Facts are Facts - I

"Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?"
Galatians 4:16.

The historic facts revealed here for the first time provide incontestable evidence that their continued suppression will prove inimical to the security of the nation, the peace of the world, the welfare of humanity, and the progress of civilization.

DEDICATION

To all men of good will of all racial origins and of all religious faith. Knowledge is a collection of facts. Wisdom is the use of knowledge. Without facts there is no knowledge. Without knowledge there is no wisdom. Facts prevent what nothing can cure. Facts are Man's best defense mechanism. Without them men fumble, falter and fail. Without them nations decline and fall. Wisdom wins wars before they start. Knowledge aborts national hostilities. Wisdom obviates racial antipathies. Knowledge effaces religious animosities. Emancipation from bigotry prefaces peace. Intolerance takes all and gives nothing. Peace rewards reciprocal respect and regard. To all Men of Good Will, "Pax Vobiscum!"

Benjamin H. Freedman

The Truth About Khazars

A facsimile reproduction of a letter addressed to Dr. David Goldstein, LL.D., of Boston, Mass by its author Benjamin H. Freedman of New York City. A little patience with the early pages will be rewarded
with the startling truths revealed herein.

960 Park Avenue
New York City
October Tenth 1954.
SPECIAL DELIVERY
Dr. David Goldstein LL.D.,
Astor Post Office Station,
Boston, Massachusetts.

My Dear Dr. Goldstein;

Your very outstanding achievements as a convert to Catholicism impress me as without a comparable parallel in modern history. Your devotion to the doctrine and the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church defy any attempt at description by me only with words. Words fail me for that.

As a vigorous protagonist persevering so persistently in propagating the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, - its purposes, its policies, its programs, your dauntless determination is the inspiration for countless others who courageously seek to follow in your footsteps.

In view of this fact it requires great courage for me to write to you as I am about to do. So I pray when you receive this communication from me you will try to keep in mind Galatians 4:16, "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" I hope you will so favor me.

It is truly a source of great pleasure and genuine gratification to greet you at long last although of necessity by correspondence. It is quite a disappointment for me to make your acquaintance in this manner. It would now afford me a far greater pleasure and a great privilege also if instead I could greet you on this occasion in person.

Our very good mutual friend has for long been planning a meeting with you in person for me. I still wish to do that. I look forward with
pleasant anticipation to doing this in the not too distant future at a
time agreeable with you.

You will discover in the contents of this long letter valid evidence for
the urgency on my part to communicate with you without further
delay. You will further discover this reflected in the present gravity
of the crisis which now jeopardizes an uninterrupted continuance of
the Christian faith in its struggle as the world's most effective
spiritual and social force the Divine mission of promoting the welfare
of mankind without regard for their diversified races, religions, and
nationalities.

Your most recent article coming to my attention appeared the
September issue of The A.P.J. Bulletin, the official publication of the
organization calling themselves The Archconfraternity of Prayer for
Peace and Goodwill to Israel. The headline of article, News and
Views of Jews and the purpose of the organization stated in the
masthead of the publication, "To Promote Interest in the Apostolate
to Israel" prompts me to take Father Time by his forelock and
promptly offer my comments. I beg your indulgence accordingly.

It is with reluctance that I place my comments in letter form. I
hesitated to do so but I find it the only expedient thing under the
circumstances. I beg to submit them to you now without
reservations of any nature for your immediate and earnest
consideration. It is my very sincere wish that you accept the in the
friendly spirit in which they are submitted. It is also my hope that
you will give your consideration to them and favor me with your
early reply in the same friendly spirit for which I thank you in
advance.

In the best interests of that worthy objective to which you are
continuing to dedicate the years ahead as you have so diligently
done for many past decades, I most respectfully and sincerely urge
you to analyze and to study carefully the data submitted to here. I
suggest also that you then take whatever steps you consider
appropriate and necessary as a result of your conclusions. In the
invisible and intangible ideological war being waged in defense the
great Christian heritage against its dedicated enemies your positive
attitude is vital to victory. Your passive attitude will make a negative
contribution to the total effort.

You assuredly subscribe fully to that sound and sensible sentiment
that "it is better to light one candle than to sit in darkness." My
solitary attempts to date "to give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow" may prove no more successful with you now than they have in so many other instances where I have failed during the past thrifty years. In your case I feel rather optimistic at the moment.

Although not completely in vain I still live in the hope that one day one of these "candles" will burst into flame like a long smoldering spark and start a conflagration that will sweep across the nation like a prairie fire and illuminate vast new horizons for the first time. That unyielding hope is the source of the courage which aids me in my struggle against the great odds to which I am subjected for obvious reasons.

It has been correctly contended for thousands of years that "In the end Truth always prevails." We all realize that Truth in action can prove itself a dynamic power of unlimited force. But alas Truth has no self-starter. Truth cannot get off dead-center unless a worthy apostle gives Truth a little push to overcome its inertia. Without that start Truth will stand still and will never arrive at its intended destination. Truth has often died aborning for that most logical reason. Your help in this respect will prove of great value.

On the other hand Truth has many times been completely "blackened out" by repeating contradictory and conflicting untruths over and over again, and again, and again. The world's recent history supplies sober testimony of the dangers to civilization inherent in that technique. That form of treason to Truth is treachery to mankind. You must be very careful, my dear Dr. Goldstein, not to become unwittingly one of the many accessories before and after the fact who have appeared upon the scene of public affairs in recent years.

Whether unwittingly, unwillingly or unintentionally many of history's most noted characters have misrepresented the truth to the world and they have been so believed that it puzzles our generation. As recently as 1492 the world was misrepresented as flat by all the best alleged authorities on the subject. In 1492 Christopher Columbus was able to demonstrate otherwise. There are countless similar other instances in the history of the world.

