

SHEMITIC IDIOMS AND GENESIS CHAPTER THREE

© 2007 William Finck

The Bible, a collection of very ancient books written in languages which have not been spoken in their original forms for many, many centuries, contains many enigmas for the average reader of modern times. This is especially true since many parts of the Bible – and it is the Old Testament being discussed here as well as the New – were written in parables and in the poetic language of prophetic vision. While it is certainly a sound practice to interpret Scripture in the context of Scripture, with the idea in mind that the Word of Yahweh our God clarifies and explains itself, the 66 books of the Protestant Bible, or 72 for the Catholics, or even 80 for the original King James Version compilers of 1611, are not by themselves a complete revelation of the history of White Man (Adam-kind). Neither should one be so arrogant as to believe that these books which we now have were the only inspired Scriptures transmitted in antiquity: for not all of the books excluded from canon by early churchmen deserved such a fate, and not all of the books of antiquity survived until the Christian era. Neither can these books be completely understood all by themselves in any language, because of their incomplete state and the antiquity of the languages they were written in. Yet with sound, thorough studies in history and archaeology, many facets of the Bible are much better understood. Not only the historical books of the Bible, but the utterances of the prophets also come to life with studies in these fields, and the certainty of the Word of Yahweh our God is surely made manifest. Furthermore, with studies of the ancient languages which the Bible was first written in, a surer understanding of that Word is acquired. Yet unless one looks outside of the Bible, to other ancient writings produced by kindred cultures during the Biblical age, a proper understanding of many of the metaphors and idioms of Biblical languages shall never be acquired, and the intended meaning of many Biblical passages shall forever remain concealed. Here we shall look at part of an ancient Mesopotamian poem, The Epic of Gilgamesh, and see that it helps us understand certain obscure, oft-debated passages found in the third chapter of Genesis.

The version of The Epic of Gilgamesh cited here, and some of the information concerning the poem, is from *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (hereinafter *ANET*), edited by James B. Pritchard, Princeton University Press, 1969, pp. 72-99. Here an Akkadian version of the poem is found, which was based upon a much older Sumerian version, and most of the Akkadian tablets containing the epic were uncovered by archaeologists who excavated the library of the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal at Nineveh. The Assyrians were Shemites, cousins of the Israelites, who had descended from that Asshur mentioned at Gen. 10:22. Their language, Akkadian, was the lingua franca (the language of commerce and diplomacy) throughout the ancient world for a thousand years up to the Persian period, where after the sixth century B.C. it was eclipsed by Aramaic. Other fragments of this Akkadian

version of the epic have been found elsewhere, some of which are dated to the first half of the second millennium B.C., and it is clearly evident that the poem existed in Akkadian even before Moses wrote the Pentateuch. The poem is known to have existed in Sumerian even before the time of Abraham. It is in Sumer, in the Chaldaean city of Ur, where Abraham is first introduced to us in Scripture (Gen. 11:27 ff.).

The creation of epic poetry as a method of communicating myth and history was a pastime of Adamic cultures throughout ancient times. Unknown to many, the Exodus account as it was written in Hebrew was originally an epic poem, and there are other shorter examples of the genre in Scripture. Reading *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, the poem surely seems to set the precedent for the later Greek epics about Odysseus, Heracles and Jason: for they are all tales of mighty men performing heroic deeds coupled with long travels to strange places. The character Gilgamesh, like so many early Greek heroes, was said to have been formed by the gods, and to be himself two-thirds god and one-third human (*ANET*, p.73). If this brings Genesis chapter 6 to mind, it is surely not an accident. Gilgamesh is also mentioned several times in the Book of Giants found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, for which see the scrolls designated 4Q530 and 4Q531. The Book of Giants is an elaboration of the Genesis 6 account associated with the “apocryphal” Enoch literature, a collection of ancient Hebrew stories and prophecies which should not be ignored by serious Bible scholars. If nothing else, this certainly shows us that the Hebrews of Biblical times did not exist in a vacuum: that elements of literary tradition, myth, culture and language were indeed shared with their kindred, neighboring nations.

