

STEVEN M. COLLINS' PRETZEL FACTORY, #4

With this fourth paper, we continue our critical review of Steven M. Collins' twisted view/s, that the "JEWS ARE JUDAH" in his position paper on Internet web site http://www.israelite.info/Christian_Authors/Jews-are-Judahreasons.htm. Steven M. Collins' mailing address is: P.O. Box 88735, Sioux Falls, SD 57109-1005. Collins is the author of a book entitled *The Lost Tribes of Israel ... Found*, which I would give only a mediocre rating. By the way, if you haven't read paper #'s 1, 2, & 3 you may not entirely comprehend this one.

The heading at the top of Collins' "JEWS ARE JUDAH" paper reads: "Four Reasons The Jews Are 'Judah'." In my paper #1 it was necessary to show that Collins did not properly interpret Zephaniah 2:1-7 correctly, as it is not an end-day prophecy as he claims. I further illustrated how the present-day Israeli constitutes an illegitimate, outlaw state inasmuch as Judaea came back under British rule in 1917 when the times of the Gentiles (heathen) were fulfilled. Additionally, I showed how the "chosen vessel", Paul, at Romans 16:20 identified the Romans (being Israelites) as the "seed of the woman" of Genesis 3:15; and those being besieged by Titus at Jerusalem who were pretending to be of Judah, but were rather the "seed of the serpent."

In paper #2, I demonstrated how, at Jeremiah 19:11, Judah as a nation was like a smashed earthen vessel, never to be put back together again once broken in 70 A.D. under Titus. I continued then to show how Collins was interpreting Zechariah chapters 12 through 14 incorrectly.

In my paper #3, I demonstrated how there is no record ever of an Edomite-Jew sitting on the throne of David. Rather, I gave evidence that the Edomite-Jew Herod appointed "obscure sorts" to the priesthood and attempted to burn all the genealogical records to cover-up his own "base origins."

Hence, with my paper #'s 1, 2 & 3, it invalidates Collins' 1st, 2nd & 3rd reasons of 4.

I will now quote from Collins on his fourth reason:

"REASON 4: THE 'ASHKEN-AZI' AND 'ASHKAN-IAN' JEW LINKAGE"

"The linchpin of arguments opposing a Judaic identity for modern Jews is the contention that modern Ashkenazi Jews are 'religious' but not 'racial' Jews. This argument asserts that the Ashkenazi Jews (i.e. central and eastern European Jews) descended from Khazar-Edomite (non-Israelite) bloodlines, and therefore cannot truly constitute 'Judah' in the modern world. This author is aware that some who espouse the 'Khazar-Edomite origin of the Jews' theory do acknowledge that some Sephardic Jews (i.e. Spanish/ Mediterranean Jews) are members of the house of Judah."

I would remind the reader that I presented evidence in my paper #3 that both the Sephardic and Ashkenazi are related inasmuch as they both have Hittite blood flowing in their veins. Contrary to Collins, the "Jewish" question is definitely genetic in nature! Not only that, but the true Israelites were given the commission to kill every last one of them – man, woman and child! Inasmuch as true Israel defaulted in implementing that command, Yahweh put it on hold as a punishment that the Canaanite variety of Jews might become pricks in our eyes and thorns in our sides so the Israelites would come to their sanity. As a result the Canaanite-Jew now controls every facet of life of every individual person in the entire world. And indeed, the

Canaanite-Jew became the head and we Israelites became the tail as per Deuteronomy 28:43-46:

“The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low. He shall lend to thee, and thou shalt not lend to him: he shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail. Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of Yahweh thy Elohim, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee: And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever.”

We were warned at Numbers 33:55: **“But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you; then it shall come to pass, that those which ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell.”**

Collins here undertakes to make these same Canaanite-Jews our brothers! I wonder from where Collins borrows his satanic “Jewish” money. Evidently, Collins is unable to comprehend that true Israel cannot simultaneously be both the head and tail of Deuteronomy 28:43-46. Collins continues his ranting and raving, insane diatribe thusly:

“This section will document the following points: (A) While some base their judgment on the identity of the house of Judah by differentiating between the terms ‘religious Jews’ and ‘racial Jews,’ two biblical passages indicate that God regards these terms as a ‘distinction without a difference,’ and (B) There is a major misunderstanding about the origin of the term ‘Ashkenazi’ Jew, and that secular evidence indicates they are, in fact, the Israelite house of Judah.”

“Those who say that modern Jews include Edomite and Khazar bloodlines are correct. Now, let’s examine the historical extent of these facts and determine from the Bible if this really matters in the eyes of God.”

