typical examples, the alleged meaning of British and Saxon, but there are many others which they mistreat in the same way, causing general laughter among linguists and philologists.

The Brit-Am maniacs show their delirium of racial superiority in the following assertions:

- They allege that Ephrayim, Menasheh and their associated Tribes (of which the Jews are excluded) were promised to rule the whole world, and that such prophecy is fulfilled in the British [ex-]Empire and the USA's world power.
- As they know that anyway the Kingdom of Israel belongs to the House of Judah, they have fabricated a genealogy by which they claim that the actual descendants of King David are the kings/queens of England!

In order to render the comment to these claims better understandable, it is necessary to consider first the scriptural aspect and then the historical facts. There are Bible verses that according to Brit-Am support their fables, but the Scriptures actually say exactly the contrary.

"I will bless you greatly, and I will multiply your seed greatly like the stars of the heavens, and like the sand which is on the seashore. Your seed will possess the gate of his enemies. In your seed will all the nations of the earth be blessed, because you have obeyed My voice". ([Genesis 22:17,18](#))

These promises, according to Brit-Am, are the proof that the Anglo-Saxons & co are the seed of Israel. But they were indeed given to Avraham, that generated many nations, not only Israel - and if these promises belong only to his Israelite descendants, then also the Jews must be included!

From a spiritual viewpoint, we may assert that in fact the Israelites were the only ones among his offspring that qualified to receive the promises, because the others did not keep Avraham's loyalty to God. Nevertheless, this Avrahamic Covenant was completed later, with the Mosaic Covenant, that did not contain unconditioned promises.

Another Scripture passage that they mention as supporting their madness is the one we have already considered above:

"... 'I know, my son, I know: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations'. And he blessed them that day, saying, 'In thee shall Yisrael bless, saying, Elohim make thee as Ephrayim and as Menasheh': and he set Ephrayim before Menasheh". (*Genesis 48:18-20*)

Do these words say anything about these Tribes becoming a world power? I do not find that meaning in Yakov's declaration, but rather a prophecy that Ephrayim would be multiplied and generate many peoples, and that also Menasheh would be the forefather of a people. They would be blessed, too. Nothing more than that. Not a single promise of becoming blue-eyed fair-haired guys controlling the world politics and economy!

These Tribes are mentioned again only after the Mosaic Covenant, that set the conditions in order that the promises be fulfilled:

"For to Me the children of Yisrael are servants; they are My servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt. I am Adonay your God... But if you will not listen to Me, and will not do all these mitzvot; and if you shall reject My statutes, and if your soul abhors My ordinances, so that you will not do all My mitzvot, but break My covenant... I will scatter you among the nations, and I will draw out the sword after you: and your land will be a desolation, and your cities shall be a waste... You will perish among the nations, and the land of your enemies will eat you up". (*Leviticus 26:14,15,33,38*)

We see, the way to attain the promises was rather a hard climb. The scattering among the nations was not a glorious thing, there is not a promise to become a world power elsewhere. Besides this, it does not appear that the British peoples & co are keeping the Mosaic rules in order to receive Israel's blessings, and they never did. They do not observe Shabbath but the sun-day, they do not keep the Israelite festivals but the pagan feasts, they do not eat only kosher food, they do not qualify to be considered Israelite according to the scriptural standards.

This is what the Scriptures say concerning the causes and nature of the scattering of the Israelites among the nations:

"I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that you shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto you go over the Yarden to possess it; you shall not prolong your days on it, but shall utterly be destroyed. Adonay will scatter you among the peoples, and you shall be left few in number among the nations, where Adonay shall lead you away". (*Deuteronomy 4:26,27*)

"It shall happen that as Adonay rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you, so Adonay will rejoice over you to cause you to perish, and to destroy you; and you shall be plucked from off the land where you go in to possess it. Adonay will scatter you among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even to the other end of the earth... Among these nations shall you find no ease, and there shall be no rest for the sole of your foot: but Adonay will give you there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and pining of soul; and your life shall hang in doubt before you; and you shall fear night and day, and shall have no assurance of your life. In the morning you shall say, Would it were even! and at even you shall say, Would it were morning! for the fear of your heart which you shall fear, and for the sight of your eyes which you shall see". (*Deuteronomy 28:63-67*)

"It shall happen, when all these things are come on you, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before you, and you shall call them to mind among all the nations, where Adonay your God has driven you, and shall return to Adonay your God, and shall obey His voice according to all that I command you this day, you and your children, with all your heart, and with all your soul; that then Adonay your God will turn your captivity, and have compassion on you, and will return and gather you from all the peoples, where Adonay your God has scattered you". (*Deuteronomy 30:1-3*)

"Yet will I leave a remnant, in that you shall have some that escape the sword among the nations, when you shall be scattered through the countries. Those of you that escape shall remember Me among the nations where they shall be carried captive". (*Ezekiel 6:8,9*)

"Moreover I swore to them in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the nations, and disperse them through the countries; because they had not

executed My ordinances, but had rejected My statutes, and had profaned My Shabbatot, and their eyes were after their fathers' idols". (*Ezekiel 20:23,24*)

"Yisrael is swallowed up. Now they are among the nations like a worthless thing. My God will cast them away, because they did not listen to Him; and they will be wanderers among the nations". (*Hoshea 8:8*)

"Scattered among the peoples", "left few in number", "from one end of the earth to the other end" (not only in the British Isles and America!), they will "find no ease", "no rest", "trembling heart", "failing of eyes", "pining of soul", their life will "hang in doubt", "fear night and day", "no assurance of life", "fear of heart", "carried in captivity", a "worthless thing", "wanderers among the nations"... all these are the characteristics of a powerful nation and a world empire, according to Brit-Am!

