

## CHAPTER FORTY-ONE

### Motivations

The people of Israel regarded themselves as a noble elite. We know from the biblical record that Joseph was appointed to high rank by the Pharaoh. Although not plainly evident, the context of Exod 2 suggests that Moses also held a high administrative position. He was adopted by the Pharaoh's daughter, certainly not a casual act.

The Hittites described Abraham as a "mighty Prince among us," Gen 23:6.

In Gen 32:28 the translators had problems understanding the meaning of Jacob's dawn struggle with a divine being. RSV translates the phrase simply as "*striven with God,*" but KJV adds a conditional phrase, "*as a prince thou hast power with God.*" The troublesome word *issaretha* from *sarah*<sup>8280</sup>, denoting persistence and perseverance, but of a princely kind. Literally, the phrase is "saretha with God." Jacob offered princely perseverance with God.

In Numbers 7 princes are listed for all the tribes. The word means "an exalted one." The modern sense "leader" fails to capture the noble social role designated by the word. In Ezek 7:27 the same word is translated as "Prince" by RSV. RSV also translates the word as "Prince" in Num 25:18 and other places.

In Num 34:18 Moses was commanded to take one "Prince" of every tribe to divide the land. As the list shows, these persons were selected from among the general group of Israelite people. The passage does not describe the selection of those men because they were leaders, as they may well have been, but because they were Princes.

Did those ancient people, the *kinnahu*, or the *Iberi*, recognize themselves as different from other people? The primary emphasis in the Hebrew tradition was their selection from among other people. That is the broad sense of the biblical accounts. If we take the traditional Christian view we see it merely as "spiritual." But they certainly could not have been ignorant of the promises to their forefather. Abraham was to be father of many nations. These promises were retained in some written or oral form, otherwise why would the Jewish scribes make the genetic promises so prominent when they edited the Mosaic books during the Babylonian captivity? Did those promises not condition how Abraham's descendants decided on the conduct, attitudes, and expectations of their lives? Did those Jewish scribes not recognize how the genetic lines were taking an unexpected turn, at their national failure?

Did the twelve tribes know they were building a pool of *Iberi* blood? Would the commandments to breed among their own kind make sense unless they saw their purpose in that light? Should we expect that they would be a model people merely through spiritual separation?

If Joel, Hosea, and Amos warned them of their fate did they recognize the significance of those warnings in terms of their biological status? Were they not

acutely aware they would be sifted among the nations? After the Assyrian captivity did they respond to a recognized obligation to God? Did they feel they could make restitution by mixing and interbreeding with other people? Did they see those events as part of a larger purpose in forcing them out of their lands?

When they were carried off to the cities of Media did they know that they would take their blood to the nations? Is this what caused them to disperse across the Mediterranean and into the hinterlands of Europe?

Once the act of breakup had occurred, and they could no longer build that pool of genetic stock, did they come to the realization that their obligation was to sift among the nations?

We know from the confused traditions, from the Stone of Destiny, and belief in a descent from a forefather called Eber, that the people of Ireland believed in a divine destiny of blood descent. The kings and queens of Europe practiced it in formal marriage requirements.

Those people recognized their genetic destiny role, and they acted to implement it. They taught it to their children as they interbred. The rich Keltic burials of Europe show the respect that elite received. The traditions of noble blood carried down to the present generation.

Somewhere in the ancient past is a source of those traditions. Was part of it out of original descent from Adam? Did the traditions arise solely from the Iberi legacy? Was there a mix of the two components of Adamic and Abrahamic genetic descent? We cannot say.

As the generations passed, and those blood stocks interbred with the people of Europe, the genetic potentials diluted. Although some members of the noble families retain fair minds and high social qualities, the general genetic level has greatly declined. And this fact is true for all levels of European people and their descendants in the Americas, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

Again, as witness to the rule of the Most Highs in the kingdoms of men, is it not curious that the white European has now spread to all corners of the globe? Did all the nations of the world not borrow his culture, and his civilization?

Christianity perverted the biological aspect of the Abrahamic promise. Modern generations do not want to know about genetic obligations to God. Genetics is a physical reality; spirituality becomes an escape from reality buried beneath erudite theologies.

But the two go hand-in-hand. More noble genetic elements lead to more spiritual sensitivity to God and to the world. Part of our great world decline is due to this dilution of noble blood.