Whether these alleged authorities were guilty of ignorance or indifference is here beside the point. It is not important now. They were either totally ignorant of the facts or they knew the facts but
chose to remain silent on the subject for reasons undisclosed by history. A duplication of this situation exists today with respect to the crisis which confronts the Christian faith. It is a vital factor today in the struggle for survival or the eventual surrender of the Christian faith to its enemies. The times in which we are living appear to be the "zero hour" for the Christian faith.

As you have observed no institution in our modern society can long survive if its structure is not from its start erected upon a foundation of Truth. The Christian faith was first erected upon a very solid foundation of Truth by its Founder. To survive it must remain so. The deterioration, the disintegration, and finally the destruction of the structure of the Christian faith today will be accelerated in direct ratio to the extent that misrepresentation and distortion of Truth become the substitutes of Truth. Truth is an absolute quality. Truth can never be relative. There can be no degrees to Truth. Truth either exists or it does not exist. To be half-true is as incredible as to be half-honest or to be half-loyal.

As you have undoubtedly also learned, my dear Dr. Goldstein, in their attempt to do an "ounce" of good in one direction many well-intentioned persons do a "ton" of harm in another direction. We all learn that lesson sooner or later in life. Today finds you dedicating your unceasing efforts and your untiring energy to the task of bringing so-called or self-styled "Jews" into the Roman Catholic Church as converts. It must recall to you many times the day so many years ago when you embraced Catholicism yourself as a convert. More power to you, and the best of luck. May your efforts be rewarded with great success.

Without you becoming aware of the fact, the methods you employ contribute in no small degree to dilution of the devotion of countless Christians for their Christian faith. For each "ounce" of so-called good you accomplish by conversion of so-called or self-styled "Jews" to the Christian faith at the same time you do a "ton" of harm in another direction by diluting the devotion of countless Christians for their Christian faith. This bold conclusion on my part is asserted by me with the firm and fair conviction that the facts will support my contention. In addition it is a well-known fact that many "counterfeit" recent conversions reveal that conversions have often proved to be but "infiltrations" by latent traitors with treasonable intentions. The attitudes you express today and your continued activity in this work require possible revision in the light of the facts submitted to you in this letter. Your present philosophy and
theology on this subject seriously merit, without any delay, reconsideration on your part. What you say or write may greatly influence a "boom" or a "bust" for the Christian faith in the very near future far beyond your ability to accurately evaluate sitting in your high "white ivory tower." The Christians implicitly believe whatever you write. So do the so-called or self-styled "Jews" whom you seek to convert. This influence you wield can become a danger. I must call it to your attention.

Your reaction to the facts called to your attention in this letter can prove to be one of the most crucial verdicts ever reached bearing upon the security of the Christian faith in recent centuries. In keeping with this great responsibility I sincerely commend this sentiment to you hoping that you will earnestly study the contents of this letter from its first word to its very last word. All who know you well are in the fortunate position to know how close this subject is to your heart. By your loyalty to the high ideals you have observed during the many years you have labored so valiantly on behalf of the Christian faith you have earned the admiration you enjoy. The Christian faith you chose of your own free will in the prime of life is very proud of you in more ways than as a convert.

Regardless of what anyone anywhere and anytime in this whole wide world may say to the contrary, events of recent years everywhere establish beyond any question of a doubt that the Christian faith today stands with one foot in the grave and the other on a banana peel figuratively speaking of course. Only those think otherwise who deliberately shut their eyes to realities or who do not chose to see even with their eyes wide open. I believe you to be too realistic to indulge yourself in the futile folly of fooling yourself.

It is clear that the Christian faith today stands at the cross-roads of its destiny. The Divine and sacred mission of Christian faith is in jeopardy today to a degree never witnessed before in its long history of almost 2000 years. The Christian faith needs loyal friends now as never before !. I somehow feel that you can always be counted upon as one of its loyal friends. You cannot over-simplify the present predicament of the Christian faith. The problem it faces is too self-evident to mistake. It is in a critical situation.

When the day arrives that Christians can no longer profess their Christian faith as they profess it today in the free world Christian faith will have seen the beginning of its "last days." What already applies to 50% of the world's total population can shortly apply
equally to 100% of the world's total population. It is highly conceivable judging from present trends. The malignant character of this malady is just as progressive as cancer. It will surely prove as fatal also unless steps are taken now to reverse its course. What is now being done toward arresting its progress or reversing its trend?

My dear Dr. Goldstein, can you recall the name of the philosopher who is quoted as saying that "Nothing in this world is permanent except change"? That philosophy must be applied to the Christian faith also. The $64. question remains whether the change will be for the better or for the worse. The problem is that simple. If the present trend continues for another 37 years in same direction and at the same rate traveled for the past 37 years the Christian faith as it is professed today by Christians will have disappeared from the face of the earth. In what form or by what instrumentality the mission of Jesus Christ will thereupon and thereafter continue to make itself manifest here on earth is as unpredictable as it is inevitable.

In the existing crisis it is neither logical nor realistic to drive Christians out of the Christian "fold" in relatively large numbers for the dubious advantage to be obtained by bringing a comparatively small number of so-called or self-styled "Jews" into the Christian "fold".

It is useless to try to deny the fact that today finds the Christian faith on the defensive throughout the world. This realization staggers the imagination of the few Christians who understand the situation. This status of the Christian faith exists in spite of the magnificent contributions of the Christian faith to the progress of humanity and civilization for almost 2000 years. It is not my intention in this letter to expose the conspirators who are dedicating themselves to the destruction of the Christian faith nor to the nature and extent of the conspiracy itself. That exposure would fill many volumes.

The history of the world for the past several centuries and current events at home and abroad confirm the existence of such a conspiracy. The world-wide network of diabolical conspirators implement this plot against the Christian faith while Christians appear to be sound asleep. The Christian clergy appear to be more ignorant or more indifferent about this conspiracy than other Christians. They seem to bury their heads in the sands of ignorance.
or indifference like the legendary ostrich. This ignorance or indifference on the part of the Christian clergy has dealt a blow to the Christian faith already from which it may never completely recover, if at all. It seems so sad.