“To assert that any of the tribes of Israel was ever a pristinely, non-Gentile entity is a myth. The Israelites have always included gentile bloodlines in their midst, and God’s word allowed them to do so. In the time of the Exodus, God allowed the Israelites to be accompanied by a ‘mixed multitude’ of people who had been slaves in Egypt. Numbers 12 records that God swiftly punished Miriam (Moses’ sister), because she dared to criticize Moses for having a Gentile (Cushite) wife. In the days of Kings David and Solomon, the Israelites virtually merged with the Gentile residents of the city-states of Tyre and Sidon (I Chronicles 14:1, II Chronicles 2, 8:18). II Chronicles 2:17 records 153,600 ‘strangers’ (Gentiles) lived in Israel during Solomon’s rule. King David had a Gentile leader in his army called ‘Uriah the Hittite’ (II Samuel 11), and David’s royal bodyguard was composed of ‘Cherethites and Pelethites’ (II Samuel 8:18), who were likely Philistines and Cretans. [4] Ruth, a Moabitess, was an ancestor of both King David and Jesus Christ (Ruth 1:4).”

Collins here endlessly piles **lie** upon **lie** upon **lie!!!** This proves beyond all reasonable doubt that Collins, rather than studying Scripture to show himself approved by Yahweh, is but a surface reader of the “translated” text!

Collins, in his last statement before I cut in on him, made the accusation that “Ruth was a Moabite.” For this I am required by Yahweh to take him to task! But to give the matter proper credence, we must go back to the beginning of the story. For this we must go back to when the Israelites entered Canaan after their 40 year wandering in the Exodus. When the Israelites entered the Promised Land, Moab was the first territory they conquered. Yahweh had commanded that Israel totally exterminate the occupants of the lands where they settled, and in

Moab they did just that. About 1450 B.C., Sihon, king of the Amorites, had conquered and occupied Moab, and was its ruler when the Israelites arrived. At Numbers 21:26, 29 we read:

“For Heshbon was the city of Sihon the king of the Amorites, who had fought against the former king of Moab, and taken all his land out of his hand, even unto Arnon ... Woe to thee, Moab! thou art undone, O people of Chemosh: he hath given his sons that escaped, and his daughters, into captivity unto Sihon king of the Amorites.”

That the Israelites had conquered the land of the Moabites, killing all the people they found there, we read at Deuteronomy 2:32-34: **“Then Sihon came out against us, he and all his people, to fight at Jahaz. And Yahweh our Elohim delivered him before us; and we smote him, and his sons, and all his people. And we took all his cities at that time, and utterly destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones, of every city, we left none to remain.”**

This would have been approximately 1453 B.C. After destroying all the Moabites, the Israelites advanced on Ammon, Numbers 21:33-35:

“And they turned and went up by the way of Bashan: and Og the king of Bashan went out against them, he, and all his people, to the battle at Edrei. And Yahweh said unto Moses, Fear him not: for I have delivered him into thy hand, and all his people, and his land; and thou shalt do to him as thou didst unto Sihon king of the Amorites, which dwelt at Heshbon. So they smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none left alive: and they possessed his land.”

The important thing to notice here is that this left a vacuum of population with the destruction and displacement of a majority of peoples of the lands of Moab and Ammon during the Joshua Period, whereupon this area east of the Jordan was promptly settled by the Israelite tribes of Reuben, Gad and half of the Tribe of Manasseh. Ruth came out of that same conquered land of Moab several generations later during the Judges Period, and it doesn't take a rocket-scientist to figure out that Ruth was an Israelite dwelling in the former land of Moab! My God, when are we ever going to start proving these things before we open our mouths and, of our own free will, make ourselves blathering fools?! And that is exactly what Steven M. Collins has made himself! He is, in all practical reasoning, a fool! And surely, he's far removed from being a Bible student!

To add to this evidence, at Judges 11:12-26, three hundred years later, we find the Israelites still occupying the lands of Moab and Ammon, well beyond the time of Ruth, and it is still part of Scripture for anyone who wishes to read it! We should at least read Judges 11:26: **“While Israel dwelt in Heshbon and her towns, and in Aroer and her towns, and in all the cities that be along by the coasts of Arnon, three hundred years? why therefore did ye not recover them within that time?”**

Now to answer Collins' charge that Moses married a *“Gentile (Cushite) wife.”* First of all, evidently Collins doesn't have the slightest idea of the meaning or origin of the word “Gentile.” The word “Gentile” is to be found nowhere in Scripture. The reason for this is because “Gentile” is a Latin term meaning a non-Roman. Under that criteria, Christ Himself and eleven of His disciples were all “Gentiles” (non-Romans), except Paul who was born a Roman citizen. It is evident that the word “Gentile” got into our Bibles when Gregory translated the Greek to Latin. Under the same criteria then, unwittingly Collins is charging Moses of marrying a non-Roman wife, and Rome had not yet come into existence. The words you will find in Scripture which have been erroneously translated “Gentile” are *goy* in Hebrew and *ethnos* in the Greek, and usually, but not always, simply mean “nations.” It's like the promise to Abraham; he was promised by Yahweh that his offspring would become many “*goy*.” Under that criteria, all the children of Israel

were “Gentiles.” So Collins’ first mistake was using the term “Gentile”, not knowing its true meaning. It’s a term which we should avoid like the plague! And if on occasion we do use the term, we should make clear the context we’re using it in. I would recommend that Collins, in his ignorance, not use the term at all, ever! Better than 90% of the time in the New Testament, when the term “Gentile” is used, it is speaking of the lost tribes of Israel. And is that not what Abraham was promised? – “I will make you many goy or nations”, or in the Greek “*ethnos*.”