Now let us see what do the Scriptures say concerning Ephrayim in the few verses where this Tribe is mentioned in connection with prophecy:

"The children of Ephrayim, being armed and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle. They did not keep God's covenant, and refused to walk in His law... Moreover He rejected the tent of Yosef, and did not choose the tribe of Ephrayim, but chose the tribe of Yehudah, Mount Tziyon which He loved". (*Psalms 78:9,10,67,68*)

"It was told the house of David, saying, 'Syria is allied with Ephrayim'. His heart trembled, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the forest tremble with the wind... For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Retzin; and within sixty-five years Ephrayim shall be broken in pieces, so that it shall not be a people". (*Isaiah 7:2,8*)

"The fortress shall cease from Ephrayim, and the kingdom from Damascus, and the remnant of Syria. They will be as the glory of the children of Yisrael, says Adonay Tzevaot. It will happen in that day that the glory of Yakov will be made thin, and the fatness of his flesh will become lean". (*Isaiah 17:3,4*)

"Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephrayim, and to the fading flower of his glorious beauty, which is on the head of the fertile valley of those

who are overcome with wine!... The crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephrayim will be trodden under foot". (Isaiah 28:1,3)

"I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your brothers, even the whole seed of Ephrayim". (Jeremiah 7:15)

"Ephrayim is like an easily deceived dove, without understanding. They call to Egypt. They go to Ashur". (Hoshea 7:11)

"Ephrayim is struck. Their root has dried up. They will bear no fruit. Even though they bring forth, yet I will kill the beloved ones of their womb. My God will cast them away, because they did not listen to Him; and they will be wanderers among the nations". (Hoshea 9:16,17)

Where is the promise of glory and power? Where is it prophesied that Ephrayim will become the head of the nations? I challenge the Brit-Am deceivers to provide one single Bible verse to support their thesis! They cannot do so, because there is not such a verse. There are scriptural promises of restoration, after they have come back to the obedience of the Commandments, and such promises are to be accomplished within a complete gathering with Judah and in Eretz Yisrael, not anywhere else, as we will see later.

Let us consider the words of the following prophecy:

"Thus says Adonay: Refrain your voice from weeping, and your eyes from tears; for your work shall be rewarded, says Adonay; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. There is hope for your latter end, says Adonay; and [your] children shall come again to their own border. I have surely heard Ephrayim bemoaning himself [thus], You have chastised me, and I was chastised, as a calf unaccustomed [to the yoke]: turn You me, and I shall be turned; for You are Adonay my God". (*Jeremiah 31:16-18*)

"Therefore thus says Adonay God: Now will I bring back the captivity of Yakov, and have mercy on the whole house of Yisrael; and I will be jealous for My holy Name. They shall bear their shame, and all their trespasses by which they have trespassed against Me, when they shall dwell securely in their land, and none shall make them afraid; when I have brought them back from the peoples, and

gathered them out of their enemies' lands, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations. They shall know that I am the Adonay their God, in that I caused them to go into captivity among the nations, and have gathered them to their own land; and I will leave none of them any more there; neither will I hide My face any more from them; for I have poured out My Spirit on the house of Yisrael, says Adonay God". (*Ezekiel 39:25-29*)

Here the Israelites have a promise of return from captivity to their own land. The Prophet Ezekiel speaks about "the whole house of Israel" (so the ten Tribes must be included), Jeremiah specifies the message to Ephrayim, both Prophets declare that they will be "brought back out of the lands of their enemies". Do the British dwell in the lands of their enemies? Are the Americans captives of the Sioux, or perhaps of the Apaches or the Comanches? Can in any way this verse be applied to England and the USA? It is evident that absolutely not. This prophecy regards a people without their own state, at the mercy of strangers in whose countries they live. This word has begun to be accomplished with the rebirth of the State of Israel, and is still in progress, gathering Jews and peoples being acknowledged as descendants of the Tribes that were or are persecuted in the lands where they lived for centuries.

They are promised to return back to their own land, not to establish themselves as an independent nation in the British Isles or America:

"Again will I build you, and you shall be built, O virgin of Yisrael: again shall you be adorned with your timbrels, and shall go forth in the dances of those who make merry. Again shall you plant vineyards on the mountains of Shomron; the planters shall plant, and shall enjoy [the fruit of it]. For there shall be a day, that the watchmen on the hills of Ephrayim shall cry, Arise you, and let us go up to Tzion to Adonay our God. For thus says Adonay, Sing with gladness for Yakov, and shout for the chief of the nations: publish you, praise you, and say, Adonay, save Your people, the remnant of Yisrael. Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the uttermost parts of the earth, [and] with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child and her who travails with child together: a great company shall they return here. They shall come with weeping; and with petitions will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by

rivers of waters, in a straight way in which they shall not stumble; for I am a father to Yisrael, and Ephrayim is my firstborn. Hear the word of Adonay, you nations, and declare it in the islands afar off; and say, He who scattered Yisrael will gather him, and keep him, as shepherd does his flock. For Adonay has ransomed Yakov, and redeemed him from the hand of him who was stronger than he. They shall come and sing in the height of Tzion, and shall flow to the goodness of Adonay, to the grain, and to the new wine, and to the oil, and to the young of the flock and of the herd: and their soul shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not sorrow any more at all. Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, and the young men and the old together; for I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow".

*(Jeremiah 31:4-13)*

The place where the Israelites will settle once they are redeemed is described as "the mountains of Shomron (Samaria)", and their sanctuary is on Mount Tzion. They will not return after having conquered the world but with weeping, rescued from those that were stronger; their return will change their mourning into joy and they will be relieved from their sorrow. They do not come from the British Isles or America, but from "the uttermost parts of the earth" and specifically from "the north country" (which for the Prophet indicates the north in connection with Israel or Babylon, namely present-day Russia, from where actually most of the Ashkenazim returned to Israel), and from "the islands afar off", a term that the Brit-Am fellows use as a "proof" that the British Isles are the place where the lost Tribes are, without realizing that the "islands afar off" are mentioned as "nations" (Goyim), not as the ones who are returning, and that the Hebrew term "islands" simply means the coastlands anywhere out of the Middle East, not necessarily islands from the geographical viewpoint - for example, Rome is considered one of the "islands". By the way, I can suggest to include Italians among their chosen people, because in Hebrew "Italyah" means "Isle of the Dew of Yah", therefore, a highly blessed place - and this country name is written exactly this way in Hebrew... No, but Italians are too dark, and they have invented mafia, and were allied with the Germans...