Christians deserve to be blessed in this crisis with a spiritual Paul Revere to ride across the nation warning Christians that their enemies are moving in on them fast. My dear Dr. Goldstein, will you volunteer to be that Paul Revere?

Of equal importance to pin-pointing the enemies who are making war upon the Christian faith from the outside is the necessity to discover the forces at work inside the Christian faith which make it so vulnerable to its enemies on the outside. Applying yourself to this specific phase of the problem can prove of tremendous value in rendering ineffective the forces responsible for this dangerous state of affairs.

The souls of millions of Christians who are totally unknown to you are quite uneasy about the status of the Christian faith today. The minds of countless thousands among the Christian clergy are troubled by the mysterious "pressure" from above which prevents them exercising their sound judgment in this situation. If the forces being manipulated against the Christian faith from the inside can be stopped the Christian faith will be able to stand upon its feet against its enemies as firmly as the Rock of Gibraltar. Unless this can be done soon the Christian faith appears destined to crumble and to eventually collapse. An ounce of prevention is far preferable to a pound of cure you can be sure in this situation as in all others.

With all the respect rightly due to the Christian clergy and in all humility I have an unpleasant duty to perform. I wish to go on record with you here that the Christian clergy are primarily if not solely responsible for the internal forces within the Christian faith inimical to its best interests. This conclusion on my part indicates the sum total of all the facts in my book which add up to just that. If you truly desire to be realistic and constructive you must "hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may". That is the only strategy that can save the Christian faith from a fate it does not deserve. You cannot pussy-foot with the truth any longer simply because you find that now "the truth hurts", - someone you know or like.

At this late hour very little time is left in which to mend our fences
if I can call it that. We are not in a position to waste any of our limited time. "Beating it around the bush" now will get us exactly nowhere. The courageous alone will endure the present crisis when all the chips are down. Figuratively and possibly literally there will be live heroes and dead cowards when the dust of this secular combat settles and not dead heroes and live cowards as sometimes occurs under other circumstances. The Christian faith today remains the only "anchor to windward" against universal barbarism. The dedicated enemies of the Christian faith have sufficiently convinced the world by this time of the savage methods they will adopt in their program to erase the Christian faith from the face of the earth.

Earlier in this letter I stated that in my humble opinion the apathy of the Christian clergy might be charged with sole responsibility for the increasing dilution of the devotion of countless Christians for the Christian faith. This is the natural consequence of the confusion created by the Christian clergy in the minds of Christians concerning certain fundamentals of the Christian faith. The guilt for this confusion rests exclusively upon Christian leadership not upon Christians generally. Confusion creates doubt. Doubt creates loss of confidence. Loss of confidence creates loss of interest. As confusion grows more, and more, and more, confidence grows less, and less, and less. The result is complete loss of all interest. You can hardly disagree with that, my dear Dr. Goldstein, can you?

The confusion in the minds of Christians concerning fundamentals of the Christian faith is unwarranted and unjustified. It need not exist. It would not exist if the Christian clergy did not aid and abet the deceptions responsible for it. The Christian clergy may be shocked to learn that they have been aiding and abetting the dedicated enemies of the Christian faith. Many of the Christian clergy are actually their allies but may not know it. This phase of the current worldwide campaign of spiritual sabotage is the most negative factor in the defense of the Christian faith.

Countless Christians standing on the sidelines in this struggle see their Christian faith "withering on the vine" and about ripe enough to "drop into the lap" of its dedicated enemies. They can do nothing about it. Their cup is made more bitter for them as they observe this unwarranted and this unjustified ignorance and indifference on the part of the Christian clergy. This apathetic attitude by the Christian clergy offers no opposition to the aggressors against the Christian faith. Retreat can only bring defeat. To obviate surrender
to their dedicated enemies the Christian clergy must "about face" immediately if they expect to become the victors in the invisible and intangible ideological war now being so subversively waged against the Christian faith under their very noses. When will they wake up?

If I were asked to recite in this letter the many manners in which the Christian clergy are confusing the Christian concept of the fundamentals of the Christian faith it would require volumes rather than pages to tell the whole story. Space alone compels me here to confine myself to the irreducible minimum. I will limit myself here to the most important reasons for this confusion. Brevity will of necessity limit the references cited to support the matters presented in this letter. I will do my best under the circumstances to establish the authenticity of the incontestable historic facts I call to your attention here.

In my opinion the most important reason is directly related to your present activities. Your responsibility for this confusion is not lessened by your good intentions. As you have heard said so many times "Hell is paved with good intentions". The confusion your articles create is multiplied a thousand-fold by the wide publicity given to them as a result of the very high regard in which you personally are held by editors and readers across the nation, Christian and non-Christian alike. Your articles constantly are continually reprinted and quoted from coast to coast.

The utterance by the Christian clergy which confuses Christians the most is the constantly repeated utterance "Jesus was a Jew". That also appears to be your favorite theme. That misrepresentation and distortion of an incontestable historic fact is uttered by the Christian clergy upon the slightest pretext. They utter it constantly, also without provocation. They appear to be "trigger happy" to utter it. They never miss an opportunity to do so. Informed intelligent Christians cannot reconcile this truly unwarranted misrepresentation and distortion of an incontestable historic fact by the Christian clergy with information known by them now to the contrary which comes to them from sources believed by them to be equally reliable.

This poses a serious problem today for the Christian clergy. They can extricate themselves from their present predicament now only by resorting to "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing the truth". That is the only formula by which the Christian clergy can recapture the lost confidence of Christians. As effective spiritual leaders they
cannot function without this lost confidence. They should make that their first order of business.