In this Akkadian epic, Gilgamesh is a mighty man “endowed with super-human size” (*ANET*, p. 73), who rules as king over the Mesopotamian city Uruk, which is the Erech mentioned at Gen. 10:10 in the Bible. Gilgamesh is portrayed as a greedy, rapacious character, and a harsh ruler who cannot be challenged, having neither rival nor equal. Therefore the people of the land appealed to the god Anu for assistance. With this, the goddess Aruru is beckoned to create another mighty giant, and she complies, creating Enkidu to be a rival to Gilgamesh. Enkidu, created in the wilderness of the steppe, out of the way of civilization and any contact with humans, becomes a great friend and protector of wildlife: a sort of Tarzan-cum-Dr. Doolittle of the ancient world. Soon Enkidu puts animal hunters and trappers in fear, protecting the animals from them and putting them out of their means of living. Seeking relief, a hunter then goes to Uruk, and appeals to Gilgamesh to lend assistance against the mighty savage Enkidu (*ANET*, pp. 73-74).

Rather than leave the city to confront Enkidu, Gilgamesh advises the hunter to subdue the savage giant by quite another method. From Tablet I, part iii, lines 40-45 of the epic (*ANET*, p. 75):

“Go, my hunter, take with thee a harlot-lass.
When he waters the beasts at the watering-place,
She shall pull off her clothing, laying bare her ripeness.
As soon as he sees her, he will draw near to her.
Reject him will his beasts that grew up on his steppe!”

The hunter does as Gilgamesh instructs him to do, and by carrying out the plot he is quite successful. From part iv, lines 16-39 of the same tablet (*ANET*, p. 75):

“ The lass freed her breasts, bared her bosom,
And he possessed her ripeness.
She was not bashful as she welcomed his ardor.
She laid aside her cloth and he rested upon her.
She treated him, the savage, to a woman’s task,
As his love was drawn unto her.
For six days and seven nights Enkidu comes forth,
Mating with the lass.
After he had (his) fill of her charms,
He set his face toward his wild beasts.
On seeing him, Enkidu, the gazelles ran off,
The wild beasts of the steppe drew away from his body.
Startled was Enkidu, as his body became taut,
His knees were motionless – for his wild beasts had gone.
Enkidu had to slacken his pace – it was not as before;
But now he had [wi]sdom, [br]oader understanding.
Returning, he sits at the feet of the harlot.
He looks up at the face of the harlot,
His ears attentive, as the harlot speaks;
[The harlot] says to him, to Enkidu:
‘ Thou art [wi]se, Enkidu, art become like a god!
Why with the wild creatures dost thou roam over the
steppe?
Come, let me lead thee [to] ramparted Uruk,
To the holy temple, abode of Anu and Ishtar,
Where lives Gilgamesh, accomplished in strength,
And like a wild ox lords it over the folk.”

Enkidu then goes on to confront and challenge Gilgamesh but loses the struggle, after which he instead becomes his close companion and fellow adventurer in later exploits.

Notice in the pericope supplied above that lines 29 and 34 (of the original) have been emphasized with bold type (which is not in the original). In *ANET*, on p. 75, a footnote at line 29 reads: “The general parallel to Gen. 3:7 is highly suggestive.” This parallel is, in fact, more than merely “highly suggestive”, and there is no similar note in *ANET* for line 34, which is certainly comparable to Gen. 3:5.

Now indeed, to the rational mind, it should be perfectly evident that the ancient Assyrians reading The Epic of Gilgamesh related one’s sexual awakening with the attainment of wisdom and understanding (line 29 above, cf. Gen. 3:6-7), and that by attaining such understanding, one was perceived as becoming like a god (line 34 above, cf. Gen. 3:5). For Enkidu surely had no knowledge of sex before meeting the harlot, and it cannot be assumed that Eve had any knowledge of sex before meeting

the serpent. This Akkadian story was being copied and recited during the very time when Moses was writing the Pentateuch, and therefore the idioms of the language are clearly contemporary with Moses, and were used by a kindred people speaking a closely related Shemitic dialect!