Let us go ahead searching where do the Israelites return from, and where do they return back:

"Therefore say, Thus says Adonay our God: I will gather you from the peoples, and assemble you out of the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you Eretz-Yisrael". (Ezekiel 11:17)

"It will happen in that day that Adonay will set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant that is left of His people from Ashur, from Egypt, from Patros, from Kush, from Elam, from Shinar, from Chamat, and from the islands of the sea. He will set up a banner for the nations, and will assemble the outcasts of Yisrael, and gather together the dispersed of Yehudah from the four corners of the earth". (Isaiah 11:11,12)

"I will make all My mountains a way, and My highways shall be exalted. Behold, these shall come from far; and behold, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim". (Isaiah 49:11,12)

"Those of the South will possess the mountain of Esav, and those of the lowland, the Pelishtim. They will possess the field of Ephrayim, and the field of Shomron. Binyamin will possess Gil'ad. The captives of this army of the children of Yisrael, who are among the Kenaanim, will possess even to Tzarfat; and the captives of Yerushalayim, who are in Sefarad, will possess the cities of the Negev". (Obadiah 1:19-20)

Before quoting the next verses concerning this topic, let us consider the lands mentioned by the Prophets:

Isaiah 11:11,12 specifies that where the remnant will be left - this means that they are still there when called back to Eretz Yisrael - are Ashur, Elam, Shinar and Hamat, which are lands of the Middle East, and Egypt, Patros and Kush, that indicate the African continent. Then, he mentions the islands of the sea as a general term for the rest of the world. In 49:11,12 the Prophet speaks in vague terms of the far lands, the north and the west, and specifically of the "land of Sinim": whoever speaks Hebrew knows perfectly that this is the name of China. Yet, the Brit-Am deceivers distort the interpretation of this word and apply it to Australia! What an impudence! It is like claiming that where in English it is clearly written "China" one tries to convince somebody that the real meaning is Australia... It makes no sense. Sinim is Sinim, not another land. Different peoples

from China are now being recognized as Israelites, accomplishing this prophecy (the Shinlung or "B'ney Menasheh" - Children of Menasheh -, the Chiang-Min, the Kaifeng Jews, etc.). These peoples are neglected by the Brit-Am fellows because they do not fulfil the requirements of their racial policy.

Obadiah describes that the Israelites will take possess of their land in the way they are doing right now. There is a name that the Brit-Am fellows misuse in order to convince simple-minded people of their fallacies: "Tzarefat", that in modern Hebrew means "France". But is the Tzarfat of the Scriptures France, or there is another place having the same name in the Prophet's times? They also relate this name with the following one, "Sefarad", that means Spain, and since France and Spain are neighbours, therefore, Tzarfat must be France. There are different facts to consider regarding these names: First, that they are not neighbours in the Prophet's view, because "the captives of Israel will possess up to Tzarfat", while the captives of Jerusalem that "are in Sefarad will possess the Negev". One group comes from captivity and settle in Tzarfat, while the other comes from Sefarad to dwell in the Negev; they are not coming from neighbouring lands nor settle outside Eretz Yisrael. Therefore, where is Tzarfat? The Scriptures tell us: *"Arise, go to Zarephath, which belongeth to Tzidon, and dwell there: behold, I have commanded a widow woman there to sustain thee"* (1Kings 17:9). Prophet Eliyahu did not sail up to France, he went to Tzarfat, a town near Tzidon, in present-day Lebanon. It is easy to find this town in a map of ancient Canaan; Tzarfat is a port between Tzidon and Tzur. A careful reading of the verse will show that Prophet Obadiah is mentioning different places of Eretz Yisrael: the mountain of Esau, the land of the Philistines, the fields of Ephrayim and Samaria, Galaad, the land of Canaan up to Tzarfat, and the Negev. It is evident that none of these places are to be found in France. In fact, we have other translations that render the meaning of the Hebrew text of Obadiah 1:20 in a more explicit way: "... and the captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess *that of the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath*" (KJV); "... and the captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess *that of the Canaanites, even to Zarephath*" (WBS); "and the captives of this host of the children of Israel shall possess *what belonged to the Canaanites, unto Zarephath*" (DBY). It is quite clear that Tzarfat belonged to the Canaanites, and

as far as history and archaeology have revealed, the land of the Canaanites was not in France. It is quite evident that here Tzarfat and Sefarad are not related at all. The prophecy concerning the captives living in Sefarad is fulfilled with the return of the Sephardi Jews to Eretz Yisrael.

According to the Scriptures, the return is not expected to happen as separate events for the Houses of Judah and Israel, but for all Israel together:

"Yisrael is a hunted sheep; the lions have driven him away: first, the king of Ashur devoured him; and now at last Nevukhadnetzar king of Bavel has broken his bones. Therefore thus says Adonay Tzevaot, the God of Yisrael: Behold, I will punish the king of Bavel and his land, as I have punished the king of Ashur. I will bring Yisrael again to his pasture, and he shall feed on Karmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied on the hills of Ephrayim and in Gil'ad. In those days, and in that time, says Adonay, the iniquity of Yisrael shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Yehudah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I leave as a remnant". ([Jeremiah 50:17-20](#))

The Prophet regards the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles as related with one single people, and those that formerly constituted two kingdoms as one remnant. He does not distinguish the two entities any longer in the future. Both Houses return together, not as different peoples! The Scriptures reassert this concept in several passages:

"Tell them, Thus says Adonay God: Behold, I will take the stick of Yosef, which is in the hand of Ephrayim, and the tribes of Yisrael his companions; and I will put them with it, [even] with the stick of Yehudah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in my hand... Say to them, Thus says Adonay God: Behold, I will take the children of Yisrael from among the nations, where they are gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Yisrael; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all". ([Ezekiel 37:19,21,22](#))

"Thus says Adonay God: When I shall have gathered the house of Yisrael from the peoples among whom they are scattered, and shall be sanctified in them in the sight of the nations, then shall they dwell in their own land which I gave to My servant Yakov". (Ezekiel 28:25)

"In those days the house of Yehudah shall walk with the house of Yisrael, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I gave for an inheritance to your fathers". (Jeremiah 3:18)

At this point, it is an unquestionable truth the fact that:

- All the Israelites were scattered among the nations, without distinction between Judah and Israel, as captives;
- They were dispersed in every land throughout the whole Earth (though a particular emphasis is given more than once to the "land of the North", from where the Ashkenazim Jews come);
- They return back to the land that was given to their fathers (Avraham, Yitzchak and Yakov), that is the land of Canaan, Eretz Yisrael;
- They will no longer be two different entities, but one single people. Yet, let us read some other verses:

