

African Tribal Heritage of the People of the Bible

The time will come when our posterity will wonder at our ignorance of things so plain.
Seneca

In the future the so-called Dark Ages will perhaps be lengthened to include our own.
G. C. Lichtenberg

When ignorance gets started, it knows no bounds.
Will Rogers

Introduction

Before I discuss the African heritage of the people of the Bible, there is an important question to which I would like to draw readers' attention. For two thousand years, Christian Europe has taught us that the Jewish people wrote the Bible. From studies of the Jewish people, we find out that they are not Europeans, they went to Europe from somewhere else. The Bible claims that these people originated from and therefore went to Europe from Ur of the Chaldees in Mesopotamia. If we accept the Bible's claim, we again find out that the Jewish people did not originate from Europeans in Ur of the Chaldees because the people of Mesopotamia were not Europeans. Specifically, the Jewish people did not originate from English people. The question therefore is if the Jewish people are not Europeans or English people how did the authors of the New Testament come to be called by the English names Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John that are not Jewish names? How did the cousin of Jesus come to be called John the Baptist, an English name, when he was not a European and specifically when he was not an Englishman? How did the disciples of Jesus come to acquire English names like Simon, Peter, Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James, Judas and others when these people were not English men, and when these names were not Jewish names either?

Perhaps, the most important question here is why did the authors of the Old Testament documents show their indigenous African tribal names, and why did the authors and people of the New Testament come to acquire English names? By giving the people of the Bible these fictitious English names, Christian Europe sought to conceal something from us, the Christian masses. It is what Christian Europe has sought to conceal from the masses for over two thousand years that this book is about to reveal. There are some things we have been taught to believe in Christianity that were not so, and I want my readers to approach reading this book from the point of view of questioning obvious incongruities like these in search of the truth.

This work is about the Bible and the religion that developed from it that has been spread around the world. It is something believers cannot explain but the philosophy of religion and the concept of God have had a huge mystical hold on the minds and imaginations of people around the world. Through the mystique of religious philosophy and the concept of God, the Christian Bible, believed to be a sacred book and the only book of religious truth, has acquired serious mystical dimensions to the extent that it has succeeded in even evoking some form of obsession in humans around the world. We have used this book and continue to use it to attribute and glorify the greatest of human achievements, but we have also used it and continue to use it to justify the most atrocious and inhuman acts in the history of our humanity.

The Bible imposes such an unquestioning soberness and obedience on its believers that most believers do not see where such a sacred and mystical book can be discussed academically. As a result, most of these people are not aware of scholastic biblical studies. To most believers, the only person with the "divine" authority to discuss the Bible is the preacher, and the only day such discussion can take place in "holiness" is Sunday. To these believers, bringing out logical

and academic issues in the Bible makes them uncomfortable because the interpreting and controlling class of the Christian mind has told them that such discussions are "unbiblical" and even downright blasphemous. As a result of such teachings, the Bible has always been in the background of people's minds and imaginations in every discussion and undertaking. Currently, invoking the Bible seems to be the final word on social and moral issues in many societies in the Christian world. That is the magnitude of the control this book has had and continues to have over the lives of millions around the world.

In *Who Wrote the New Testament: The Making of the Christian Myth*, Burton Mack (1995) noted this in his prologue:

It is the strange authority granted to the Bible in our society, an acquiescence that pertains whether one is a Christian or not, together with the poverty of our knowledge and public discussions of the bible, that is the stimulus for this book. Here we are with the Bible on our hands and we do not know how we got it, how it works, or what to make of it in public forum (p. 4).

This is a rather strange observation because the Bible itself tells us that the Jewish people wrote the documents of the Bible and gave them to the Greeks. However, historians and biblical scholars have found out that it is not true that the Jewish people wrote the Bible so we still do not know "how we got it," and we much less understand it. The making of the Christian myth that Burton Mack pointed out in the above quotation goes on daily. In a foreword to the Gideon New Testament, Psalms, and Proverbs, the producers wrote:

The Bible contains the mind of God, the state of man, the way of salvation, the doom of sinners, and the happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its histories are true, and its decisions are immutable. Read it to be wise, believe it to be safe, and practice it to be holy. It contains light to direct you, food to support you, and comfort to cheer you. It is the traveler's map, the pilgrim's staff, the pilot's compass, the soldier's sword, and the Christian's charter. Here Paradise is restored, Heaven opened, and the gates of hell disclosed."

I do know that the believers who wrote all these wrote them to glorify the Bible. However, the question that bothers me is how do people who do not know the origin of the biblical documents, people who do not know who wrote these documents, people who do not know where the book came from, and how the God of the Bible came to be know all these about the Bible? Or is the Bible such a great document that one does not have to know its origin or who wrote it to proclaim it in such theosophical highlights? This is an example of the making of the Christian myth. To believers in the Bible, it is sufficient to know that it is the "Book of God." Who this God is, and how he came to be does not matter. Because of the blind faith believers have in the Bible, the book has even been taken out of the minds and imaginations of humans from where it emerged, and given to God. Humans wrote the individual documents that were compiled into the Bible, and it is the revelation of the people who wrote these religious documents that the Greeks put together as the *Biblio* meaning the Book that this book is about.

The Bible without question is the greatest philosophy ever designed and written by man. It is no wonder that this Book humbles every human with whom it comes in contact, and it now has the attention of millions around the world. From centuries of carefully designed strategies to confer sacredness and divinity on the Bible, most Christians have come to believe that the Bible is the final authority on thinking, reasoning, and life. As a result, all thinking and reasoning stop for many people as soon as the Bible is invoked in any discussion. People do not know how to proceed in a discussion anymore once the Bible has been quoted in support of any debate.

People are almost frightened by the adulations that believing commentators shower on the Bible. In an Arts and Entertainment Network documentary on *Who Wrote the Bible*, the narrators pointed out that it is a book of sixty-six books with over eight hundred thousand words of enduring value. The narrator goes on to state that it is the cornerstone of our laws, ethics, moral

code and the four words of God are perceived to be a b

The narrative shrouded in the ut and inspired proph for them to reveal greatest book of re millions that belie Bible been kept a s to be kept? What believers in this Bi

The answer became the Jews a the Bible and ther political relationships not to believe in : problem that has unquestioning sob ideas as part of our thinking is the unc the Bible, Christian

What ama: where the Bible ca most historians an area of scholastic scholars found out the Bible actually itself gave us as th which I am going t Bible.

The Bible subordinated the h biblical assertion. Christianity has p modern research hi and even Bible sci documents of the I Bible but the peopl should we still belie

In 1987, R entitled *Who Wrot* support of the trad used very cogent a pointed out before l

It is a strang such a cent biblical boo' by the prop traditional a:

code and the fountainhead of faith for over half the population of this earth. It is said to be the words of God and it has been translated into almost every language on earth. The Bible is perceived to be a book of inspiration, beauty, wisdom, and compassion.

The narrator concludes by pointing out that despite all these, the origins of the Bible are shrouded in the utmost obscurity and mystery. The Jewish people have claimed that their priests and inspired prophets wrote the documents of the Bible. If this is true, why should it be difficult for them to reveal the origin of this book? How can the origin of a book believed to be the greatest book of religious truth of over half the population of the world be kept a secret from the millions that believe in this book? What is going on here? Why has the origin and authors of the Bible been kept a secret for the past two thousand years? What made it necessary for such a secret to be kept? What is it that the traditional defenders of the Bible have been trying to hide from believers in this Bible?

The answers to all of these questions go back to the African origin of the people that became the Jews and Hebrews in Europe and the African origin of the authors and doctrines of the Bible and therefore Christianity. The Bible is in effect caught up in the comparative socio-political relationship between black and white people. Despite all these, even those who profess not to believe in the Bible still do not know how to respond once the Bible is invoked. The problem that has arisen from such reverence to the Bible is that in the grip of the Bible's unquestioning soberness, the world has come to accept contradictory and sometimes illogical ideas as part of our perception of religious truth. As Will Durant pointed out, the greatest snare of thinking is the uncritical acceptance of irrational assumptions and that is where the world is with the Bible, Christianity, and all other religions.

What amazes most scholars who study the Bible is the fact that no one dares to question where the Bible came from or who wrote it beyond the fallacy that the Jewish people wrote it. To most historians and biblical scholars, the question of who wrote the Bible has become a major area of scholastic inquiry. This area of research became even more important when biblical scholars found out that the people we have long known and believed wrote some documents of the Bible actually did not write those documents. In other words, some of the names the Bible itself gave us as the writers of some of the documents in it were false. This is the foundation upon which I am going to expose the traditional lies that have long been taught and preached about the Bible.