Is the Genesis chapter 3 account also about sexual seduction and awakening? Of course it is, and so "... the eyes of them both [Adam and Eve] were opened, and they knew that they *were* naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons" (Gen. 3:7). At "aprons", a footnote in *The King James Study Bible*, Thomas Nelson Publishers, ©1988, says "*girding coverings*". Adam and Eve, ashamed of themselves after their sexual awakening, attempted to conceal their nudity by covering their bodies, specifically their loins – as that type of garment alone is sufficient enough to inform us – thereby hiding the "scene of the crime", and the source of their feelings of guilt! Note that Adam and Eve were naked before their seduction, "and were not ashamed" (Gen. 2:25). The Genesis chapter 3 account is all about sexual seduction, written in a parable containing ancient Shemitic idioms, which the Shemitic Epic of Gilgamesh certainly helps us to understand. Now the next questions to be answered must be: Who is the serpent? Or did Adam and Eve have sex with a snake? Or a tree?

The "serpent" is introduced to us at Genesis 3:1: "**Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which Yahweh God had made ...**" Many scoffers assert that this statement somehow proves that the serpent was part of the original creation (Gen. 1:20-25; 2:19-20), and must be a literal snake. Yet this statement is merely comparing the serpent to the beasts of that original creation. Examine a similar statement: "Now the Jaguar was more luxurious than any automobile Chevrolet had made." The Jaguar is, of course, not manufactured by Chevrolet. One may protest that Yahweh God had created all things, as Scripture reminds us in so many places, and of course it is true that He did. Yet while the Genesis 3 serpent may have been created by Yahweh, or it may have been a corruption of Yahweh's original creation – which we witness men doing today in many places – it was not necessarily a part of the original creation **here on earth**, described in the first two chapters of Genesis.

The Genesis account of creation found in the first two chapters of the book is neither a technically scientific nor a historically complete record. Rather, it is a prophetic vision of the stages of creation given from an earth-bound perspective. For that reason it is quite geocentric, and the sun, moon and stars are described as mere lights in the sky, when now through scientific observation we know with certainty that they are much more than that. The "days" of Genesis chapter 1 are better understood to be "ages", a meaning which the original Hebrew word used there surely bears. As our own science tells us, the planet is certainly much older than 6000 or so years. Once these Genesis chapters are properly understood, it is realized that there is no conflict between the Bible and science (true science, not evolution, which is in fact a godless religion). The earth is surely many ages, or millions – even billions – of years old, and many things happened here before the beginning of history as it is recorded by our

White Adamic race. The fossil and geological records offer much proof of this, in spite of the insane objections presented by evangelical fundamentalists.

With all of this being said, the foundation is now laid for an understanding of the origin of the serpent, with the idea in mind that, once the language is understood, the Word of Yahweh our God clarifies and explains itself. At Rev. 12:7-9 we find: “⁷ **And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, ⁸ And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. ⁹ And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.**” At Rev. 20:2, in another prophecy, we again see “the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan”, where it is certainly evident that the “serpent” is an enduring entity, and not just some snake in the grass. These are “the angels which kept not their first estate” described by the apostle Jude in his epistle (v. 6). We also find at Luke 10:18, that Yahshua Christ exclaims: “**I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven**”, and here this Satan is again associated with “serpents and scorpions” – surely figurative human “serpents” and figurative human “scorpions” – in the accompanying remarks at 10:19. Bear in mind that Yahshua Christ, being one with the Father from the beginning (i.e. John 1:1-5, 14), surely witnessed the things which happened before He was born on earth as a man. So it is evident that the serpent – and the phrase “that old serpent” surely must refer to the serpent of Genesis – is one with Satan, the Devil, and other epithets given to him and his kindred throughout Scripture. The “serpent” of Genesis 3 is a member of that race of angels which revolted from Yahweh God, and were cast out into the earth, as described in Revelation chapter 12. We are not told when this happened, but can only imagine that it happened some time before Adam, but during the latter ages of creation. The fossil record shows that there were many races of humans here before Adam, the first Aryan White man, such as Neanderthal man, Cro-Magnon man, etc., any one of which may have been of that race of angels. Throughout Scripture angels appear as men, and are often even indistinguishable from men (i.e. Gen 18:1-33; 19:1-14).