"I will strengthen the house of Yehudah, and I will save the house of Yosef, and I will bring them back; for I have mercy on them; and they will be as though I had not cast them off: for I am Adonay their God, and I will hear them. Ephrayim will be like a mighty man, and their heart will rejoice as through wine; yes, their children will see it, and rejoice. Their heart will be glad in Adonay. I will signal for them, and gather them; for I have redeemed them; and they will increase as they have increased. I will sow them among the peoples; and they will remember me in far countries; and they will live with their children, and will return. I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and gather them out of Ashur; and I will bring them into the land of Gil'ad and Levanon; and there will not be room enough for them. He will pass through the sea of affliction, and will strike the waves in the sea, and all the depths of the Nile will dry up; and the

pride of Ashur will be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt will depart".  
*(Zekharyah 10:6-11)*

Their return will be a relief from their affliction, and it will be their salvation - it does not convey the meaning of a powerful people having an organized state in which they live comfortably! They come mainly "from Ashur" (Asia) and "Egypt" (Africa), to dwell in Eretz Yisrael. Any doubt?...

"He will set up a banner for the nations, and will assemble the outcasts of Yisrael, and gather together the dispersed of Yehudah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephrayim will depart, and those who persecute Yehudah will be cut off. Ephrayim will not envy Yehudah, and Yehudah will not persecute Ephrayim. They will fly down on the shoulders of the Pelishtim on the west. Together they will plunder the children of the east. They will extend their power over Edom and Mo'av, and the children of Ammon will obey them. Adonay will utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with His scorching wind He will wave His hand over the River, and will split it into seven streams, and cause men to march over in sandals. There will be a highway for the remnant that is left of His people from Ashur, like there was for Yisrael in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt". *(Isaiah 11:12-16)*

"Adonay will be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians will know Adonay in that day. Yes, they will worship with sacrifice and offering, and will make a vow to Adonay, and will perform it... They will return to Adonay, and He will be entreated by them, and will heal them. In that day there will be a highway out of Egypt to Ashur, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Ashur; and the Egyptians will worship with the Assyrians. In that day, Yisrael will be the third with Egypt and with Ashur, a blessing in the midst of the earth; because Adonay Tzevaot has blessed them, saying, "Blessed be Egypt My people, Ashur the work of My hands, and Yisrael My inheritance". *(Isaiah 19:21-25)*

These prophecies regard the Messianic Age, in which the redemption of Israel is followed by that of her former enemies and involves a defeat of the present ones: the Philistines, Edom, Ammon and Moav represent the Islamic peoples that fight against Israel, have forced the Assyrians to exile and rule over the true

Egyptians, the Kopts. Assyrians and Egyptians will achieve liberation, and it is significant the fact that Israel will be the "third" of them. But this concerns another topic not pertaining to this discussion.

As we have seen, the Scriptures utterly disavow Brit-Am's claims, and so do also archaeology, documented history and genetics. There is not the slightest hint of a trace that might suggest any connection between the lost Tribes of Israel and the British people. Consequently, they have to resort to pagan fairy tales and mediaeval legends, developed during periods of general ignorance and superstition like the Middle Ages. Indeed, it is in that era that mysticism was in vogue and secret societies and chivalric orders arose, Christianity adopted heathen traditions and the search of magic objects was an obsession. The aristocratic families fabricated genealogies to claim any descent from Bible figures in order to gain more prestige and influence within the clergy. They usually did so by connecting some mythological character of their own clan with the circle of people related with Yeshua of Natzaret or his ancestry. The conquest of the Holy Land became the goal of the European kings and leaders, while others made any effort to find sacred objects like the Graal, the Shroud, slivers of the cross, etc. which by any mysterious reason were allegedly carried somewhere in Europe. It is within the environment of these myths that the whole building of Brit-Am is founded.

One of the most absurd as well as blasphemous claims is that of the "perpetual heritage of King David's throne", that they have transferred to the British royal house! To support this assertion, they associate excerpts of Bible verses out of their context with pagan sacred places and idolatrous objects actually linked with superstition and not with facts.

"HaShem tells you that Adonay will make you a house. When your days are fulfilled, and you shall sleep with your fathers, I will set up your seed after you, who shall proceed out of your bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be His Father, and he shall be My son: if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men; but My loving kindness shall not depart from him, as I took it from Sha'ul,

whom I put away before you. Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure for ever before you: your throne shall be established forever". (*2Shmuel 7:11-16*)

This passage of the Scriptures is widely [ab]used by the Brit-Am fanatics to assert that the royal lineage of King David cannot be interrupted and therefore a sovereign of his descent must be still ruling somewhere. Of course, that "somewhere" must be England... Before exposing the fairy tales that they take as "proofs" to link the British monarchy with the Davidic line, let us consider more accurately what did that promise of perpetual establishment of David's throne actually meant and involved:

Apparently, the declarations *"I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever"* and *"your throne shall be established forever"* are unconditional promises. Moreover, the term "forever" seems to indicate a perpetual, everlasting, eternal situation. Yet, it is not so in Hebrew: the word translated "forever" is *"'olam"*, that implies a long time, with possibility of interruption; it is not an immutable, unconditioned situation. Hebrew words, as it is a characteristic of Semitic languages, have their root in a verb; in the case of *"'olam"*, the root indicates a concept like "hidden from sight", something whose beginning or end cannot be defined, but not necessarily eternal. This term is also used for periods that lasted for long time in the past, but have come to an end. The same meaning conveys for a future event: it may not be defined in time, but may cease being. The concepts that are declared to be *"'olam"* may also be conditioned in order to keep being so. There are many examples in the Scriptures in which the term *"'olam"* is used, and it is impossible to translate it always as "forever" without rendering the phrase meaningless. Some of these examples are: *"An Ammonite or a Moavite shall not enter into the Assembly of Adonay; even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of Adonay forever: You shall not seek their shalom nor their prosperity all your days forever"* (Deuteronomy 23:3,6) - Here the term "forever" is limited to only ten generations. Yet, we know that Ruth the Moabitess was accepted in the Assembly of Israel, and that King David was only the third generation after a Moabite woman! - *"Observe and hear all these words which I command you, that it may go well with you, and with your children after you forever, when you do that which is good and right in the eyes of Adonay your God"* (Deuteronomy 12:28) - Here the "forever" is conditioned to the observance of the