My dear Dr. Goldstein, you are a theologian of high rank and a historian of note. Of necessity you also should agree with other outstanding authorities on the subject of whether "Jesus was a Jew". These leading authorities agree today that there is no foundation in fact for the implications, inferences and the innuendoes resulting from the incorrect belief that "Jesus was a Jew". Incontestable historic facts and an abundance of other proofs establish beyond the possibility of any doubt the incredibility of the assertion so often heard today that "Jesus was a Jew".

Without any fear of contradiction based upon fact the most competent and best qualified authorities all agree today that Jesus Christ was not a so-called or self-styled "Jew", They now confirm that during His lifetime Jesus was known as a "Judean" by His contemporaries and not as a "Jew", and that Jesus referred to Himself as a "Judean" and not as a "Jew". During His lifetime here on earth Jesus was referred to by contemporary historians as a "Judean" and not as a "Jew". Contemporary theologians of Jesus whose competence to pass upon this subject cannot be challenged by anyone today also referred to Jesus during his lifetime here on earth as a "Judean" and not as a "Jew".

Inscribed upon the Cross when Jesus was Crucified were the Latin words "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum". Pontius Pilate was the author of that infamous inscription. Latin was Pontius Pilate's mother-tongue. No one will question the fact that Pontius Pilate was well able to accurately express his own ideas in his own mother-tongue. The authorities competent to pass upon the correct translation into English of the Latin "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum" agree that it is "Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans". There is no disagreement upon that by them.

During His lifetime here on earth Jesus was not regarded by Pontius Pilate nor by the Judeans among whom He dwelt as "King of the Jews". The inscription on the Cross upon which Jesus was Crucified has been incorrectly translated into the English language only since the 18th century. Pontius Pilate was ironic and sarcastic when he ordered inscribed upon the Cross the Latin words "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum". About to be Crucified, with the approval of Pontius Pilate, Jesus was being mocked by Pontius Pilate. Pontius Pilate was well aware at that time that Jesus had been denounced, defied and
denied by the Judeans who alas finally brought about His Crucifixion as related by history.

Except for His few followers at that time in Judea all other Judeans abhorred Jesus and detested His teachings and the things for which He stood. That deplorable fact cannot be erased from history by time. Pontius Pilate was himself the "ruler" of the Judeans at the time he ordered inscribed upon the Cross the Latin words "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum", in English "Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans". But Pontius Pilate never referred to himself as "ruler" of the Judeans. The ironic and sarcastic reference of Pontius Pilate to Jesus as "Ruler of the Judeans" can hardly be accepted as recognition by Pontius Pilate of Jesus as "Ruler of the Judeans". That is inconceivable by any interpretation.

At the time of the Crucifixion of Jesus Pontius Pilate was the administrator in Judea for the Roman Empire. At that time in history the area of the Roman Empire included a part of the Middle East. As far as he was concerned officially or personally the inhabitants of Judea were "Judeans" to Pontius Pilate and so-called "Jew" as they have been styled since the 18th century. In the time of Pontius Pilate in history there was no religious, racial or national group in Judea known as "Jew" nor had there been any group so identified anywhere else in the world prior that time.

Pontius Pilate expressed little interest as the administrator of the Roman Empire officially or personally in the wide variety of forms of religious worship then practiced in Judea. These forms of religious worship extended from phallic worship and other forms of idolatry to the emerging spiritual philosophy of an eternal omnipotent and invisible Divine deity, the emerging (Jehovah) concept which predated Abraham of Bible fame approximately 2000 years. As the administrator for the Roman Empire in Judea it was the official policy of Pontius Pilate never to interfere in the spiritual affairs of the local population. Pontius Pilate's primary responsibility was the collection of taxes to be forwarded home to Rome, not the forms of religious worship practiced: by the Judeans from whom those taxes were collected.

As you well know, my dear Dr. Goldstein, the Latin word "rex" means "ruler, leader" in English. During the lifetime Jesus in Judea the Latin word "rex" meant only that to Judeans familiar with the Latin language. The Latin word "rex" is the Latin verb "rego, regere, rexi, rectus" in English means as you also well know "to rule, to
lead". Latin was of course the official language in all the provinces administered by a local administrator of the Roman Empire. This fact accounts for the inscription on the Cross in Latin.

With the invasion of the British Isles by the Anglo-Saxons, the English language substituted the Anglo-Saxon "king" for the Latin equivalent "rex" used before the Anglo-Saxon invasion. The adoption of "king" for "rex" at this late date in British history did not retroactively alter the meaning of the Latin "rex" to the Judeans in the time of Jesus. The Latin "rex" to them then meant only "ruler, leader" as it still means in Latin. Anglo-Saxon "king" was spelled differently when first used but at all times meant the same as "rex"; in Latin, "leader" of a tribe.

During the lifetime of Jesus it was very apparent to Pontius Pilate that Jesus was the very last Person in Judea the Judeans would select as their "ruler" or their "leader". In spite of this situation in Judea Pontius Pilate did not hesitate to order the inscription of the Cross "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum". By the wildest stretch of the imagination it is not conceivable that this sarcasm and irony by Pontius Pilate at the time of the Crucifixion was not solely mockery of Jesus by Pontius Pilate and only mockery. After this reference to "Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans" the Judeans forthwith proceeded to Crucify Jesus upon that very Cross.

In Latin in the lifetime of Jesus the name of the political subdivision in the Middle East known in modern history as Palestine was "Iudaea". It was then administered by Pontius Pilate as administrator for the Roman Empire of which it was then a part. The English for the Latin "Iudaea" is "Judea". English "Judean" is the adjective for the noun "Judea". The ancient native population of the subdivision in the Middle East known in modern history as Palestine was then called "Iudaesus" in Latin and "Judean" in English. Those words identified the indigenous population of Judea in the lifetime of Jesus. Who can deny that Jesus was a member of the indigenous population of Judea in His lifetime?