If the serpent was a man (though not an Adamic man), what is the “tree which is in the midst of the garden” (Gen. 3:3) which Adam and Eve ate from in the temptation? Genesis 2:9 says: “**And out of the ground made Yahweh God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.**” The “tree of life” and the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” do not grow out of the ground, nor are they good for food, but they are “in the midst of the garden”. Genesis chapter 2 is not an historic record. Rather, it is a prophetic vision representing past events, written in the form of a parable. The “tree of life” and the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” are not literal, but figurative trees. Literal trees have knowledge only in fairy tales and in Hollywood.

In Proverbs, at 3:18; 11:30; 13:12; and 15:4, the phrase “tree of life” appears as an idiom, where it indeed seems to signify *a means of sustenance or a way of salvation or preservation*. At Gen. 3:22 it is seen that Adam must “put forth his hand, and take

also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever”, thereby recovering from his fall into disgrace. At Rev. 22:14 we find the “tree of life” mentioned again, and it is reserved for those who shall be permitted entry into the new Jerusalem, the city which descends from heaven. In John 15:1-7 Yahshua Christ tells us that He is the “true vine”, and He explains that those who abide in Him are the branches. In John 6:31-51 Yahshua explains that He is the “bread of life”, and that those who eat such bread shall live forever. The only viable conclusion is that Yahshua Christ is the figurative tree of life, and that those descendants of Adam who abide in and keep the ways of Yahshua are given to remain a part of that figurative tree, thereby bringing forth righteous fruit (John 15:5-8). The purpose of fruit is to produce more trees of the same kind! Even today, families are seen as “trees”, and as they grow (or “branch out”) their various elements are called “roots”, “stems”, “branches”, etc. Obeying the Biblical commandments to remain a separate people, and not to commit fornication (race-mixing), “righteous fruit” can only be pureblooded, Adamic offspring of the children of Israel!

The “tree of life” being a figurative tree, it only makes sense that the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” is also a figurative tree. Men are often portrayed as trees in the Bible, for instance in Ezekiel chapter 31, and at Matt. 3:10; 7:17-19; 12:33; and Luke 3:9 and 6:43-44. If the children of Yahweh can be branches upon the “true vine”, the tree of life, then those angels who rebelled against Yahweh and who were cast out into the earth, or their descendants, can surely be the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, which Adam and Eve ate from. That the act of eating can be an idiom for sexual relations, see Proverbs 9:17 and 30:20. Also notice in the pericopes from Gilgamesh supplied above that the harlot was twice described with a noun usually used to describe fruit: “ripeness”.

Verification for this interpretation is found in the parable of the wheat and the tares and its explanation, in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew. From Matt. 13:24-25: “²⁴... **The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field:** ²⁵ **But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.**” And from Matt. 13:37-39: “³⁷... **He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man;** ³⁸ **The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one;** ³⁹ **The enemy that sowed them is the devil ...**”. When could Satan – the Adversary – have sowed tares in among the wheat? Genesis chapter 3 is not a historical record. Rather, it is a parable representing events which occurred early in the history of the Adamic race. By seducing Eve, the enemies of Yahweh were able to sow tares among the wheat. There have been many other women – and men – like Eve down to this very day. After the seduction of Eve, she was warned that “... in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children ...” (Gen. 3:16), a natural result of her sexual foray, and “... thy desire *shall be* to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee” (ibid.), in spite of her incontinence and desire for the “fruit” which the serpent offered her (Gen. 3:6). Genesis chapter 3 is indeed a parable about sexual seduction, and an understanding of Shemitic idioms as they appear elsewhere in the Bible, and also in contemporary writings such as The Epic of

Gilgamesh, surely helps us to comprehend as much. Another result of Eve's seduction was that her "seed", or offspring, would have perpetual enmity with the "seed", or offspring, of the serpent, who are also the Adversary, or Satan (Gen. 3:15). Once these two parties, or groups of people or races, are properly identified, it is wholly evident that there has indeed been perpetual enmity between them. This enmity has manifested itself at many intervals throughout history and is recorded not only in the Old and New Testaments, but in the annals of history down to this very day.