Commandments and doing what is good. - *"Then you shall tell them, Because the waters of the Yarden were cut off before the Ark of the Covenant of Adonay; when it passed over the Yarden, the waters of the Yarden were cut off: and these stones shall be for a memorial to the children of Yisrael forever"* (Joshua 4:7) - Where can those stones be found today? Are they still there?... - *"Of whom have you been afraid and in fear, that you lie, and have not remembered Me, nor laid it to your heart? Have not I held My shalom even of long time, and you do not fear Me?"* (Isaiah 57:11) - Here the same term is used for a situation in the past. There are many other verses where the word "*olam*" is written not meaning "forever": Genesis 6:4; Exodus 21:6; 27:21, Leviticus 7:34; 10:15; 16:33-34; 24:7-8; 25:45-46; Numbers 19:10; Deuteronomy 15:17; 32:7; 33:15, Joshua 24:2; 1Shmuel 1:22; 27:8; 2Shmuel 12:10; 1Kings 8:13; 2Kings 5:27; Isaiah 46:9; 58:12; 61:4, Jeremiah 5:15; 18:15; Job 22:15; Ecclesiastes 1:10. Besides the lack of precision of the term translated "forever" in the above quoted passage, there are other verses in the Scriptures that complete the concept expressed in it:

"Now the days of David drew near that he should die; and he charged Shlomo his son, saying, I am going the way of all the earth: be you strong therefore, and show yourself a man; and keep the charge of Adonay your God, to walk in His ways, to keep His statutes, [and] His mitzvot, and His ordinances, and His testimonies, according to that which is written in the Torah of Mosheh, that you may prosper in all that you do, and wherever you turn yourself. That Adonay may establish His word which He spoke concerning me, saying, If your children take heed to their way, to walk before Me in truth with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail you a man on the throne of Yisrael".  
*(1Kings 2:1-4)*

"Adonay has sworn to David in truth. He will not turn from it: 'I will set the fruit of your body on your throne. If your children will keep My covenant, My testimony that I will teach them, their children also will sit on your throne forevermore'". *(Psalm 132:11-12)*

Evidently, there were some conditions for the actual fulfilment of the promise that the throne would have been established forever: *"keep the charge of Adonay your God, to walk in His ways, to keep His statutes, [and] His mitzvot, and His*

*ordinances, and His testimonies, according to that which is written in the Torah of Mosheh" , so " That Adonay may establish"; then it also says: "If your children will keep My covenant, My testimony that I will teach them, their children also will sit on your throne forevermore " , it is clear that "if not" implies the contrary. What is more, in all the quoted verses, the promise of God is always preceded by a "shall" or "will", that is, it may be accomplished in the future, not necessarily in the present. This future character of the promise is clear in the following words:*

*"Behold, the days come, says Adonay, that I will perform that good word which I have spoken concerning the house of Yisrael and concerning the house of Yehudah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause a Branch of righteousness to grow up to David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Yehudah be saved, and Yerushalayim shall dwell safely; and this is [the name] by which she shall be called: Adonay our righteousness. For thus says Adonay: David shall never want a man to sit on the throne of the house of Yisrael; neither shall the Kohanim the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to burn meal offerings, and to do sacrifice continually". ([Jeremiah 33:14-18](#))*

The Prophet is referring to the Messianic Age - in this all Rabbis and authorities in Hebrew Scriptures agree, and it is a future event. Moreover, this passage emphasizes the idea that "forever" is not such as understood in English: *"David shall never want a man to sit on the throne of the house of Yisrael; neither shall the Kohanim the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to burn meal offerings, and to do sacrifice continually"* - Do the Levites still perform the services they were appointed to do "forever" and "continually"? Is it there not lacking them a man doing so in the present, and since almost two millennia? Therefore, why must David have a physical throne with somebody of his descent ruling today? Both concepts are subject to the same conditions: that David would not lack one of his lineage to be king as well as the Levites would not cease serving in the Temple. But the Temple has not been rebuilt yet, nor the Kingdom of Israel has been re-established either. As well as the Levites were not able to continue their ministry during the Babylonian exile because the Temple was destroyed, and they cannot do so since 70 CE, when the second Temple was demolished, the House of David ceased ruling twice: during the usurpation of

queen Atalyahu, that lasted seven years, and after the last king of Judah, Tzidkiyahu, was taken captive by Nebukhadnetzar and the Kingdom of Judah did no longer exist (that of Israel disappeared 120 years before). Therefore, it is evident that the promise of a "perpetual" ruling lineage is conditioned by Israel's behaviour and may be accomplished in the future, but it is not continuous and has been actually interrupted. In fact, the Scriptures confirm that the royal lineage of David is no longer ruling, and this will last for a long time:

"For the children of Yisrael shall abide many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without sacred stone, and without efod or images. Afterward the children of Yisrael shall return, and seek the Adonay their God, and David their king, and shall come with trembling to Adonay and to His blessings in the last days". (*Hoshea 3:4-5*)

The children of Israel will "abide many days without king", until they "seek Adonay their God in the last days". This is what actually happened, and is still going on. There is not any Davidic Kingdom on the Earth right now.

Notwithstanding, the deceivers insist in contradicting the Scriptures, history and science, passing superstitions off as true facts. The fantasy of the mediaeval British is well known through the Arthurian legends (though most of their elements were actually imported from the Hungarians), and of the same character are the "proofs" presented by Brit-Am and their gang. Fortunately, the modern British people do not believe in such tales and consider them what they are: legends and a good subject for fiction films. As well as the Arthurian, the "Brit-Am legends" have also mythical characters, magic and sorcery, sacred objects and places, fairies, goblins and trolls - even a roaring stone!

The story begins as follows:

"Once upon a time, there was a nice girl called Tea-Tephi who was the daughter of a wicked king of a far away land, who was taken captive by another king more wicked than him. Tea-Tephi was able to escape because her uncle Jeremy, who was a wizard and a druid, took her to the promised land, that is Ireland..." Sorry, I try to be serious, but it is not so easy when telling Brit-Am's stories, believe me!