And of course you know, my dear Dr. Goldstein, in Latin the Genetive Plural of "Iudaesus" is "Iudaeeorum". The English translation of the Genetive Plural of "Iudaeeorum" is "of the Judeans". It is utterly impossible to give any other English translation to "Iudaeeorum" than "of the Judeans": Qualified and competent theologians and historians regard as incredible any other translation into English of "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeeorum" than "Jesus the
Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans". You must agree that this is literally correct.

At the time Pontius Pilate was ordering the "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum" inscribed upon the Cross the spiritual leaders of Judea were protesting to Pontius Pilate "not to write that Jesus was the ruler of the Judeans" but to inscribe instead that Jesus "had said that He was the ruler of the Judeans". The spiritual leaders of Judea made very strong protests to Pontius Pilate against his reference to Jesus as "Rex Iudaeorum" insisting that Pontius Pilate was not familiar with or misunderstood the status of Jesus in Judea. These protests are a matter of historical record, as you know.

The spiritual leaders in Judea protested in vain with Pontius Pilate. They insisted that Jesus "had said that He was the ruler of the Judeans" but that Pontius Pilate was "not to write that Jesus was the ruler of the Judeans". For after all Pontius Pilate was a foreigner in Judea who could not understand the local situations as well as the spiritual leaders. The intricate pattern of the domestic political, social and economic cross-currents in Judea interested Pontius Pilate very little as Rome's administrator.

The Gospel by John was written originally in the Greek language according to the best authorities. In the Greek original there is no equivalent for the English that Jesus "had said that He was the ruler of the Judeans". The English translation of the Greek original of the Gospel by John, reads "Do not inscribe 'the monarch (basileus) of the Judeans (Ioudaios), but that He Himself said I am monarch (basileus) of the Judeans (Ioudaios)". "Ioudaia" is the Greek for the Latin "Iudea" and the English "Judea". "Basileus" is the Greek "monarch" in English. "Rex" is the nearest word in Latin for "basileus" in Greek. The English "ruler", or its alternative "leader", define the sense of Latin "rex" and Greek "basileus" as they were used in the Greek and Latin Gospel by John.

Pontius Pilate "washed his hands" of the protests by the spiritual leaders in Judea who demanded of him that the inscription on the Cross authored by Pontius Pilate be corrected in the manner they insisted upon. Pontius Pilate very impatiently replied to their demands "What I have written, I have written". The inscription on the Cross remained what it had been, "Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum", or "Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans" in English.

The Latin quotations and words mentioned in this letter are verbatim quotations and the exact words which appear in the 4th century translation of the New Testament into Latin by St. Jerome. This translation is referred to as the Vulgate Edition of the New Testament. It was the first official translation of the New Testament into Latin made by the Christian Church. Since that time it has remained the official New Testament version used by the Catholic Church. The translation of the Gospel by John into Latin by St. Jerome was made from the Greek language in which the Gospel of John was originally written according to the best authorities on this subject.

The English translation of the Gospel by John 19:19, from the original text in the Greek language reads as follows, "Pilate wrote a sign and fastened it to the Cross and the writing was 'Jesus the Nazarene the monarch of the Judeans' ". In the original Greek manuscript there is mention also made of the demands upon Pontius Pilate by the spiritual leaders in Judea that Pontius Pilate alter the reference on the Cross to Jesus as "Ruler of the Judeans". The Greek text of the original manuscript of the Gospel by John establishes beyond any question or doubt that the spiritual leaders in Judea at that time had protested to Pontius Pilate that Jesus was "not the ruler of the Judeans" but only "had said that He was the ruler of the Judeans".

There is no factual foundation in history or theology today for the implications, inferences and innuendoes that the Greek "Ioudaios", the Latin "Iudaeus", or the English "Judean" ever possessed a valid religious connotation. In their three respective languages these three words have only indicated a strictly topographical or geographic connotation. In their correct sense these three words in their respective languages were used to identify the members of the indigenous native population of the geographic area known as Judea in the lifetime of Jesus. During the lifetime of Jesus there was not a form of religious worship practiced in Judea or elsewhere in the known world which bore a name even remotely resembling the name of the political subdivision of the Roman Empire; i.e., "Judaism" from "Judea". No cult or sect existed by such a name.

It is an incontestable fact that the word "Jew" did not come into existence until the year 1775. Prior to 1775 the word "Jew" did not exist in any language. The word "Jew" was introduced into the English for the first time in the 18th century when Sheridan used it in his play "The Rivals", II,i, "She shall have a skin like a mummy,
and the beard of a Jew". Prior to this use of the word "Jew" in the English language by Sheridan in 1775 the word "Jew" had not become a word in the English language. Shakespeare never saw the word "Jew" as you will see. Shakespeare never used the word "Jew" in any of his works, the common general belief to the contrary notwithstanding. In his "Merchant of Venice", V.III.i.61, Shakespeare wrote as follows: "what is the reason? I am a Iewe, hath not a Iewe eyes?"

In the Latin St. Jerome 4th century Vulgate Edition of the New Testament Jesus is referred to by the Genitive Plural of "Iudaeus" in the Gospel by John reference to the inscription on the Cross, "Iudaeorum". It was in the 4th century that St. Jerome translated into Latin the manuscripts of the New Testament from the original languages in which they were written. This translation by St. Jerome is referred to still today as the Vulgate Edition by the Roman Catholic Church authorities, who use it today.

Jesus is referred as a so-called "Jew" for the first time in the New Testament in the 18th century. Jesus is first referred to as a so-called "Jew" in the revised 18th century editions in the English language of the 14th century first translations of the New Testament into English. The history of the origin of the word "Jew" in the English language leaves no doubt that the 18th century "Jew" is the 18th century contracted and corrupted English word for the 4th century Latin "Iudaeus" found in St. Jerome's Vulgate Edition. Of that there is no longer doubt.