The Bible itself tells us that the Jewish people wrote the Bible. Early historians wrote and subordinated the histories of ancient civilizations of Egypt and the Middle East based upon this biblical assertion. Jewish history was carefully designed to complement this biblical assertion. Christianity has propagated this idea around the world for over two thousand years and yet modern research has shown that all of these were false. Historians, archaeologists, Egyptologists, and even Bible scholars have all found out that the people the Bible tells us that they wrote the documents of the Bible were not the authors of these documents. If the Jewish people wrote the Bible but the people they tell us wrote the documents of the Bible did not write these documents, should we still believe that the Jewish people wrote this Bible?

In 1987, Richard Elliot Friedman, one of the foremost scholars of the Bible wrote a book entitled *Who Wrote The Bible?* To write such a book one must be certain that the evidence in support of the traditional assertion of the authors of the Bible was false. In this book, Friedman used very cogent arguments to suggest the people who must have written the Bible. However, he pointed out before he began his speculation that:

It is a strange fact that we have never known with certainty who produced the book that has played such a central role in our civilization. There are traditions concerning who wrote each of the biblical books – the Five Books of Moses are supposed to be by Moses, the book of Lamentations by the prophet Jeremiah, half the Psalms by King David – but how is one to know if these traditional ascriptions are correct? (p. 15, emphasis mine).

Here is one of the foremost Jewish biblical scholars revealing that authors the Bible claims wrote documents of the Bible did not write these documents. Unfortunately, such revelation about the true origin of the Bible is not the kind of information that is passed on to the believer on Sundays.

Discussions of the origin and the authors of the Bible have had their debating and controversial days. The *New York Times*' review of Friedman's book stated that it was "thought provoking" and would be "of interest to anyone who, aware of the unevenness and problems in the biblical text, seeks a sympathetic and perceptive guide." *U. S. News & World Report's* review pointed out that this book "promises to *rekindle* heated debate about the Good Book's origins." All of these go to confirm that western historical and biblical scholarship has never known with certainty who wrote the Bible despite the intense interdisciplinary effort that has been directed at this inquiry for centuries. The question that arises from the secrecy and mystery surrounding the origin and authors of the Bible is, what part of the Bible is the work of God and what part is the work of humans? This is a question most scholars who are confronted with the search for the origin and authors of the Bible ask themselves daily.

As I pointed out in the introduction, misquotations, misunderstandings, mistranslations, and misinterpretations of the documents of the Bible have caused the greatest controversies, confusion, and misery among humans. There is no literary work over which so many people have claimed knowledge and authority as the Bible. At the same time, there is no other literary work, whose narratives, intended meanings, and purposes have been so much speculated, misquoted, mistranslated, and misinterpreted.

The documents of the Bible were translated for the Greeks from who it traveled to entire Europe. It was in Europe that these documents first became a sacred book of religion. As a result, most of the controversies, confusion, and misery caused from the Bible originated in Europe. It is evident from this that Europeans have never understood the Bible because they have never known its place of origin, who wrote these documents, or the purpose it was intended to serve.

Western historians and biblical scholars have searched for the origin and the history behind the Bible but such scholastic search has been flawed by four main factors. The first of these factors is the fact that the leading scholars in biblical research have mostly been Jewish scholars who see the Bible as a record of their history and therefore cannot be known to outsiders. This gives them some kind of monopoly over biblical research. As a result, however, the focus of the search of these scholars has been on seeking and confirming what the Bible has said instead of searching for what might have been that the Bible did not say. From this focus, these scholars have narrowed their search for biblical information and the authors of the Bible within the context of the suggested geographical setting of the Bible and only around the history of Israel. In effect, there is some kind of conspiratorial protection from some biblical scholars to make sure that nothing is brought out to undermine Jewish people's place as the children of God in the eyes of Europeans.

Such conspiratorial protection of the Bible and the Jewish people must have been caused by the history of intimidation that has long surrounded scholastic search for the truth behind the Bible. Historical evidence shows that the early Church and most early biblical scholars were not tolerant and ready to accept any deviations from what they perceived as the "biblical truth." For example, Isaac ibn Yashush was among the early Jewish biblical scholars to find out that Moses did not write the first five books of the Bible as scholars of the biblical documents attributed to him. When he wrote to reveal the earliest reasons why Moses did not write the first five books of the Bible, he was perceived and called a heretic by his colleagues, especially Abraham ibn Ezra. There is also evidence that some early scholars who found out some truths that contradicted what has traditionally been accepted as biblical truths were urged to hide it and be quiet. In *Who Wrote The Bible?* Richard Elliot Friedman quoted ibn Ezra as having written to his fellow scholars almost threatening them that: "And he who understands will keep silent" (1987, p.19). This speaks volumes about the suspected conspiracy I have mentioned, and it seems to reflect a clear

voice of intimidation
historical background
if it were as safe to te

The second
behind the biblical d
these documents are
these authors wrote
tunneled toward wha
would perhaps under

The third fi
condemning and the
beliefs in the Bible. I
deleted the passages
Bible. The Church r
Index of Prohibited E
Later the Church als
biblical books attribut

The Catholic
Spinoza for revealing
Bible. Judaism excon
scholars believe that
tried to reveal. The C
Simon, wrote. As it c
and warn scholars ne
undermine the veraci
lying lore in Christia
continued survival an

In this regard
being brought to "ha
tried William Robert
removing him from
difficult to understan
the biblical version c
works have almost al
Friedman, 1987, pp. 1

The final flav
the fact that though t
for almost two thous
its search off Ancier
revelation of the Afri
historians, and even
successfully speculate

The difficulty of tellin

This work is
became the Christian
years, the world has
concepts and docum
Europeans, and Islam
verify whether it is tr
documents in the Bit

voice of intimidation from some Jewish scholars to hide the truth about the Bible. From such a historical background, I would say that the truth in Christianity would have been told more often if it were as safe to tell it as it is to hide it.

The second factor in the flaw of western scholastic search for the authors and history behind the biblical documents is the fact that most of the people that seek to find the authors of these documents are already believers in the teachings of these documents. They already believe these authors wrote these documents. As a result, the research visions of these scholars are also tunneled toward what would confirm their beliefs in these documents, and not any deviations that would perhaps undermine their beliefs or question the veracity of the Bible on some issues.

The third factor has been the early traditional power of the Catholic Church in condemning and thereby discouraging findings of any deviations from the normal religious beliefs in the Bible. For example, the Church rejected the work of Bonfils of Damascus and later deleted the passages in his work that questioned Moses' authorship of the first five books of the Bible. The Church relegated the work of Andreas van Maes on the same topic to the Catholic Index of Prohibited Books, the most powerful index of religious freedom censorship ever known. Later the Church also censored Isaac de la Peyrere's book suggesting that Moses did not write the biblical books attributed to him. De la Peyrere was arrested, jailed, and forced to recant. He did.

The Catholic Church and Judaism banded together and went after the Dutch philosopher Spinoza for revealing more evidence showing that Moses did not write the first five books of the Bible. Judaism excommunicated Spinoza, and the Church issued 37 edicts against his work. Some scholars believe that the later attempt on Spinoza's life was because of the powerful truths he tried to reveal. The Catholic Church burned almost all the books the French protestant, Richard Simon, wrote. As it can be seen, the Church's intimidation over centuries was enough to inform and warn scholars not to search or reveal anything that would question, disagree, and therefore undermine the veracity of the Bible. From these, it is clear that the foundations of the legendary lying lore in Christianity had the mighty hand of the Catholic Church behind it to ensure the continued survival and propagation of the Christian lying lore.

In this regard, the Church was very powerful, defensive, and protective of the Bible from being brought to "harm" through the revelation of truths behind the Book. The Catholic Church tried William Robertson Smith, the Scottish professor of the Old Testament and succeeded in removing him from his position as the Chair of a College in Aberdeen in Scotland. It is not difficult to understand why almost all the contemporary works out there have tended to support the biblical version of the stories and authors of the Bible, and why dissenting and revealing works have almost always been silenced in one way or another. For more discussion of this see Friedman, 1987, pp. 17-21.

The final flaw in western scholastic search for the people and authors of the Bible is in the fact that though the Bible gives a major clue, historical and biblical scholars have ignored it for almost two thousand years. By ignoring this clue, western scholarship has effectively turned its search off Ancient Egypt and her modern descendants, the black Africans. As a result, a revelation of the Africans who wrote the Bible would come as a major surprise to most believers, historians, and even biblical scholars who have for far too long believed that they have successfully speculated and therefore they know all the answers to the biblical riddle.