As it stands in Hebrew, Genesis 4:1 is a demonstrably corrupt verse, and so it cannot be relied upon as a Scriptural authority. Scholarly sources have attested that the Hebrew of Genesis 4:1 is corrupted, and so it can hardly be properly translated. See, for example, *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 1, p. 517. Cain was certainly not the son of Adam, and this can be discerned in several other places. First, the genealogies provided at Gen. 4:16-24 and 5:1 ff. do not associate Cain with Adam. Secondly, statements found in the New Testament show that Cain was the son of the serpent, the devil, or Satan, such as those found at Luke 11:46-51; John 8:31-47; and 1 John 3:12. 1 John 3:12 plainly states that Cain was "of that wicked one", although there is no Biblical evidence that Cain ever spoke to the "serpent", who was in reality his natural father – as the Aramaic targums state in their versions of Genesis 4:1. Note that there is no word for "half-brother" in Hebrew or Greek, and the term never appears in the Bible, although many half-brothers and half-sisters appear elsewhere in Scripture.

John 8:44 states that certain Judaeans were of their father the devil. These Judaeans claimed to be Abraham's seed, but denied ever being in bondage (8:33). In Romans 9:1-13, Paul explained that not all Judaeans were Israelites: some descended from Jacob, and some from Esau. The Edomites, the descendants of Esau, could indeed claim to be Abraham's seed. And the Edomites were never in bondage, while the Israelites had been in bondage in Egypt, and later in Assyria and Babylon. The Edomites had become a part of the kingdom of Judaea and converted to Judaism about 130 years before the birth of Christ. This event is mentioned by the Greek geographer Strabo, writing circa 25 A.D., and explained in detail by the Judaeian historian, Flavius Josephus, writing circa 70 A.D. Because Esau married Canaanite women (Genesis 36), and the Canaanites had previously intermixed with the Kenites, who were the descendants of Cain (see Strong's #'s 7014 & 7017), along with the Rephaim, who were descendants from the "giants" of the Genesis 6 account, and with several other non-Adamic peoples (i.e. Genesis 15:19-21), the descendants of Esau were also descendants of Cain. Because we are told that those who belong to Yahshua Christ hear His voice and follow Him (John 10:27), it can be safely inferred that the disbelieving Judaeans who contended with Him were not Israelites, but were Edomites, and Yahshua told them that they were not His sheep, which is why they did not believe Him (John 10:26). These are those who claimed to be Judaeans, but were truly of the synagogue (assembly) of Satan (Rev. 2:9; 3:9), along with their lineal descendants today.

Seeing that the disbelieving Judaeans were descended from Cain – and so ultimately from the serpent (John 8:44; 1 John 3:12; Matt. 13:39) – it is then

understandable how Yahshua could hold them responsible for the blood of all the prophets beginning with Abel, whom Cain slew, as recorded at Luke 11:47-51. It would have been criminal on the part of Christ to have made such a charge had it not been literally true. The Greek word which the A.V. renders “generation” in this passage is properly and much more appropriately translated “race”, speaking of fathers and sons both near and remote. Both Kenites (i.e. 1 Chron. 2:55) and Canaanites (i.e. the descendants of Judah’s son Shelah, Gen. 38:1-5; 1 Chron. 4:21-23) also infiltrated ancient Israel – and especially the tribe of Judah – in the earliest times, perpetrating much evil. One recorded example of a descendant of Cain slaying the priests of Yahweh is found in the story of Saul and the murderous Doeg the Edomite, at 1 Sam. 21:7; 22:6-19. It is those disbelieving Judaeans, the Edomites and other Kenites and Canaanites who long ago adopted Judaism, who caused all the trouble for the followers of Christ in the early centuries of the Christian era, and who are at it again today, with the support of derelict clergymen and ignorant, dishonest politicians.