The available original manuscripts from the 4th century to the 18th century accurately trace the origin and give the complete history of the word "Jew" in the English language. In these manuscripts are to be found all the many earlier English equivalents extending through the 14 centuries from the 4th to the 18th century. From the Latin "Iudaeus" to the English "Jew" these English forms included successively: "Gyu", "Giu", "Iu", "Iuu", "Iuw", "Ieuu", "Ieuy", "Iwe", "Iow", "Iewe", "Ieue", "Iue", "Ive", "Iew", and then finally in the 18th century, "Jew". The many earlier English equivalents for "Jew" through the 14 centuries are "Giwis", "Giws", "Gyues", "Gywes", "Giwes", "Geus", "Iuys", "Iows", "Iouis", "Iews", and then also finally in the 18th century, "Jew".

With the rapidly expanding use in England in the 18th century for the first time in history of the greatly improved printing presses unlimited quantities of the New Testament were printed. These
revised 18th century editions of the earlier 14th century first translations into the English language were then widely distributed throughout England and the English speaking world among families who had never possessed a copy of the New Testament in any language. In these 18th century editions with revisions the word "Jew" appeared for the first time in any English translations. The word "Jew" as it was used in the 18th century editions has since continued in use in all editions of the New Testament in the English language. The use of the word "Jew" thus was stabilized.

As you know, my dear Dr. Goldstein, the best known 18th century editions of the New Testament in English are the Rheims (Douai) Edition and the King James Authorized Edition. The Rheims (Douai) translation of the New Testament into English was first printed in 1582 but the word "Jew" did not appear in it. The King James Authorized translation of the New Testament into English was begun in 1604 and first published in 1611. The word "Jew" did not appear in it either. The word "Jew" appeared in both these well known editions in their 18th century revised versions for the first times.

Countless copies of the revised 18th century editions of the Rheims (Douai) and the King James translations of the New Testament into English were distributed to the clergy and the laity throughout the English speaking world. They did not know the history of the origin of the English word "Jew" nor did they care. They accepted the English word "Jew" as the only and as the accepted form of the Latin "Iudaeus" and the Greek "Ioudaios". How could they be expected to have known otherwise? The answer is they could not and they did not. It was a new English word to them.

When you studied Latin in your school days you were taught that the letter "I" in Latin when used as the first letter in a word is pronounced like the letter "Y" in English when it is the first letter in words like "yes", "youth" and yacht". The "I" in "Iudaeus" is pronounced like the "Y" in "yes", "youth" and yacht" in English. In all the 4th century to 18th century forms for the 18th century "Jew" the letter "I" was pronounced like the English "Y" in "yes", "youth" and yacht". The same is true of the "Gi" or the "Gy" where it was used in place of the letter "I".

The present pronunciation of the word "Jew" in modern English is a development of recent times. In the English language today the "J" in "Jew" is pronounced like the "J" in the English "justice", "jolly", and "jump". This is the case only since the 18th century. Prior to
the 18th century the "J" in "Jew" was pronounced exactly like the "Y" in the English "yes", "youth" and yacht". Until the 18th century and perhaps even later than the 18th century the word "Jew" in English was pronounced like the English "you" or "hew", and the word "Jews" like "youse" or "hews". The present pronunciation of "Jew" in English is a new pronunciation acquired after the 18th century.

The German language still retains the Latin original pronunciation. The German "Jude" is the German equivalent of the English "Jew". The "J" in the German "Jude" is pronounced exactly like the English "Y" in "yes", "youth" and yacht". The German "J" is the equivalent of the Latin "I" and both are pronounced exactly like the English "Y" in "yes", "youth" and yacht". The German "Jude" is virtually the first syllable of the Latin "ludaeus" and is pronounced exactly like if. The German "Jude" is the German contraction and corruption of the Latin "ludaeus" just as the English "Jew" is the contraction and corruption of the Latin "ludaeus". The German "J" is always pronounced like the English "Y" in "yes", "youth" and yacht" when it is the first letter of a word. The pronunciation of the "J" in German "Jude" is not an exception to the pronunciation of the "J" in German.

The English language as you already know, my dear Dr. Goldstein, is largely made up of words adopted from foreign languages. After their adoption by the English language foreign words were then adapted by contracting their spelling and corrupting their foreign pronunciation to make them more easily pronounced in English from their English spelling. This process of first adopting foreign words and then adapting them by contracting their spelling and corrupting their pronunciation resulted in such new words in the English language as "cab" from the French "cabriolet" and many thousands of other words similarly from their original foreign spelling. Hundreds of others must come to your mind.

By this adopting-adapting process the Latin "ludaeus" and the Greek "loudaios" finally emerged in the 18th century as "Jew" in the English language. The English speaking peoples struggled through 14 centuries seeking to create for the English language an English equivalent for the Latin "ludaeus" and the Greek "loudaios" which could be easily pronounced in English from its English spelling. The English "Jew" was the resulting 18th century contracted and corrupted form of the Latin "ludaeus" and the Greek "loudaios". The English "Jew" is easily pronounced in English from its English
spelling. The Latin "Iudaeus" and the Greek "Ioudaios" cannot be as easily pronounced in English from the Latin and Greek spelling. They were forced to coin a word.

The earliest version of the New Testament in English from the Latin Vulgate Edition is the Wiclif, or Wickliffe Edition published in 1380. In the Wiclif Edition Jesus is there mentioned as One of the "iewes". That was the 14th century English version of the Latin "Iudaeus" and was pronounced "hew-weeze", in the plural, and "iewe" pronounced "hew-weet" in the singular. In the 1380 Wiclif Edition in English the Gospel by John, 19:19, reads "ihesus of nazareth kyng of the iewes". Prior to the 14th century the English language adopted the Anglo-Saxon "kyng" together with many other Anglo-Saxon words in place of the Latin "rex" and the Greek "basileus". The Anglo-Saxon also meant "tribal leader".