The difficulty of telling Africa's story in the west

This work is a revelation of the Africans who wrote the theosophical documents that became the Christian Bible of ancient Greece, Europe, and the world. For over two thousand years, the world has known and credited the Jewish people as the creators of the foundational concepts and documents that became the doctrines of Judaism for Jews, Christianity for Europeans, and Islam for the Arabs. However, few people have gone beyond this knowledge to verify whether it is true that the Jewish people created the foundational concepts, doctrines, and documents in the Bible or not. One of the most simple arguments supporting the fact that the

Jewish people did not write create the ideas or write the documents of the Bible is their inability to tell the world where and how these documents originated. Another is their inability to tell the world who truly wrote these documents beside the false authors they assigned to the documents. As a major part of the revelation in this work therefore, I will like to establish that the Jewish people did not create the foundational concepts or the theosophical documents that became the foundations of world religions. A larger ethnic group of black people from whom the Jewish people originated created the concepts of religion, the sacramental practices, and the religious documents that the Jewish people translated for the Greeks. This larger ethnic group of people is the modern descendants of Ancient Egyptians, and they can be found in Africa. This work will introduce the historical, biblical, linguistic, and cultural evidence to confirm this.

Before then, I would like to point out that Europeans have not known all the evidence I intend to introduce in this book, but they have known something about the African heritage of the Jewish people. They have long known that the Jewish people came to Europe from among a larger group of black people. However, they have never known the specific African tribal group from which the Jewish people originated. Much of what scholars have said about the ethnic origin of the Jewish people has usually been the generic statements pointing out that the Jewish people originated from Africa. Honestly, the Jewish people know that they originated from some black tribes, but they also do not specifically know which these tribes were.

Personally, I am aware that there was a time in the 1960s and 70s when the Jewish scholars were secretly traveling around Africa researching African tribes to find out where they must have originated. I do believe, however, that in these days when being associated with Africa is a denigration in Europe, they have stopped trying but the evidence in Africa has not gone away. I am personally aware that some Jewish scholars came to Ghana when I was there and studied *Akan* religion, especially the religion of the *Asante* people to find out if there were any similarities between that and Judaism or Christianity. To the Jewish people therefore, this work is going to be a major revelation of their roots because the work will reveal the larger ethnic group from which they originated and the tribes and ethnic groups that joined this larger group in the biblical Exodus.

This revelation is about what Africa knows, and revealing any positive truth about Africa today is not easy. As I have pointed out, over the centuries, the negative ideas that early western scholars wrote about Africa have now ossified in the minds and imaginations of people around the world. Most people do not want to shed their negative perceptions about Africa because keeping Africa down through these negative perceptions helps to keep them at a level on top, and that makes them feel psychologically good.

For example, there was a genetic study in America and China to try to find the origin of the Chinese people. This study was called the *Chinese Human Genome Project*. The study found out that the earliest Chinese people originated from Africa. In the review of this project in the *LA Times*, Li Jan, one of the researchers is reported to have said that his fellow Chinese scholars would be very upset because he revealed to the world that ancient Chinese people were Africans. This study was a well designed genetic study conducted by Chinese scholars in America and China. These scholars made this conclusion themselves but they never wanted it to be known that modern Chinese people originated from Africa. This is because the early negative ideas Europeans wrote and propagated about Africa have solidified in the minds and imaginations of people and it has made being African the worst of human flaws in this world. The Chinese scholars would be upset because they do not want to be associated with whatever Africa is in the eyes of the world.

For this reason, revealing a relationship between Africa, the Bible, and Christianity, as this book seeks to do, is even more difficult because in matters concerning religion, especially Christian religion, the truth is fervently guarded with a heavy armor of indoctrinated faith. A carefully designed propaganda and strategy to perpetuate the lies that early historians and apostolic fathers of Christianity told further protect this armor. As a result, not many people who

have adopted this religion, devoted their lives. In religion, one does not go into discussing and so on. Unknowingly, these people have lost their lives.

The worst part of religious and historical knowledge is rather too limited. We do not know, and they do not know, and the story somewhere. They interacted with and with no. However, that is the

From Christianity that in the past four eyewitnesses off the Egyptians. For example, people were in Ancient times. Believers do not know the Greeks in Alexandria imagined that there might be descendants of believers around the world. Believers have never read and been told

As a foundation of the biblical story was a story on this earth. As a result, we restrict the discussion to fabrications to defend ourselves. It may even help to work is not intended to tell of the biblical story that is Africa's side of the story. We must prepare the minds and prepare the

Because westerners know and understand negative anthropology of African history that is of religion, specifically linking Africans to the Bible from a geographical perspective. They became a people in Africa they moved to Canaan in Ancient Egypt. All never be known and and the Middle East is

have adopted this religion know all they need to know about the religion they have adopted and devoted their lives. Because of this, when it comes to serious explorations into the Christian religion, one does not get to explore seriously with those who know the truth, instead one gets into discussing and sometimes debating with those who "do not know or understand, but believe." Unknowingly, these people have been the soldiers and the guardians of the "legendary lying lore."

The worst part of being involved in a discussion with such people is that their only source of religious and historical knowledge is the Bible and its interpretations. Unfortunately, these are rather too limited. What makes the only source of these people even more limited is the fact that they do not know, and they have never imagined that there might be eyewitnesses to the biblical story somewhere. The question is could all the people the Jewish people claim to have lived and interacted with and wrote about in the biblical narratives be extinct? The answer is an emphatic no. However, that is the impression the biblical neglect of these people seems to suggest.

From Christianity's deliberate silence about these people, most Christians do not know that in the past four hundred years, Christian Europe has been doing all it can to cut possible eyewitnesses off the biblical story. These eyewitnesses are the Africans who were the Ancient Egyptians. For example, most believers in the Bible as the book of God know that the Jewish people were in Ancient Egypt where they claim to have become a people. However, what these believers do not know is that the documents of the Bible were compiled, edited, and translated for the Greeks in Alexandria in Ancient Egypt. In much the same way, these believers have never imagined that there might be modern descendants of the Ancient Egyptians and therefore there might be descendants of eyewitnesses who might still know something that Christian Europe and believers around the world has never known about the Bible. What is worse is, most of these believers have never explored the role of the Ancient Egyptians in the Bible beyond what they have read and been told by the interpreters.

As a foundation for the continuation of this discussion, I would like to establish that the biblical story was a story about real humans, and their modern descendants continue to live on this earth. As a result, any historical discussion of the Bible that seeks to speculate, theorize, and restrict the discussion to only biblical references, or couch the discussion in inherent biblical fabrications to defend the faith is not enough. It is the human story behind the Bible that this book seeks to bring out so that those who believe would know and better understand what they believe. It may even help to strengthen and refine some believers' faiths. I must also point out that this work is not intended to question any Christian's faith. Instead the work is intended to tell the side of the biblical story that has never been told, or has been concealed from Christian masses, and that is Africa's side of the story. This is the background I would like readers to have to open their minds and prepare themselves for the revelations in this book.

Because western scholarship about Africa has mostly been based upon socio-political and negative anthropological sentiments and not the truth, Europeans have been the last people to know and understand any aspect of history about Africa. One of the most important aspects of African history that Europeans have failed to know and understand is the true story of the origin of religion, specifically the story of Europe's Christian religion. Among the peripheral evidence linking Africans to the documents of the Bible is geographical evidence. When we look at the Bible from a geographical point of view, we find out that geographically, the Jewish people became a people in Ancient Egypt not in Canaan. They became a people in Ancient Egypt before they moved to Canaan. The documents of the Bible were compiled and translated for the Greeks in Ancient Egypt. All of these suggest that the true story behind the Bible and Christianity can never be known and understood without knowing about the people that lived in Ancient Egypt and the Middle East in ancient times.

Our emerging knowledge

From the growth and development of knowledge in more recent times, Europeans continue to find out a close relationship amongst Ancient Egyptians, Africans, Jews, the Bible, and Christianity beyond what the Bible has stated or what the interpreters have said. In the formative years of Christianity, this relationship between Africans and the Bible did not matter. However, in more recent times since the relationship between Europeans and Africans has been based upon Europe's superiority and Africa's inferiority, it has become extremely important to Christian Europe that modern Europeans do not find out that the concepts and practices of Christianity were derived from ancient African theosophical concepts and sacramental practices. As a result, Christian Europe has long wished that the relationship amongst Ancient Egyptians, Africans, Jews, the Bible, and Christianity were never explored. Because of this, much of the true historical and archaeological information that tends to bring Ancient Egyptians and their modern descendants, the Africans, close to the origins of Christianity has always been either openly denied, or secretly suppressed.