This is the right spirit with which one should listen to their proofs, taking them as what they actually are: fairy tales. So, I try to expose their fantastic fallacies in few words, because they are really blasphemous and nonsensical. As the beginning of the tale says, the Brit-Am storytellers assert that Prophet Jeremiah did not die in Egypt but sailed up to Ireland carrying with him an alleged daughter of King Tzidkiyahu, called Tea-Tephi (Perhaps she is also a relative of "Nephi", according to the name resemblance? Maybe she intended to reach her uncle in America but the winds drove her ship on the route to Ireland...). Jeremiah (Brit-Am's Merlin) allegedly carried with him also Jacob's pillow stone (Brit-Am's Excalibur), the Ark of the Covenant (Brit-Am's Graal), and placed them in Teamhair - Tara Hill, Ireland (Brit-Am's Camelot). Tea-Tephi (Brit-Am's Guinevere) is said to have married a descendant of Heremon (Brit-Am's Arthur), allegedly of the lineage of Zerach, son of Judah. In this way, knowing that the sceptre belongs to Judah and the Israelites must have a king of that Tribe, they have invented this alternative descent. They claim indeed that, while the offspring of Zerach's twin brother Peretz - from whom David descended - went to Canaan, Zerach's children sailed to Troy and then they settled in the British Isles and founded a royal dynasty in Ireland. Of course, there is not any reliable record about this story, it is just a mediaeval legend. Then, they connect Zerach's lineage with King David (Brit-Am's Lancelot) himself, as they claim that he sailed to Ireland and ruled there, being identified with the Eochaidh Ollamh Fodhla of the Irish accounts! One of his daughters is supposed to have married within the line of Heremon, thus joining both lineages of Judah, Peretz and Zerach, in one - a further "Davidic" descent was added to that of Zerach with Tea-Tephi marrying that imaginary king of Ireland. Strange thing, the Scriptures do not say anywhere in which moment might David have been absent from his Kingdom for so long as to reach Ireland and establish another kingdom there... as it is also inexplicable how could Ollamh Fodhla, that according to the Irish accounts reigned three centuries before David's rule in Israel, be the same person. The Irish accounts also mention Heremon as having ruled over Ireland after having defeated the Tuatha-de-Danann, before Judah's sons were born, perhaps before the birth of Judah himself!... I consider that it is not necessary to go deeper in this fiction novel that Brit-Am credits as true history.

A brief chronology of the Irish kingdom and comparison with contemporary events in Canaan

Ireland		Canaan	
According to the <i>Annals of the Four Masters</i> , the Tuatha-de-Danann ruled Ireland from 1897 bce to 1700 bce		In this period lived Avraham, Yitzchak and Yakov-Israel – According to the earlier dating of the Exodus, also the twelve sons of Yakov were born in this period.	
Milesian invasion	Heremon rules Ireland 1699-1683 bce	Yakov and his twelve sons settle in Egypt (earlier dating of the Exodus)	Yakov and his twelve sons lived in this period in Canaan (later dating of the Exodus)
Eochaidh Ollamh Fodhla	1317-1277 bce	Israelites ruled by Judges (earlier dating of the Exodus)	Israelites dwelling in Egypt (later dating of the Exodus)
	ca 1010-970 bce	King David rules Israel	
	721 bce	Fall of the Kingdom of Samaria - deportation to Assyria	
	597-586 bce	Tzidkiyahu, last King of Judah	Jerusalem is destroyed - Deportation to Babylon
Cobhthach Cael Breagh *	591-541 bce	The Israelites of both former Kingdoms are in exile in Assyria, Babylon and Media.	
* He assassinated his brother, king Laeghaire; and was slain by Maion, his nephew. This is the king that allegedly must have married the legendary Tea-Tephi			

The chronologic outline above reports the Irish records most widely credited by historians, archaeologists and researchers. If it is not enough to prove the unreliability of Brit-Am's fables, all the other elements on which such fables are built are proven false by documentary evidences:

- Tea-Tephi: Actually, she never existed; the Irish accounts where she is supposed to be mentioned, contain no record of her. In fact, some fanatic revivalists of the 19th century CE associated two unrelated names of the Irish and English traditions, Tea and Tephi, and created that legendary princess. Therefore, she is the fruit of a modern fable, not any ancient historic person. Some of them however, having admitted that the character is fictitious, have transferred the same attributes to "Skuthia", an alleged daughter of a pharaoh (therefore, and Egyptian, not Israelite), who is said to have reached Ireland and founded a royal line (the Milesians). Her name is related in fact with Scythia, and the Milesians traced their lineage to Scythia and Magog. Concerning the myth of Scuthia, the experts (archaeologists and historians) are very skeptical. It is actually considered a spurious legend, having little or no historical support at all. oTara Hill, whose Gaelic name is 'Teamhair', derives from a word meaning 'the place with a wide view'. Notwithstanding, the storytellers want to relate this name with Avraham's father Terach, in the same way they do violence to linguistics with all their stupid associations. It is a hill of about 90 metres above the surrounding countryside and was chosen as the traditional residence of the ancient Irish kings.
- Dowd Town: It is a place located about five kilometres north of Tara Hill, which the Brit-Am liars with their typical shamelessness mistranslate as "David's Town" in order to assert that King David actually was in Ireland. Perhaps they do not know that David in Gaelic is Daibhead, not Dowd. The true history of the O'Dowd clan and the variants O'Dubhda, O'Dowda and others descend from the Uo Faichrach, a name derived from a pagan king of Connacht and his son Daithi, who reigned in the 5th century CE. The O'Dubhda were a dynasty of kings of Tara since then for a long period. This is the documented history of the term Dowd and is recorded by the

families and clans having this name, that know nothing at all about King David having been in their realm.