After the return to Jerusalem from Babylon in the late 6th century B.C., the original Hebrew dialect fell into disuse among the Judaeans in favor of the closely related Aramaic, which was the common language of trade and diplomacy throughout the Persian Empire at that time. Therefore, in order for people to properly understand the Scriptures at Sabbath services, religious leaders had to translate them from the Hebrew into Aramaic. That this practice was indeed extant can be determined in the text of Neh. 8:7-8, where it is described. Although Greek became widely known and commonly used throughout the east after the 4th century B.C., supplanting Aramaic as the lingua franca of the region, Aramaic continued to be spoken locally by many of the native peoples. It is actually Aramaic which is called “Hebrew” in the New Testament. While it is certain that many quotes from the Old Testament which are found in the New Testament were taken directly from the Septuagint (which is the Greek translation of Scripture), it is just as certain that Aramaic translations of Scripture were also in use at the time in which the gospels were written. Ephesians 4:8 is one quote from the Old Testament which agrees with an Aramaic version of Scripture, but with neither the Masoretic nor Septuagint texts. Without the Aramaic targums, one may be inadvertently led to believe that Paul had misquoted Scripture at Eph. 4:8!

The Aramaic targum called pseudo-Jonathan says at Gen. 4:1: “And Adam knew that his wife Eve had conceived from Sammael the Angel (of death) and she became pregnant and bore Cain. And he was like those on high and not like those below. And she said: ‘I have got a man from the angel of the Lord’.” Another, the Palestinian Targum, says it differently: “And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain; and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord ...”. While it is evident that neither of these targums may perfectly represent whatever it was that the original text of Genesis 4:1 may have said, it is also evident that something is missing from the Hebrew of Genesis 4:1 which we have today, and subsequently from the Greek translation of it found in the Septuagint. It is further evident that early Aramaic interpretations of Scripture attempted to compensate for what they believed was missing from Genesis 4:1. Surely it is obvious that those who

wrote the targums didn't see a snake and apple story in the text of Genesis 3! Aside from the Aramaic targums and the passages from the New Testament discussed above, other "apocryphal" Hebrew writings support the assertion that the Genesis 3 account represents sexual seduction, such as 4 Maccabees 18:7-8 and the Protevangelion chapter 10, among others. These writings do not have their source in the Talmud of Judaism. Rather, like most of the Hebrew Scriptures, they were later taken in, expounded upon, and perverted by the Talmudists.

A proper understanding of Genesis chapter 3 is of great importance in acquiring a proper understanding of not only all the rest of the Bible, but of history also. In the context of the Bible, childish tales about snakes and apples are outright deceptions, and are the very reason why the White Adamic race is in such trouble today. For at this very moment, the jews, arabs and their kin are leading the world down a path of destruction. These people are indeed descended from the ancient Canaanites, Edomites, Kenites and related tribes, and so they are the descendants of the serpent, the devil, the Satan of Genesis 3 and Revelation 12, "which deceiveth the whole world" (Rev. 12:9). They **ARE** the antichrist (1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7)! They are currently gathering with others of the heathen nations for battle, hoping to finally destroy the White Adamic race, the remnant which are indeed, for the most part, the true descendants of the Old Testament children of Israel (cf. Rev. 16:13-16; 20:7-9; Ezek. 38:1-39:29). Those who insist upon promoting snake and apple stories are themselves among the number of the deceivers.

From the A.V., Rev. 20:1-3 reads thusly: "**¹ And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. ² And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, ³ And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.**" And Rev. 20:7-8: "**⁷ And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, ⁸ And shall go out to deceive the nations ...**". There are several periods with which this thousand years has been identified. One is from the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. to the admission of the jews into Britain after the Norman conquest of 1066. One more likely is from the time that the jews began to be publicly excoriated and separated from Society. This began under the emperor Constantinus, a son of Constantine "the Great", who ruled in the 4th century, and lasted until the feudal system was replaced with jewish capitalism in the 15th century. It is jewish capitalism which has been the power behind all of our wars of the past few centuries, and is the power behind globalism, multiculturalism, and the dangers we face today. There are no ghosts or goblins who have the world deceived today, and neither can a single man survive a thousand years and do such things. However a race of people certainly can do as much, and indeed they have!