Even information about Africa that is not about religion is either vehemently denied or quietly suppressed. Some western scholars have even made it their earnest duties to monitor what their fellow scholars write about Africa to make sure that these scholars do not reveal some of the deliberately hidden truths about this continent. In 1977, W. Y. Adams wrote a book entitled *Nubia: Corridor to Africa*. The title of the book scared many western historians and Egyptologists. Was Nubia the corridor through which African people went from inner Africa to become the Ancient Egyptians, or was it the corridor through which the Ancient Egyptians moved to inner Africa to become the Africans? Whichever way one looked at it, there seemed to be a link between the Africans and the Ancient Egyptians with Nubia as the corridor of passage. Linking Ancient Egypt to black Africans has been a relationship most western historians and Egyptologists have refused to accept or acknowledge. Consequently, some scholars had to monitor what Adams had to write closely.

In the introduction to his book, Adams acknowledged his frustration from the subtle control of truth about Africa and the intimidation of his colleagues when he wrote:

"I did not originally set out to write this book for anthropologists, Egyptologists, or any of the scholarly specialists to whom the foregoing paragraphs are addressed. My intention was merely to make Nubian history known in an intelligible form to the general public, or at least to that part of it whose interest was kindled by the publicity given Abu Simbel and the High Dam salvage campaign. *Yet I found that, in the present state of our knowledge, I could not write a wholly popular book, knowing all the while that my professional colleagues would be looking over my shoulder.* For their sake (and sometimes at their insistence), I have introduced passages of discussion, debate, and sometimes downright quibbling which I had no original thought of including; as a result the lay reader may at times see more of the "dirty linen" of [western] historical scholarship than he wished to. ..." (1977, p. 9, emphasis mine).

The disdain in Adam's introductory paragraph clearly comes from his frustration in the assault on his conscience by colleagues who tried to intimidate him to hide whatever truth he must have found. The "dirty linen" of western historical scholarship about Africa, and the intimidation of some scholars to make sure that their colleagues do not reveal what early western scholarship has traditionally hidden is clearly evident in many modern scholastic works in history, anthropology, and science.

Early European knowledge of the black origin of Christianity

European scholars have long known about the African origin of the Jewish people, the Bible, and therefore the African origin of the religion Europeans call Christianity. This is about Africa and what European scholars have never known is the evidence from Africa that would confirm what they have long known about the Jewish people, the Bible, and Africans. It is the

evidence fr
authors of
book inten
than has e
Europeans
result, bef
knows, I w
people, and

In
which the
Jewish peo
African tril
still have a
their royal
their ancie
of their an
some of th
ancient nar
the Ancien
ruins in Eg

Pr
than provi
white. To
proving th
modern ge
it requires
of itself.

I h
of the blac
among hun
However, i
result, it is
people to t
became th
black herit
thousand y

Ar
Bible and
years. In it
Christianit
evidence t
Bible for t
the Bible
theosophic
of Christian

M
African or
apostolic
knowledge
of Racist a

evidence from Africa confirming the African heritage of the Jewish people, the Africa origin and authors of the doctrines of the Bible, and therefore the African origin of Christianity that this book intends to provide. The revelation in this book is therefore more specific and conclusive than has ever been attempted or revealed before now. However, that does not mean that Europeans have never known anything about the African heritage of the Jewish people. As a result, before I reveal anything about the ethnic origin of the Jewish people from what Africa knows, I will first explore what Europeans have known about the African origin of the Jewish people, and how they have reacted because of this knowledge.

In the introductory summary, I revealed that I have discovered the African tribes from which the Jewish people originated from the African tribal names they carry today. I linked the Jewish people to the African tribes that were the Ancient Egyptians. Proving the blackness of the African tribes that were the Ancient Egyptians is not difficult because they are still black. They still have a culture and tradition of kingship going back to Ancient Egypt. There is evidence of their royal dynasties originating from Ancient Egypt. Their kings still carry the royal names of their ancestors that were the Ancient Egyptians and these modern descendants have rebuilt some of the ancient cities of their ancestors in Egypt and given these modern cities the same ancient names as they were in Egypt. In addition to all these, there is evidence of the blackness of the Ancient Egyptians in the images, wall paintings, and reliefs we have found in their ancient ruins in Egypt, and in museums around the world.

Proving that the Jewish people were originally black people is; however, more difficult than proving the blackness of the Ancient Egyptians because the Jewish people of today are white. To Europeans who were closer in time to the coming of the Jewish people to Europe, proving that the Jewish people were black people would not have been difficult. However, to modern generations that are far removed in time from the coming of the Jewish people to Europe it requires producing some of the evidence Christian Europe has sought to conceal in preservation of itself.

I have to prove the original black heritage of the Jewish people to validate my discovery of the black tribes from which they originated. It is important therefore for me to explain that among humans, it is the black skin color that changes to all the skin colors we have in the world. However, no mixture of humans can produce the black skin color except two black people. As a result, it is easier for black people to turn white as the Jewish people have done than it is for white people to turn black. This simply means it is at least possible for the original black people that became the Jews and Hebrews in Europe to turn white as they are today. For me to prove the black heritage of the Jewish people we must go to Europe where they have lived for over two thousand years to find out what Europeans have known about them.

Among the greatest of the hidden truths in Europe is the African origin and authors of the Bible and the concept of Christianity. Christian Europe has known this for over two thousand years. In its formative years, Christian Europe accepted the origin and authors of the doctrines of Christianity in the Africans without any hesitation or reservation. During this period, there is evidence that early Christian Churches in Europe worshipped black images of the people of the Bible for the sake of religious sanctimony and purity. The earliest black images of the people of the Bible in Christendom were therefore the earliest evidence of the African origin of the theosophical concepts and doctrines that became the documents of the Bible and the foundations of Christian doctrine in Europe.

Modern Europeans may not know this, or they may not want to know now, but the African origin of Christianity was common knowledge among western scholars and the early apostolic fathers of the Church long before Renaissance. It has been and it is still common knowledge through our modern times into this twenty-first century. In *The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalistic Ideas in Europe*, Leon Poliakov revealed that knowledge of the people

of the Bible as black people was common in Europe and in early European scholarship. In his chapter on *The Quest for the New Adam*, Leon Poliakov wrote:

The scientists for their part were advancing even more remarkable hypothesis. James Cowles Prichard, by far the most popular anthropologist of the first half of the nineteenth century (who was a monogenist on the authority of the Scriptures, as he himself expressly admitted) had elaborated round about 1810, a kind of evolutionary theory according to which Adam and Eve were Blacks. It was only in the course of time that their descendants, as they became civilized and changed their way of life, had acquired a white colour (1996, p. 211, see also *Histoire Naturelle*, pp. 146-7, 151).

I would like to point out that the discussion of *The Quest for the New Adam* in Leon Poliakov's book is about Europe's search for a new and different source of origin when they determined that they could never have originated from the same [thus inferior] progenitor as black people. Do you think that from this background Europeans would acknowledge that the people of the Bible were black people?

In the introductory summary of this work, I revealed that I have discovered the African tribes from which the Jewish people originated. I discussed a few issues to show that the Jews were originally black people and here is evidence of such knowledge in Europe. Most early and modern European scholars have been influenced by the Bible to design their scholarship alongside what the Bible has said. What is most noteworthy in the work of this anthropologist, therefore, is that he freely admitted that he was a Christian, and he freely theorized that the people of the Bible beginning with Adam and Eve were black. Throughout Europe, statues, paintings, and all images of the people of the Bible have been portrayed as white people. What would make a Christian scholar assert that the people of the Bible were black in contradiction to the overt teachings and preaching of the Church? What would make a European scholar even assume that the people of the Bible were black people if he were not sure? What would make a European scholar and Christian risk being ostracized by his people and the Church to hypothesize that the people of the Bible were black people? This could only happen only if such a European scholar and Christian knew for sure that what he was talking about was the truth.

There is also a very important revelation in Prichard's assertion. From his European, Christian, and scholastic background, Prichard pointed out that white people originated from black people, and that they turned white only by changing their ways of life. This assertion may sound humorous today but modern science of the origin of humans has found it to be true. What would make a European, a Christian, and a scholar assert that Europeans were originally black people when the Church, Europeans, and most western scholars of the time were looking for ways to disassociate themselves from Africans? If Adam and Eve were black people then Europeans who look and claim to be different and superior to Africans because of their white skin color originated from black people. A branch of any tree cannot be superior to the stem from which it originates. Perhaps the most important point to bring out here is that if European anthropologists knew that Adam and Eve were black people then they admitted as late as the nineteenth century that the people of the Bible were black people. How then did Christian Europe come to have a white Jesus?