- The "stone of destiny": One of Brit-Am's most revered idols is the "lia fail" or "stone of Scone" (provided they are the same thing), which they claim being the stone that served as pillow to Yakov in Beyt-El, allegedly carried to Ireland by one of the girls mentioned above. The tradition says that whoever claimed for himself the right to be the high king of Ireland had to stand on the magic stone *lia fail*, which roared if the applicant was approved. This is what Brit-Am regards as "history". This stone is claimed by them to be the one in the coronation chair at Westminster Abbey, while it seems that the true one is still in Ireland, at Cormac's House. All the Irish accounts credit the Tuatha-de-Danaan (not the Milesians or any Israelite girl) as those who brought the *lia fail* in Ireland from Germany (not from Canaan). There are discordant legends about the *lia fail* being carried to Scotland by the Irish kings when they moved there, and it can hardly be identified with the stone of Scone. There is a complete disagreement between the Irish and the Scottish accounts concerning this item; either the Scottish writers were not acquainted with the Irish records or they did not take them in consideration and gave their own version. It is quite likely that the *lia fail* and the stone of Scone are two different pieces... And that the coronation stone at Westminster is the same stone of Scone is also subject to serious objections. What is absolutely certain is that none of these rocks is Yakov's pillow. Not only because the original stone was the most obvious phallic symbol of ancient Ireland - a thing that was utterly forbidden to Israelites - but also because of its geologic composition: it is red calciferous sandstone, probably of Scottish origin, while the stones existing in the area of Beyt-El are white limestone, and the nearest place where one can find red sandstone is about 160 kilometres away, in Edom. The stone of destiny, namely Brit-Am's sacred idol, is a phallus-shaped stone that allegedly roars...
- The Ark of the Covenant: Another blasphemous claim preached by the Brit-Am deceivers is that Prophet Jeremiah allegedly took with him the Ark of the Covenant that was at the Temple in Jerusalem, and carried it to

Ireland. In 1899 CE, some fanatic revivalists excavated Tara Hill convinced that they would have found there the Graal... sorry, the Ark of the Covenant. What they found were some Roman coins that somebody had hidden there some days before so that they would not be disappointed. In further excavations made by serious archaeologists, authentic Roman items of the 1st-3rd centuries CE were found. In fact, the very Prophet Jeremiah said "they shall say no more: The Ark of the Covenant of Adonay; neither shall it come to mind; nor shall they remember it; nor shall they visit it; nor shall that be made again" (Yirmeyahu 3:16). How can these Brit-Am charlatans contradict the Scriptures so openly?

- There is another people claiming to have the Ark of the Covenant as well as kings of the Davidic lineage (already dethroned in 1974 CE), but they are not quite the ethnic type which the Brit-Am fellows like: the Ethiopians. Differently from the Brit-Am revivalist forerunners, whose claim was clearly ridiculous, scientists and historians showed some interest for the Ethiopian hypothesis and performed serious research, only to prove that the Ark of the Covenant is not in Ethiopia either. The most likely possibility is that when King Nebukhadnetzar attacked Jerusalem the last time, the Babylonians built a siege wall around the city wall (2Kings 25:1,4), then the city and the Temple were destroyed. The Ark might have been hidden underground somewhere between the two walls during the siege, or burned with the Temple.
- Concerning the Davidic royal line, the Ethiopian dynasty that ended only some decades ago traces their ancestry up to King Shlomoh, through a supposed son that he had with the Queen of Sheva. Even though the scriptural and historical support to this claim is quite faint, yet is much stronger than Brit-Am's claims, since the faintest is much more than absolutely nothing. Indeed, there is an ancient Jewish tradition in Ethiopia and there were periods in which that nation was ruled by Jewish kings - something that never happened in Britain or any other Western-European country. About the love story of the Queen of Sheva with King Shlomoh, the Scriptures do not say anything; though it might be implied. Indeed, many interpreters understand that the Hebrew verb "to come" in the

phrase "she came to Shlomoh" (1Kings 10:2; 2Chronicles 9:1) is often used in the Scriptures with the meaning of entering a house for the purpose of sexual relations. Also the statement "King Shlomoh gave to the Queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked" (1Kings 10:13; 2Chronicles 9:12) may imply that he also satisfied her sexually. A further element that may support the idea that both sovereigns were lovers would arise if the Shir HaShirim composed by Shlomoh refers to her; indeed, the beloved lady perfectly fits the description of a Yemenite noblewoman: dark complexioned (Shir HaShirim 1:5-6), coming from the desert, perfumed with myrrh, incense and fragrant spices (Shir HaShirim 3:6), adorned with gold, pearls, etc. Notwithstanding, the Queen of Sheva was not Shlomoh's wife, and she returned back to her country after her visit to Jerusalem. Besides the Bible account, that is the only contemporary record concerning this Queen, a good deal of tales flourished some centuries later, that became part of the legendary heritage of Ethiopia and Arabia, and was even included among their sacred literature - while not any sacred Celtic or Anglo-Saxon item might recall any Israelite tradition. Even though there is not any proof that the Ethiopian dynasty may indeed have been of Davidic bloodline, at least there are some biblical hints; but with regards the British monarchy, such a possibility is absolutely impossible. Perhaps the Brit-Am fellows do not know the present queen's house: Hannover-Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, a fully German line that changed its name into a more English one, Windsor, during the WWI, as they were in war with their own country, Germany. This is documentary history that may be read in the official website of the British Monarchy. Nevertheless, here I show the present queen's ancestry:

- George I (he did not speak English!), married Sophia Dorothea of Braunschweig-Lüneburg;
- George II, married Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach;
- their son Friedrich was not king, married Augusta of Saxe-Gotha and were the parents of

- George III, married Charlotte Sophia of Mecklenburg-Strelitz and were the parents of the tree following monarchs:
- George IV, married Caroline of Braunschweig
- William IV and
- Victoria, that married Albert of Saxe-Coburg;
- Edward VII, married Alexandra of Denmark (who had also German bloodline),
- George V, married Mary of Teck – the house changes its name to "Windsor";
- George VI, married Elizabeth Bowes-Lyon;
- Elizabeth II, that married Phillip of the royal house of Greece, also of German line.
- Therefore, the British monarchy, as many others in Europe (including the Russian Czars) is a German family, in which the kings usually married German spouses and so keeping almost pure their Teutonic bloodline. There is not any Israelite ancestry in the British dynasties, neither the present nor the past ones.
- It is obvious that neither King David nor Prophet Jeremiah have ever been in the British Isles. The whole life of King David is recorded in the Scriptures, his acts of valour as a warrior, his songs and poetry as a psalmist, his love affairs, his fleeing from King Shaul, his conquest of Jerusalem, his reign and battles, until his last days. As for Prophet Jeremiah, the Scriptures say that he was carried by the Jews to Egypt, and other ancient sources (Elmakin, Epiphanius, Abulpharagius, Jerome, Tertullian, etc.) say that Jeremiah died in Egypt. The most credited versions about how did he end his days assert that Jeremiah was stoned

in Egypt. Irish annals do not contain one single word about the prophet Jeremiah. There are some Irish legends that speak about a group of Egyptians, including a descendant of the Pharaoh, that landed in Ireland, many centuries before both David and Jeremiah were born, perhaps before Mosheh also. They were pagans and worshipped the sun, not the Holy One of Israel.