In the Tyndale Edition of the New Testament in English published in 1525 Jesus was likewise described as One of the "lewes". In the Coverdale Edition published in 1535 Jesus was also described as One of the "lewes". In the Coverdale Edition the Gospel by John, 19:19, reads "Iesus of Nazareth, kynge of the Iewes". In the Cranmer Edition published in 1539 Jesus was again described as One of the "Iewes". In the Geneva Edition published in 1540-1557 Jesus was also described as One of the "Iewes". In the Rheims Edition published in 1582 Jesus was described as One of the "Iewes". In the King James Edition published in 1604-1611 also known as the Authorized Version Jesus was described again as one of the "Iewes". The forms of the Latin "Iudaeus" were used which were current at the time these translations were made.

The translation into English of the Gospel by John, 19:19, from the Greek in which it was originally written reads "Do not inscribe ‘the monarch of the Judeans’ but that He Himself said ‘I am monarch’ ". In the original Greek manuscript the Greek "basileus" appears for "monarch" in the English and the Greek "Ioudaios" appears for "Judeans" in the English. "Ioudaia" in Greek is "Judea" in English. "Ioudaios" in Greek is "Judeans" in English. There is no reason for any confusion.

My dear Dr. Goldstein, if the generally accepted understanding today of the English "Jew" and "Judean" conveyed the identical implications, inferences and innuendoes as both rightly should, it would make no difference which of these two words was used when referring to Jesus in the New Testament or elsewhere. But the
implications, inferences, and innuendoes today conveyed by these two words are as different as black is from white. The word "Jew" today is never regarded as a synonym for "Judean" nor is "Judean" regarded as a synonym for "Jew".

As I have explained, when the word "Jew" was first introduced into the English language in the 18th century its one and only implication, inference and innuendo was "Judean", However during the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries a well-organized and well-financed international "pressure group" created a so-called "secondary meaning" for the word "Jew" among the English speaking peoples of the world. This so-called "secondary meaning" for the word "Jew" bears no relation whatsoever to the 18th century original connotation of the word "Jew". It is a misrepresentation.

The "secondary meaning" of the word "Jew" today bears as little relation to its original and correct meaning as the "secondary meaning" today for the word "camel" bears to the original and correct meaning of the word "camel", or the "secondary meaning" today for the word "ivory" bears to the original and correct meaning of the word "ivory". The "secondary meaning" today for the word "camel" is a cigarette by that name but its original and correct meaning is a desert animal by that ancient name. The "secondary meaning" of the word "ivory" today is a piece of soap but its original and correct meaning is the tusk off a male elephant.

The "secondary meanings" of words often become the generally accepted meanings of words formerly having entirely different meanings. This is accomplished by the expenditure of great amounts of money for well-planned publicity. Today if you ask for a "camel" someone will hand you a cigarette by that name. Today if you ask for a piece of "ivory" someone will hand you a piece of soap by that name. You will never receive either a desert animal or a piece of the tusk of a male elephant. That must illustrate the extent to which these "secondary meanings" are able to practically eclipse the original and correct meanings of words in the minds of the general public. The "secondary meaning" for the word "Jew" today has practically totally eclipsed the original and correct meaning of the word "Jew" when it was introduced as a word in the English language. This phenomena is not uncommon.

The United States Supreme Court has recognized the "secondary meaning" of words. The highest court in the land has established as basic law that "secondary meanings" can acquire priority rights to
the use of any dictionary word. Well-planned and well-financed world-wide publicity through every available media by well-organized groups of so-called or self-styled "Jews" for three centuries has created a "secondary meaning" for the word "Jew" which has completely "blacked out" the original and correct meaning of the word "Jew". There can be no doubt about that.

There is not a person in the whole English-speaking world today who regards a "Jew" as a "Judean" in the literal sense of the word. That was the correct and only meaning in the 18th century. The generally accepted "secondary meaning" of the word &"Jew" today with practically no exceptions is made up off our almost universally-believed theories. These four theories are that a so-called or self-styled "Jew" is (1) a person who today professes the form of religious worship known as "Judaism", (2) a person who claims to belong to a racial group associated with the ancient Semites, (3) a person directly the descendant of an ancient nation which thrived in Palestine in Bible history, (4) a person blessed by Divine intentional design with certain superior cultural characteristics denied to other racial, religious or national groups, all rolled into one.

The present generally accepted "secondary meaning" of the word "Jew" is fundamentally responsible for the confusion in the minds of Christians regarding elementary tenets of the Christian faith. It is likewise responsible today to a very great extent for the dilution of the devotion of countless Christians for their Christian faith. The implications, inferences and innuendoes of the word "Jew" today, to the preponderant majority of intelligent and informed Christians today, is contradictory and in complete conflict with incontestable historic fact. Christians who cannot be fooled any longer are suspect of the Christian clergy who continue to repeat, and repeat, and repeat ad nauseam their pet theme song "Jesus was a Jew". It actually now approaches a psychosis.

Countless Christians know today that they were "brain washed" by the Christian clergy on the subject "Jesus was a Jew", The resentment they feel is not yet apparent to the Christian clergy. Christians now are demanding from the Christian clergy "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth". It is now time for the Christian clergy to tell Christians what they should have told them long ago. Of all religious groups in the world Christians appear to be the least informed of any on this subject. Have their spiritual leaders been reckless with the truth?
Countless intelligent and informed Christians no longer accept unchallenged assertions by the Christian clergy that Jesus in His lifetime was a Member of a group in Judea which practiced a religious form of worship then which is today called "Judaism", or that Jesus in His lifetime here on earth was a Member of the racial group which today includes the preponderant majority of all so-called or self-styled "Jews" in the world, or that the so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world today are the lineal descendants of the nation in Judea of which Jesus was a national in His lifetime here on earth, or that the cultural characteristics of so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world today correspond with the cultural characteristics of Jesus during His lifetime here on earth and His teachings while He was here on earth for a brief stay. Christians will no longer believe that the race, religion, nationality and culture of Jesus and the race, religion, nationality and culture of so-called or self-styled "Jews" today or their ancestors have a common origin or character.