Prichard was not the only European scholar to point out that the people of the Bible were black. In 1933, Dr. John G. Jackson, an African American scholar wrote a book entitled *Was Jesus Christ A Negro? and The African Origin of the Myths and Legends of the Garden of Eden*. In this book, Dr. Jackson quoted the work of Sir Godfrey Higgins to support his assertion that Jesus was black.

In 1836, a knighted and renowned British orientalist, Sir Godfrey Higgins wrote *The Anaclypsis, or an Inquiry into the Origin of Languages, Nations, and Religions*. In this work, Sir Higgins also pointed out that the people of the Bible were black and that in all the early Catholic

Churches of E
be black [peop
himself perfect
of the Myths
indirectly was
religion and e
conclusion is r
that conceived
God in the bi
accepted, and e
Christ and his r

From I
Christian make
taught him to be

Here is
the stories and
documents. Th
is if the people
the Catholic Ch
portray Jesus a
Church of whi
people, and wh
upon the blackn

We mu
Jews to Europe
as white people
color of the Je
fathers of the C
they were not c
therefore the g
original black i
and his mother c

On auth
Bible, this piec
biblical story is
must have origi
people that I an
the Bible, and al

Sir Hig
Bible is very si
This revelation
African origin c
acknowledged t
black people as
from the forma
psychologically
black mother, r
sacramental prac

Sir Hig
among his peop
prove his assert

Churches of Europe: "the God Christ, as well as his mother, are described in their old pictures to be black [people]. The infant God in the arms of his black mother, his eyes and drapery white, is himself perfectly black" (1836, p. 7, see also *Was Jesus Christ A Negro and The African Origin of the Myths and Legends of the Garden of Eden*, p. 14). What Sir Higgins also revealed indirectly was the fact that the doctrines of the Bible were originally black people's doctrines of religion and even the authors of our cherished Bible were black people. Arriving at this conclusion is rather simple. If Jesus were black and his people wrote his story, then the people that conceived and wrote this story must be also black. This confirms that the original people of God in the biblical story were black. It also reveals that the early Catholic Church knew, accepted, and acknowledged the black ethnicity of the people of the Bible by portraying the God Christ and his mother as the black people they originally were.

From his name Godfrey, Higgins must have been himself a Christian. Why would a Christian make such an assertion, if it were not true, in contradiction of what the Church has taught him to believe and what the Church itself has been propagating around the world?

Here is something else readers should consider in this analysis. The Jewish people sent the stories and documents of Christian doctrine to Europe as original Jewish people's stories and documents. They also told Europeans that the people of the Bible were their people. The question is if the people of the Bible and the Jewish people were not originally black people why would the Catholic Church, the foundation Church of Christian religion in Europe and around the world, portray Jesus and his mother as black people? What would have made it that necessary for the Church of white people to portray the most important personalities in Christianity as black people, and why? The answer is simple. The people of the early Christian Church did this based upon the blackness of the people they saw and called the Jewish people.

We must remember that early Catholic Church was closer in time to the coming of the Jews to Europe than any of the Renaissance painters that began to portray the people of the Bible as white people. Certainly, early apostolic fathers of the Church were closer to knowing the skin color of the Jewish people than leaders of our modern Churches. These early white apostolic fathers of the Church would have had no reason to portray Jesus and his mother as black people if they were not originally black. The early portrayal of Jesus and his mother as black people was therefore the gospel truth. That was why the Church portrayed Jesus and his mother in the original black images of the Jewish people at the time. This was how the earliest images of Jesus and his mother came to be black in the Catholic Churches of Europe.

On authority of the earliest Christian portrayals of the Jewish people as the people of the Bible, this piece of historical information reveals that the Jewish people who claim that the biblical story is their ancestral story were originally black people. If they were black people they must have originated from a larger tribal group of black people. It is this tribal group of black people that I am going to reveal to confirm the blackness of Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible, and also authenticate the revelation of the Africans who wrote the Bible.

Sir Higgins' revelation of the black ethnicity of Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible is very significant because the Catholic Church introduced Christianity to Western Europe. This revelation not only confirms that the Catholic Church has long known and acknowledged the African origin of Christianity, but also that Western Europeans have long known, accepted, and acknowledged the black heritage of Jesus, his mother, and her people. The acknowledgement of black people as the people of the Bible and the creators of the doctrines of Christianity began from the formative years of Christianity and lasted until racism and racial prejudice made it psychologically impossible and uncomfortable for Europeans to accept a black Jesus and his black mother, no matter how central and revered these people were in Christian doctrine and sacramental practices.

Sir Higgins anticipated that this revelation was not going to be received with equanimity among his people in Europe. He therefore armed himself with numerous irrefutable proofs. To prove his assertion, Sir Higgins did not theorize to give his fellow scholars and religious racists

the opportunities to theorize alongside the racist "legendary lying lore" of Europe. Instead, he sent doubters of his assertion to places and Churches in Europe where such images of the *black Christ and his mother Mary* could be found. He sent his detractors to Cathedral-a-Moulins, the famous Chapel of the Virgin of Loretto where there was still an image of the black Jesus and his mother in that Church. He also sent unbelievers to the Church of Annunciata, the Church at St. Lazaro, and the Church of St. Stephen at Genoa where the black images of Jesus and his mother could also be found. Sir Higgins sent his challengers to the Church of St. Francisco at Pisa, to the Church at Brixen in Tyrol, and to the Church at Padua. Sir Higgins also sought to prove his assertion with churches closer to his readers in Western Europe. He therefore sent unbelievers in these places to the Catholic Cathedral at Augsburg, the Church of St. Theodore at Munich in Germany, and even to Rome and the Borghese chapel of Maria Maggiore.



Fig. 2: Bronze portrait of St. Peter at his Basilica in Rome today.

The big question is, if all these early Churches portrayed Jesus, the God Christ and his mother as black people what doubt should we have today about the origin and centrality of

Africans in the creation of Europe? The answer is that the black ethnicity of Jesus was in the minds of European Christians about Africans that was unacceptable to Christian Europe. The self-confession of Europe's self-confession was unacceptable to "superior" and the people of the world because it did not fit the people who are now

What I would like to see in a socio-anthropological study of the black people of Europe were black is a simple matter of European names. These people derived their blackness from Egyptians, Canaan, and later from Europe therefore derived they originated in Africa of the racial and ethnic background about the Christian racial and ethnic identity and ethnic heritage became the Jews and

What is interesting about the people of the Bible were black people and the Church also never because it knew. However that the Church never

Sir Godfrey European racism, the blackness of the people as a result, some of the Christian images of Jesus and black. To make such the "black figurines" replaced them with their mother in all Catholic question these revealed ethnic background of the black images of these revelations were

Of course, some Jewish people from and they were considered that Sir Higgins also thrown away or destroyed

Africans in the creation and development of the documents and doctrines of Christianity in Europe? The answer to this question is not about Christian Europe's doubt of the veracity of the black ethnicity of Jesus and his mother. The answer to this question is not even about religion. In the minds of Europeans, the real answer to this question was about acknowledging something about Africans that could raise Africans above Europeans. That was unacceptable even to Christian Europe. The issue therefore was whether accepting this truth erodes some aspects of Europe's self-conferred superiority over Africans or not. If it did, then this fact was simply unacceptable to "superior" Europeans. In other words, Europeans knew that Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible were all black people. However, they simply refused to accept it because it did not fit into Europe's comparative anthropological perception of itself and the black people who are now the Africans.

What I would like to point out to readers that may feel psychologically uncomfortable or socio-anthropologically insecure from knowing that Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible were black is a simple fact. The people of the Bible did not derive their racial and ethnic identities from European names, or Renaissance and other European paintings and artistic depictions of them. These people were real humans with a racial and ethnic heritage. The people of the Bible derived their black racial and ethnic heritage from the black people that were the Ancient Egyptians. These were the people some of who broke away from Ancient Egypt, went to live in Canaan, and later went to Europe to become the Jews and Hebrews. These Jews and Hebrews of Europe therefore derived their black racial and ethnic heritage from the black tribes from whom they originated in Ancient Egypt before they broke away into the biblical Exodus. The question of the racial and ethnic heritage of Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible is therefore not about the Christian religion or what European racial sentiments are willing to acknowledge. The racial and ethnic identity of Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible are about the true racial and ethnic heritage of the Jewish people and the people from whom they originated before they became the Jews and Hebrews in Europe.