## Further details

This essay is drawing to a conclusion. There are many other claims that may be considered and all of them proven utterly false, but these already exposed should be enough to show how Brit-Am and similar groups deceive people. They have not any single evidence, neither the slightest hint of proof for their absurd and ridiculous claims. The Scriptures disavow them, history, archaeology, geology, anthropology, genetics and linguistics disprove them, science discredits them.

Brit-Am's storytellers always refer to "ancient sources" to spread their lies, but they fail to point to any specific account, record or proof of any kind. If there existed historical documents which supported their claims, they would have reproduced and multiplied them in facsimile and shown them to the whole world. But they have not done that, simply because there are no such documents. They have only counterfeit items and speculative theories.

One of these deceptive methods is their comparisons between Hebrew and Celtic words, which they relate in a forced way in order to convince people that the original language of the British was Hebrew. Yet, the same comparisons may be established with almost every language obtaining the same results, since it is proven that all tongues have a common origin, namely Babel, and that Aramaic - that is closely related to Hebrew - is the source for all Semitic languages and many non-Semitic as well; even Greek has taken many terms from Aramaic and transferred them to most European tongues. Consequently, their language "proof" is completely worthless.

The "appointed place": One of the Scripture passages that the blasphemous Brit-Am fellows like to misquote is *2Shmuel 7:10-13*:

"I will appoint a place for My people Yisrael, and will plant them, that they may dwell in their own place, and be moved no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as at the first, and [as] from the day that I commanded judges to be over My people Yisrael; and I will cause you to rest from all your enemies. Moreover Adonay tells you that Adonay will make you a house. When your days are fulfilled, and you shall sleep with your fathers, I will set up your seed after you, who shall proceed out of your bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever".

The masters of deception assert that the "appointed place" are the British Isles and America, pleading the future tense of the verb. Since they boast so baldly about their knowledge of the "Hebrew" language, we may pertinently ask the Brit-Am teachers: what tense is "will appoint" in the original text, in Hebrew? Actually, the correct translation is: *"I have appointed a place"*. The rendering "will appoint" only indicates that the place would be appointed from the time of the Judges - already over in David's time - and continuously, hence the future tense was applicable to the idea set forth - a permanent designated place from the time of the Judges, and that place is where the Temple was to be built. Consequently the appointed place is the land that was promised to the fathers, and Mount Zion where the House of G\$d was settled. Let us read some verses of the numerous ones that indicate which is the appointed place:

"In that day Adonay made a covenant with Avram, saying, 'To your seed I have given this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Perat.'" (*Genesis 15:18*)

"Adonay said to Mosheh: 'I will bring you into the land which I swore to give to Avraham, to Yitzchak, and to Yakov; and I will give it to you for a heritage: I am Adonay'." (*Exodus 6:1,8*)

"Remember Avraham, Yitzchak, and Yisrael, Your servants, to whom You swore by Your own self, and said to them, 'I will multiply your seed as the stars of the sky, and all

this land that I have spoken of I will give to your seed, and they shall inherit it forever'." *(Exodus 32:13)*

"Adonay spoke to Mosheh, Depart, go up from here, you and the people that you have brought up out of the land of Egypt, to the land of which I swore to Avraham, to Yitzchak, and to Yakov, saying, 'I will give it to your seed'." *(Exodus 33:1)*

"Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which Adonay swore to your fathers, to Avraham, to Yitzchak, and to Yakov, to give to them and to their seed after them". *(Deuteronomy 1:8)*

"Adonay said to him, This is the land which I swore to Avraham, to Yitzchak, and to Yakov, saying, I will give it to your seed: I have caused you to see it with your eyes, but you shall not go over there". *(Deuteronomy 34:4)*

"So Adonay gave to Yisrael all the land which He swore to give to their fathers; and they possessed it, and lived therein. Adonay gave them rest round about, according to all that He swore to their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; Adonay delivered all their enemies into their hand". *(Joshua 21:43,44)*

Quoting the whole Bible would take a long space, but these few examples must be enough. Which was the place that G@d promised to Avraham calling it "this land"? Which was the country before Mosheh's eyes when he was on Mount Pisgah and shown to him as the Promised Land inherited by His people? Which is the place conquered by Yehoshua that was promised to the People of Israel where they would have found rest from their enemies?... It was not England, was it? Until proved otherwise, it is Canaan, Eretz Yisrael.

## Conclusion

It is quite clear and thoroughly demonstrated that the British/Celtic/Anglo-Saxon etc. people are NOT the lost Tribes of Israel and have not any link with them, neither ethnic, genetic, cultural, historic, nor even spiritual or theological. Whoever proposes such hypothesis is to be considered a deceiver in the service of religious organizations that usually take advantage of simple-minded people to convince them to follow their sinister purposes, in this specific case, the

promotion of a racial superiority, that is against Judaism, against Christianity and against any honest belief and human nature.

Therefore, we may ask: Do the lost Tribes exist, or it is just a myth? First of all, it is necessary to define the inaccuracy of the concept of lost "Tribes" and the preference for the more realistic expression "lost Israelites", or better than lost, "unknown" Israelites or unknown Hebrews. In fact, there are peoples that can rightfully claim Israelite origins or ancestry, as it is a matter of fact that many of the exiles of both former Kingdoms did not return back to the Land of Israel and intermarried or adopted other cultures and languages. Nevertheless, there are some specific features that are unique to the Hebrew people and that have not been completely lost, but are still present within some peoples, mainly in Asia and Africa, and allow us to distinguish them from the non-Hebrew surrounding groups. These peoples also fulfil some prophetic requirements, like not having their own statehood or being a minority spread worldwide, besides the fact of keeping much of Torah rules not present in other cultural and legal systems. There is with certainty some Israelite blood in the present-day Assyrians, who intermarried many of their exiles and are today sympathetic towards the Jewish People, as well as there is a strong Israelite identity within the Roma, with whom is concerned an essay in the set "Myths, Hypotheses and Facts" ([here](#)), and other groups in [Asia](#) and [Africa](#). All these essays are founded on serious scientific research, leaving aside legends and fantastic accounts.