Not only does Collins err on the term “Gentile”, but also on the term “Cush.” You can tell by the devious manner in which he stated it, he was implying that Moses married a Negro. Evidently, Collins is unaware there were two countries named Cush in Bible times. One was Ethiopia, lying south of the Sudan in Africa. There was another Cush in eastern Mesopotamia, or what at other times was part of the Babylonian empire. These people were never a black race at any time! This Cush flourished about 1500 B.C., identical to the time of Moses when the Exodus from Egypt occurred. In short, Moses married a daughter of the priest of Midian, Zipporah, though not an Israelite, she was White. Let’s now continue with Collins’ nauseating diatribe:

“God knew that many Gentiles would intermarry with the Israelites, and gave directions on how ‘strangers’ (or ‘sojourners’) could be lawfully blended into the Israelite tribes. In Leviticus 19:33 - 34, God commanded:

“...if a stranger sojourn with you in your land, you shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwells with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and you shall love him as yourself; for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God.”

“About 800 years later, God again cited this command in Ezekiel 47:21-23:

“So you shall divide this land unto you according to the tribes of Israel ... you shall divide it by lot for an inheritance unto you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you: and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have an inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel ... In what tribe the stranger sojourns, there shall you give him his inheritance, saith the Lord.”

“Interesting! God commanded the Israelites to give equal inheritances to Gentile ‘sojourners’ who intermarried with the Israelites, and THEY ARE TO BE REGARDED AS FULL MEMBERS OF THE TRIBE in which they ‘sojourned.’ Indeed, despite the various wars between the Israelites and the Edomites, God also commanded the Israelites in Deuteronomy 23:7-8:

“You shall not abhor an Edomite; for he is your brother ... the children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the Lord in their third generation.”

“Strangely, some who deny the ‘Jewishness’ of the Jews use the term ‘Edomite’ as a pejorative epithet. In the above scripture, God ordered Israelites not to despise Edomites! It is easy to see why God regarded the Edomites as ‘brothers’ to the Israelites.”

“Edomites descend from Esau (Genesis 36:43), and Esau was Jacob’s twin brother (Genesis 25:19-26). Jacob was renamed Israel (Genesis 32:28), and Judah was one of his twelve sons. This means Esau (Edom) was an uncle to Judah, the first Jew. Edomites are descended from Abraham and Isaac, so they are also descended from Eber (from whom we derive the term ‘Hebrew’). [5] Since Edomites are both Semite and Hebrew, Edomites are as closely-related to the Israelites as any Gentile can be!”

“God decreed that when strangers (Gentiles) ‘sojourned’ among the Israelites, they could intermarry with Israelites and be regarded as Israelites as surely as if they were ‘born in the land.’ The term ‘sojourn’ encompasses more than just ‘dwell’ in the land, however. A Gentile had to adopt the religion and culture of the Israelites to be considered an Israelite. Now we will apply this biblical principle to the history of the Jewish people.”

For Collins' information, Scripture does not say: "You shall not abhor an Edomite; for he is your brother." It's a copyist's error in the Hebrew. It's all a matter of doing some basic research and not following what others have said by their traditional error.

I found the *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible* assigned the term "Edomite" with the Hebrew word #130 which says:

"#130 ... **Edômîy**, ... **Edôwmîy**, ed-o-mee'; patronymic [derived from father's name] from 123; an Edomite, or descendant from (or inhabitant of) Edom:— Edomite. See 726."

Inasmuch as I didn't want to overlook anything important, and I felt there was something desperately wrong with this passage, I decided to check on the word #726 which had the following to say:

"#726 ... **Arôwmîy**, ar-o-mee'; a clerical error for 130; an *Edomite* (as in the margin): — Syrian."

At once this struck me, for if the proper rendering was "Syrian" instead of "Edomite", it would make all the difference in the world. At the time, I knew this made more sense if Deuteronomy 23:7 were to read "Syrian" rather than "Edomite", for the Syrians were Abraham's relatives, in which case this verse would read:

"Thou shalt not abhor a Syrian; for he *is* thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land."

One day I was reading along in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 24, under the subtitle Edom when I read this:

"... there are places where, because of the similarity between the letters ד (d) and ר (r), the text has wrongly read אַרַם, 'Aram' (i.e., Syria), and אַרְסִימ, 'Arameans' (i.e., Syrians), for אַדְמ, 'Edom', and אַדְסִימ, 'Edomites', such as II Kings 16:6; II Chr. 20:2, where the KJV has followed the MT, but the RSV has followed an emended text."

The main thing to notice here is the "similarity between the letters ד (d) and ר (r)." You can see very readily that a very small slip of the pen can change the word from Edomite to Syrian, or Syrian to Edomite. Collins has now struck out on all of his 4 reasons of 4.

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836

Please Feel Free To Copy, Or Order:
10 for 2.00; 25 for 3.00; 50 for 5.00 or 8.00 per 100