What is interesting about all these is that the Jewish people who claim that they were the people of the Bible have not questioned or refuted the fact that the original people of the Bible were black people and that is how Jesus and his mother Mary came to be black. The Catholic Church also never questioned or refuted the veracity of the people of the Bible being black because it knew. However, the responsive action of the Church to all these revelations confirmed that the Church never wanted it to be known that the people of the Bible were black.

Sir Godfrey Higgins went on to point out that with the growth and development of European racism, many of the European Churches embarked upon concealing the truth of the blackness of the people of the Bible from the Christian masses and the European public. As a result, some of the Churches designed the propaganda to either explain why the earliest Christian images of Jesus and his mother were black, or deny entirely that these people were originally black. To make such denial and propaganda easy and plausible, most of the Churches removed the "black figurines" of Jesus and his mother from the Churches and European public view and replaced them with white images. The Church had worshiped the black images of Jesus and his mother in all Catholic Churches in Europe for over a thousand years therefore it could not question these revelations. Moreover, it was not the place of the Church to question the racial and ethnic background of the people of the Bible. As a result, the Church's action of quietly removing the black images of Jesus and his mother and replacing them with white images confirm that these revelations were true and unimpeachable.

Of course, such replacements became easy and well justified because by this time the Jewish people from whose blackness Europeans had known the people of the Bible looked white, and they were considered white in many European communities. What is interesting about this is that Sir Higgins also pointed out that the "black figurines" of Christ and his mother were not thrown away or destroyed. They were kept in secret basements and repositories where they are

still held sacred by the few who know and believe in the religious purity, originality, and true spirit of Christianity (see *The Anaclypsis, Vol. I, Bk. IV, Chapt. 1*).

Despite these actions and propaganda by the Catholic Church, there are still some Churches in Europe that have retained the images of the black Jesus and his mother to this day. One of my students from Spain told me that some of the oldest Catholic Churches in Spain have not changed or concealed their ancient black figurines of Jesus and his mother to this day. This was confirmed in the History Channel's recent documentary on the *Inquisition*. In the discussion of the Inquisition in Spain, I saw at least one church in the video that still has its old black figurines of Jesus and his mother. In another recent History Channel documentary called the *Catacombs of Rome*, the earliest paintings of Jesus in Christian catacombs portrayed him as a black man with a lamb across his shoulders as Christ the Shepherd. In the Catacombs of St. Domitilla, another early Christian burial place underneath the city of Rome, there are several depictions of Jesus as a black man on the tombs of many of these early Christians. Again, we must remember that the Catholic Church was closer in time to the coming of the Jews to Rome so the artists in these catacombs depicted what they saw the earliest Jewish people were, and that was black.

I have personally lived and traveled far and wide in Europe. In one of our personal travels, my wife and I noticed that the statue of St. Peter outside St. Peter's Basilica in Rome was physically different from the one inside. The one inside was an image of a black man. I did not know why the same person would be depicted in two different racial images but I now know the reason for the difference. The one outside is for the pacification of European racial and prejudicial sentiments, and the one inside portraying a black man, is for the purity and sacredness of true Christian worship. Is the portrait of St. Peter above the portrait of a white person? Even today, some believers argue that the image of St. Peter in the Basilica was not originally black and that it is the bronze that was used in designing the statue that is turning black. Others also argue that the blackness of St. Peter in the Basilica is a miracle because St. Peter is turning into the black man he originally was.

Another question that has puzzled many believers in the Bible and biblical scholars is if the people of the Bible were not black, where did the Catholic Church come by the black Madonnas still in European Churches and Churches around the world? What is most fascinating about all these is that these black Madonnas are acknowledged and worshipped at the highest pinnacle of Christian worship.

On May 30, 1982, Mr. Ed Reiter wrote an article in the *New York Times* entitled *Medal Honors the 'Black Madonna.'* Below is the article:

Life in Poland is bleak these days, but even in this time of lingering national trauma there are causes for celebration. One such occasion will take place this summer, when Polish Catholics mark the 600th anniversary of their "Black Madonna" shrine and a new medal, authorized by the Vatican, will enable people around the world to share in the observance - at least vicariously.

The Black Madonna is a portrait of Mary, mother of Jesus Christ, said to have been painted by St. Luke on a plank from a table made by Jesus. The Roman Emperor Constantine is said to have carried the painting from Jerusalem to Constantinople. From there, centuries later, it passed into the hands of Prince Wladyslaw, founder of the monastery of Josna Gora, a Marian sanctuary in Czestochowa, Poland.

Upon completion of the monastery in 1382, the Prince presented the painting to the Pauline Fathers there, and ever since then it has been an important object of veneration.

Pope John Paul II, himself a son of Poland, has termed the Black Madonna, "the pulse of our nation within the heart of its mother." The shrine has helped unify Polish Catholics through recurrent periods of religious persecution and repression and millions of pilgrims visit it every year despite government efforts to discourage demonstrations of fervor. A counterpart shrine honoring Our Lady of Czestochowa has been erected in this country at Doylestown, Pa.

The 600th Polish Catholics jubilee celebration permit. The Pope history, and offer threats from many

This piece of in knowledge, Jesus, his m piece of information is heritage of the people of Church has tangible ev portrayal from St. Luke the mother of Jesus, as Church portrays Jesus a of God. What reveals ti Mary, the mother of Jesu or for that matter, any l with a black husband? known the people and th

Despite Christia know that Jesus' real fa that was transposed to J calculated deception in claim that Jesus was the became the son of the C sisters of Jesus have ne only child, the son of Gc

From this analy mother, and the entire This revelation also cor honor, worship, and pri and his mother portraye when the Church has lor

The conspiracy black people in Africa when they all knew tha for the past two thousa only black people in th to be black and that co were all black people.

A major point I were not Jews, and the Ancient Egyptians. The only do we know that we know the specific out that the Jewish pec the Jewish people did African tribes and the Jewish people did not they come by and con

The 600th anniversary observance has prompted a number of special activities among Polish Catholics and other Catholics of Polish extraction. These will culminate Aug. 26 in a jubilee celebration at the shrine. Pope John Paul II is expected to attend if political conditions permit. The Pope did visit the shrine in 1979, shortly after becoming the first Polish pontiff in history, and offered a prayer at that time for justice and peace in a world "still under so terrible threats from many sides (quoted from Was Jesus Christ A Negro ... by Dr. Curtis Alexander, ed.).

This piece of information confirms that in the deepest recesses of the Catholic Church's knowledge, Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible were all black people. This particular piece of information is therefore extremely important for establishing the black and African heritage of the people of the Bible. The importance of this evidence is in the fact that the Catholic Church has tangible evidence of the ethnicity of the mother of Jesus Christ from an artistic portrayal from St. Luke. Without a doubt, the Catholic Church has known and portrayed Mary, the mother of Jesus, as a black woman for over two thousand years. Yet because of racism, this Church portrays Jesus as a blonde-haired, blue-eyed, thin-nosed, thin-lipped, white-skinned Son of God. What reveals the fallacy in this is the fact that this same Church continues to portray Mary, the mother of Jesus as the Black Madonna. How possible is it that the black woman, Mary, or for that matter, any black woman would have a blonde-haired, blue-eyed, white-skinned son with a black husband? Who else can this simple deception fool but Europeans who have never known the people and the story behind the Bible, anyway?

Despite Christian Europe's deceptive stories about the fatherhood of Jesus, we in Africa know that Jesus' real father was called *Osafo*, a carpenter. This was the indigenous *Akan* name that was transposed to *Joseph* in Greek and later in other European tongues. It was because of the calculated deception in the concealment of the ethnicity of Jesus Christ that Christianity began to claim that Jesus was the son of God. We in Africa know that Jesus was the son of *Osafo* before he became the son of the Christian God. This has also been the reason discussion of the brothers and sisters of Jesus have never come up anywhere in any Church. To most Christians, Jesus was an only child, the son of God, but that is part of the *legendary lying lore*.

From this analysis, the quiet and lingering assertions of the black ethnicity of Jesus, his mother, and the entire people of the Bible from the nineteenth century become unimpeachable. This revelation also confirms the idea that the Catholic Church and its Pope still acknowledge, honor, worship, and pray the mother of Jesus as the black woman she was. Why then are Jesus and his mother portrayed as white people in all the modern images of these people in Christianity when the Church has long known that they were black people?

The conspiracy in all these is that the Catholic and Protestant Churches of Europe came black people in Africa to introduce us to images of a white God, Jesus, and his mother Mary when they all knew that all these people were black. This has been the greatest lie in Christianity for the past two thousand years. However, Jesus and his mother alone could not have been the only black people in the Bible. They must have originated from a tribe of black people for them to be black and that confirms that the tribe and people of the Bible from whom they originated were all black people.