The resentment by Christians is more ominous than the Christian clergy suspect. Under existing conditions the Christian clergy will find that ignorance is not bliss, nor wisdom folly. Christians everywhere today are seeking to learn the authentic relationship between the so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world today and the "Judeans" who populated "Judea" before, during and after the time of Jesus. Christians now insist that they be told correctly by the Christian clergy about the racial, religious, national and cultural background of the so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world today and the basis for associating these backgrounds with the racial, religious, national and cultural background of Jesus in His lifetime in Judea. The intelligent and informed Christians are alerted to the exploded myth that the so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world today are the direct descendants of the "Judeans" amongst whom Jesus lived during His lifetime on earth.

Christians today are also becoming more and more alerted day by day why the so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world for three centuries have spent uncounted sums of money to manufacture the fiction that the "Judeans" in the time of Jesus were "Jews" rather than "Judeans", and that "Jesus was a Jew". Christians are becoming more and more aware day by day of all the economic and political advantages accruing to the so-called or self-styled "Jews" as a direct result of their success in making Christians believe that "Jesus was a Jew" in the "secondary meaning" they
have created for the 18th century word "Jew". The so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world today represent themselves to Christians as "Jews" only in the "secondary meaning" of the word "Jew". They seek to thereby prove their kinship with Jesus. They emphasize this fiction to Christians constantly. That fable is fast fading and losing its former grip upon the imaginations of Christians.

To allege that "Jesus was a Jew" in the sense that during His lifetime Jesus professed and practiced the form of religious worship known and practiced under the modern name of "Judaism" is false and fiction of the most blasphemous nature. If to be a so-called or self-styled "Jews" then or now the practice of "Judaism" was a requirement then Jesus certainly was not a so-called "Jew". Jesus abhorred and denounced the form of religious worship practiced in Judea in His lifetime and which is known and practiced today under its new name "Judaism". That religious belief was then known as "Pharisaism". The Christian clergy learned that in their theological seminary days but they have never made any attempt to make that clear to Christians.

The eminent Rabi Louis Finkelstein, the head of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, often referred to as "The Vatican of Judaism", in his Foreword to his First Edition of his world-famous classic "The Pharisees, The Sociological Background of Their Faith", on page XXI states:

"... Judaism . . . Pharisaism became Talmudism, Talmudism became Medieval Rabbinism, and Medieval Rabbinism became Modern Rabbinism. But throughout these changes in name ... the spirit of the ancient Pharisees survives, unaltered ... From Palestine to Babylonia; from Babylonia to North Africa, Italy, Spain, France and Germany; from these to Poland, Russia, and eastern Europe generally, ancient Pharisaism has wandered "demonstrates the enduring importance which attaches to Pharisaism as a religious movement ..."

The celebrated Rabbi Louis Finkelstein in his great classic quoted from above traces the origin of the form of religious worship practiced today under the present name "Judaism", to its origin as "Pharisaism" in Judea in the time of Jesus. Rabbi Louis Finkelstein confirms what the eminent Rabbi Adolph Moses states in his great classic "Yahvism, and Other Discourses", in collaboration with the celebrated Rabbi H.G. Enlow, published in 1903 by the Louisville...
Section of the Council of Jewish Women, in which Rabbi Adolph Moses, on page 1, states:

"Among the innumerable misfortunes which have befallen ... the most fatal in its consequences is the name Judaism... Worse still, the Jews themselves, who have gradually come to call their religion Judaism ... Yet, neither in biblical nor post-biblical, neither in talmudic, nor in much later times, is the term Judaism ever heard ... the Bible speaks of the religion .... as 'Torath Yahve', the instruction, or the moral law revealed by Yahve... in other places... as 'Yirath Yahve', the fear and reverence of Yahve. These and other appellations continued for many ages to stand for the religion... To distinguish it from Christianity and Islam, the Jewish philosophers sometimes designate it as the faith or belief of the Jews ... it was Flavius Josephus, writing for the instruction of Greeks and Romans, who coined the term Judaism, in order to pit it against Hellenism ... by Hellenism was understood the civilization, comprising language, poetry, religion, art, science, manners, customs, institutions, which... had spread from Greece, its original home, over vast regions of Europe, Asia and Africa ... The Christians eagerly seized upon the name... The Jews themselves, who intensely detested the traitor Josephus, refrained from reading his works ... hence the term Judaism coined by Josephus remained absolutely unknown to them ... it was only in comparatively recent times, after the Jews became familiar with modern Christian literature that they began their religion Judaism, .." (emphasis supplied).

This statement by the world's two leading authorities on this subject clearly establishes beyond any question or any doubt that so-called "Judaism" was not the name of any form of religious worship practiced in Judea in the time of Jesus. The Flavius Josephus referred to in the above quotation lived in the 1st century. It was he who coined the word "Judaism" in the 1st century explicitly for the purpose recited clearly above. Religious worship known and practiced today under the name "Judaism" by so-called or self-styled "Jews" throughout the world was known and practiced in Judea in the time of Jesus under the name "Pharisaism" according to Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, head of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and all the other most competent and qualified recognized authorities on the subject. The form of religious worship known as "Pharisaism" in Judea in the time of Jesus was a religious practice based exclusively upon the Talmud. The Talmud in the time of Jesus was the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, all rolled into one, of those
who practiced "Pharisaism". The Talmud today occupies the same relative position with respect to those who profess "Judaism". The Talmud today virtually exercises totalitarian dictatorship over the lives of so-called or self-styled "Jews" whether they are aware of that fact or not. Their spiritual leaders make no attempt to conceal the control they exercise over the lives of so-called or self-styled "Jews". They extend their authority far beyond the legitimate limits of spiritual matters. Their authority has no equal outside religion.