A major point that must be repeated from all these is that these black people of the Bible were not Jews, and they were not Hebrews. They originated from the black tribes that were the Ancient Egyptians. These were the tribes that moved south to become the Africans. In Africa, not only do we know that Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible were black people, but also we know the specific African tribes from which they originated. Notice that I have just pointed out that the Jewish people originated African tribes. This is because our knowledge reveals that the Jewish people did not originate from one black tribe. They originated from several black African tribes and the Exodus narrative in the Bible confirms this. A major question is, if these Jewish people did not originate from the black tribes that were the Ancient Egyptians, how did they come by and continue to carry the tribal and cultural names of these Ancient Egyptians?

How could the Jewish people have acquired such an African tribal and cultural identity without originating from an African tribe? What confirms the African tribal origin of the Jewish people beyond any shadow of a doubt is that, these people do not carry names from one African tribe. They carry names from several black African tribes thus confirming that they originated from several black tribes. Again, the question is from where did the Jewish originate that the names of all these black African tribes could be found?

The fact is the blackness of the people of the Bible has been a major thorn in the historical flesh of Christian Europe for over five hundred years now. As part of the effort to conceal the truth of the African origin of the Bible and Christianity, Christian Europe has fastened itself to the claim of the Jewish people that the documents and the theosophical ideas of Christianity were all Jewish people's creations. Again, what made it easy for Christian Europe to accept and portray the Jewish people as the creators of the concepts and doctrines of Christianity was the fact that at this time, Jewish people were accepted as white people because their skin color approximated white skin color. Moreover, accepting the Jewish people as the creators of the documents and ideas of Christian religion was more tolerable to European racial sentiments than acknowledging black people in Africa as the creators. Europeans have long suspected that the Jewish people did not create the biblical documents and religious doctrines they claim to have created. However, the acceptance of the Jewish people's story as the creators of the foundations of Christianity was necessary to cut off Africa's connection to the history, origin, concepts, and sacramental practices of Christianity.

In the introduction of this work, I revealed that from the transposed African names of the authors of the Books of the Old Testament, there is no doubt that Africans wrote the Bible. However, even if we accept the fallacy that the Jewish people created the documents and doctrines of the Bible, these documents and doctrines still originate from black people because the Jewish people originated from black African tribes. Again, if the Jewish people who supposedly created and introduced the concepts and documents of Christianity to Europeans were not black people why would the early Catholic Church of white people in the land of white people portray the most important people the Church worshipped as black people?

More evidence of black Jesus and his mother Mary

Revelation of the blackness of Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible was quite common in European scholarship of the nineteenth century. In the 1933 work of Dr. John G. Jackson, he also invoked the earlier work of Kersey Graves to support his assertion of the blackness of Jesus. In 1875, Kersey Graves also wrote a book entitled *The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors*. In this book, Graves did not only identify the leitmotif of crucifixion in sixteen other religious and political figures around the world, but he also pointed out from evidence in Europe, that Jesus was black and the people of the Bible were originally black people. He wrote:

There is as much evidence that the Christian Savior was a black man, or at least a dark man, as there is of his being the son of the Virgin Mary, or that he once lived and moved upon the earth. And that evidence is the testimony of his disciples, who had nearly as good an opportunity of knowing what his complexion was as the evangelists who omit to say anything about it. ... In the pictures and portraits of Christ by early Christians he is uniformly represented as being black (from *The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors*, cited in *Was Jesus Christ A Negro ...* reprinted in 1987 by Curtis Alexander, ed.).

All of these confirm that my discovery of the black African tribes from which the Jewish people originated has some veracity in it. The people of the Bible originated from a black African heritage.

For Christian Europe and Europeans these revelations were not lies; they were simply unacceptable truths because acknowledging that the Jesus Europeans worship and the people of

the Bible, their superiority over the very black people? How as pagans were the documents that the interaction between Jesus around whom

It is clear the Bible were black. Today, this secret Christians around these people have this issue has kept why would it be questioned or disputed?

As I have blackness of the Jewish would be the Roman had a tradition of secrets of the Church experienced it to be worse than that. I fed up with the Church formed the African Church in Rome Catholic Church practices of the Catholic Archbishop Stallin priest in America Bishop in the Catholic

Part of the Church was his prison in April 1995, Ar new among black pointed this out in up. In the first half up. In the second Orthodox Church this idea. In this 2 support of all these

The first evidence a black man was generations were According to Arcl Rahab, and Baths black, what could Jesus? Remember region of Canaan, North Africa originated from

the Bible, their sacred book, were black people would definitely upset Europe's self-conferred superiority over black Africans. How could Christian Europe accept that the people of the Bible, the very black people Christianity claims are the cursed ones to be enslaved by Europeans, were black people? How could Christian Europe face the humiliation that the Africans they condemned as pagans were the very people that created the doctrines of Christian religion and wrote the documents that became the Christian Bible? From all that has happened in the history of the interaction between Europeans and Africans, how could Christian Europe acknowledge that the Jesus around whom they have designed the Christian religion was a black man?

It is clear that Christian Europe had reasons to refuse to acknowledge that the people of the Bible were black people. Early Christians in Europe knew all these but they covered it up. Today, this secret seems to have been so well hidden for so long that not only do modern Christians around the world not know the truth about the African origin of Christianity, but also these people have accepted the propaganda to deny and even challenge this truth. Nevertheless, this issue has kept coming up now and again for almost three hundred years. If it were not true, why would it keep coming up now and again over these centuries, and why has nobody questioned or disproved it?

As I have pointed out above, if any organization in Christendom knew of the original blackness of the Jewish people and therefore the original blackness of the people of the Bible, it would be the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps, as a result of it, the Roman Catholic Church has had a tradition of not letting black people too close to its central organization and the hidden secrets of the Church about black people. As a result, it is an understatement for those who have experienced it to say that the Catholic Church is racist, and through history, the Church has done worse than that. In 1989, black Catholic priest, Archbishop George Augustus Stallings, Jr. was fed up with the Catholic Church's racism against black people in America so he broke away and formed the African-American Catholic Congregation (AACC). Seven months later, the Catholic Church in Rome excommunicated Archbishop Stallings. However, the American National Catholic Church (ANCC) that has often disagreed with some of the policies, teachings, and practices of the Catholic Church in Rome decided not to acknowledge the excommunication of Archbishop Stallings. Rev. Stallings was therefore still acknowledged and accepted as a Catholic priest in America. The American National Catholic Church elevated Stallings to the rank of a Bishop in the Catholic Church in 1990, and in 1991 made him an Archbishop.

Part of the reason for the excommunication of Archbishop Stallings from the Catholic Church was his propagation of the idea that Jesus was a black man. In an interview with *Emerge* in April 1995, Archbishop Stallings pointed out that the fact that Jesus was a black man is not new among black scholars and political leaders because a Black Nationalist called Robert Young pointed this out in 1829. In 1894, another black man called Henry McNeal Turner also brought it up. In the first half of the 20th century, Alexander McGuire and Marcus Garvey both brought it up. In the second half of the 20th century Rev. Albert B. Cleage, Jr. of the Pan-Africanist Orthodox Church and the Shrines of the Black Madonna in Detroit also preached and propagated this idea. In this 21st century, I am also bringing it up and finally producing Africa's evidence in support of all these people.

The first evidence Archbishop Stallings introduced to support his assertion that Jesus was a black man was in Matthew 1:1-17 where the 42 generations of Jesus are traced. Among these generations were four women, three of who were supposed to be Hittites or Canaanites. According to Archbishop Stallings, biblical scholars universally agree that these women, Tamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, were all black women. If these three women were black, what could have been the racial heritage of the rest of the people in the 42 generations of Jesus? Remember that during this period, there were no Europeans in or near the geographical region of Canaan, and the Arabs that live there today did not come there until after 600 A. D.

North Africa was one of the earliest centers of Christianity and three early Catholic Popes originated from there. Tradition says that the people of North Africa were converted to

Christianity with the assertion that Jesus, as a black man was one of them. Later, this assertion was changed to say that Jesus, the leader of the Christian religion walked among the people of North Africa when he was supposedly brought to hide in Ancient Egypt. So he was one of them. The New Testament states that Jesus was taken to Ancient Egypt in his infancy to hide him from the murderous intentions of King Herod (Matthew 2, 13: 15). Archbishop Stallings argues that if Jesus were white, he could not have been taken to Ancient Egypt to hide. The question Archbishop Stallings asked is "How could it have been possible for a blond-haired, blue-eyed, thin-nosed, thin-lipped, pale-faced baby to have been hidden among [a sea of black faces] in a land of black people in Ancient Egypt?" There are numerous questions that must be asked about this. The first and the most important question we have to ask here is why was infant Jesus taken to hide in Ancient Egypt and nowhere else in the entire geographical region of Canaan?

Archbishop Stallings also introduced the traditional evidence of the coin head of the Roman Emperor Justinian the Great to confirm that the earliest Roman portrayal of Jesus depicted him as a black man. This historical coin has been one of the earliest evidence of the portrayal of Jesus. On one side of this coin was Jesus with "kinky hair" and black features and on the other, a vast contrast from the physical features of Jesus, was Justinian, a European, with a straight hair, nose, and white features. Archbishop Stallings cited what Cambridge Ancient Encyclopaedia wrote about this:

"Whatever the fact, this coin," with the straight-haired Justinian on the obverse side, "places beyond doubt the belief that Jesus Christ was a Negro" (cited from Emerge, 1995, p. 24).

Archbishop Stallings continued that despite this "the image that we have seen Him portrayed in over 1 billion reproductions of Warner Sallman's rendition of the head of Christ" does not look like a black man. All of these are evidence of the traditional legendary lying lore in Christianity? These are the foundations of the lies that have been accepted as the ultimate truths in Christianity today.

In addition to all these, Church historians do not forget the time when the Catholic Church acknowledged the true ethnicity of Jesus and the people of the Bible as black people. The Catholic Church itself does not forget the three black North African Popes in the early history of the Church. These people were Pope Victor I 189-199 A. D., Melchiades or Miltiades 311-314 A. D., and Gelasius 492-496 A. D. all of who are still honored in the Catholic Church as saints today (see J. A. Rogers, *World's Great Men of Color*, Vol. II, p. 5). This is a part of the early history of Christianity that most Church historians do not talk about. However, some historians point out that these black North Africans were made Popes in acknowledgement of the black heritage of Jesus and therefore Christianity itself.

What do all these mean? They mean Christian Europe has long known that the true Jesus that Christians are supposed to worship was a black man. Why then would Christian Europe change the black images of Jesus Christ, his mother, and the people of the Bible to white images? The answer is simple. The black images of Jesus and the people of the Bible were simply changed to white images to satisfy the emerging racism and racial prejudice of Christian Europe and Europeans against black people.

I must point out here that before Protestantism; there was no racism. Christian Europe used the Bible to create racism and racial prejudice against black people and therefore had to change the black image of Jesus to white to satisfy racism. Christian Europe achieved the change of the black image of Jesus Christ to a white image through four main processes. First, Christian Europe accepted slave traders' justification of their consciences and description of the Africans they were dehumanizing as inferior, uncivilized, and sub-humans. Secondly, Christian Europe determined that based upon its perception of black people, white and black people could not have originated from the same human origin. Thirdly, Christian Europe decided to search for the separate origin of Europeans and found it in the biblical narrative of Noah and the Flood. In its interpretation of

this narrative, Ch slaves of white processes, it was when black peopl helped to change t

What this mother, and the p and Europeans. I racism against bl back to the black should think abou perpetuate racism been a major lie about it seriously i

Perhaps, they worship orig then find out if th before moving to is nothing but a lie

What is ir Jesus Christ and t Nevertheless, Eur people must have September 27, 1 exhibition called t very realistic, but greatest sensation this piece, Mary th elephant dung wi around her. This c of New York. Ho fact that Mary hat of elephant dung a

This art p everything it can and the people c destroying the fou never known this to modern generat reveal a truth that exhibition acquire cut off about 7 mi Observers pointed year-old secret of black.

Unfortuna that Mary, the mo an innocent art ex do not know this ethnic origin of th

this narrative, Christian Europe pronounced black people as the ones cursed by Noah to be the slaves of white people because black people are the descendants of Ham. Through these processes, it was no more acceptable for Europeans to worship the true image of the black Jesus when black people are supposedly cursed in the Bible. Finally, Renaissance artists and painters helped to change the images of the people of the Bible from black to white.

What this means is that modern worshipping of the white images of Jesus Christ, his mother, and the people of the Bible is a perpetuation of the racist sentiments of Christian Europe and Europeans. That is something modern Christianity that professes to be moving away from racism against black people should think about seriously and change the image of Jesus Christ back to the black person he was. Perhaps more importantly, this is something black Christians should think about seriously. I am not suggesting that black people should not help Europeans to perpetuate racism and racial prejudice against the black race. All I am saying is that there has been a major lie in the worship of a white Jesus in Christianity, and black people should think about it seriously in the name of religious purity.

Perhaps, what all Christians should first ask themselves is where the white Jesus Christ they worship originated in Europe. If Jesus did not originate anywhere in Europe, they should then find out if the people of Ancient Egypt where the Jewish people claim to have gone to live before moving to Canaan and Europe were Europeans. The fact is Christian Europe's white Jesus is nothing but a lie.

What is intriguing about all these is that most western scholars have also long known that Jesus Christ and the people of the Bible were all black people, but they have also kept it quiet. Nevertheless, European's knowledge of Jesus, his mother, and the people of the Bible as black people must have been the most widely known secret in Europe. This is because as late as September 27, 1999, a group of young British artists brought an impressionist realism art exhibition called *Sensations* from England to the Brooklyn Museum in New York. The art was very realistic, but the medium was repugnant to many people, to say the least. What caused the greatest sensation in this exhibition was one particular art piece called *The Holy Virgin Mary*. In this piece, Mary the mother of Jesus was portrayed as a black woman through the medium of dark elephant dung with portrayals of various parts of the human anatomy including the genitalia around her. This caused a great uproar among Catholics in America and especially the Catholics of New York. However, a spokesperson for the Catholic League was not so much upset by the fact that Mary had been portrayed as a black woman as the Virgin was portrayed in the medium of elephant dung and surrounded with genitalia.

This art piece seriously hit the Catholic Church's nerve. The Church has been doing everything it can for almost two thousand years to cover up the fact that the Holy Mary, Jesus, and the people of the Bible were black people. It has almost succeeded in distorting and destroying the foundations of this truth in Ancient Egyptian history and modern generations have never known this truth and then came this art exhibition that perhaps sought to reveal this secret to modern generations. The art piece was immediately seen by some Church leaders as seeking to reveal a truth that has been painstakingly concealed for a long time. The confusion over this art exhibition acquired socio-political dimensions as the then Mayor of New York, Rudolf Giuliani, cut off about 7 million dollars of city funding from the Brooklyn Museum for exhibiting such art. Observers pointed out that secretly, the Mayor, who is a Catholic, was defending the thousands-year-old secret of the Church and its propaganda and denial that the people of the Bible were black.

Unfortunate for Christian Europe, the Jews were originally black people and that follows that Mary, the mother of Jesus was a black woman. Why should the Church fight it now through an innocent art exhibition? This is because the Church has long assumed that modern generations do not know this secret, so it had to continue to defend the centuries-old lies of the racial and ethnic origin of the people of the Bible. I believe this is the reason a work like this is needed to

remind people of what was the truth because we have not come that far to forget how it was before. At least, not in Africa.

All of these revelations validate my discovery of the specific black African tribes from which the Jewish people originated. There should be no more generic talk about the black heritage or the African origin of the Jewish people because we can now place them in their tribes of origin in Africa

African tribal affinity of Jesus and John the Baptist

There is a lot of ethnic, linguistic, and cultural evidence of the black heritage of the Jewish people in the Bible and also in the history of the Jewish people that Europeans have never known. I do believe that modern Jewish people do not know the evidence of their African heritage in the Bible either, and they would never know unless Africans point these out to them. For example, here is a piece of linguistic and cultural evidence and revelation of the African tribal kinship of Jesus and John the Baptist.

Jewish history states that John the Baptist and Jesus had affinity to the *Essene* religious and political group of the Jews. This group was one of the four religious and political groups that emerged after 37 B. C. when the Romans defeated Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonean kings. The Romans left much of the decisions of ruling the Jewish people to local Jewish institutions that served in the Great Assembly and the Sanhedrin. The other three religious and political groups that emerged alongside the *Essenes* were the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Zealots. In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, scholars of Jewish history confirm the affinity of Jesus and John the Baptist to the *Essene* group by simply stating that:

It seems likely that both John the Baptist and Jesus had affinities with the *Essenes* (*Britannica*, 1996, P. 74).

The *Essenes* were a religious and political group of the Jewish people, but these people derived the name of this group from an African tribal identity, specifically they derived this name from the name of an *Akan* tribe. The *Akan* tribe from which the Jewish *Essenes* derived the name of their religious and political group was *Assin*. The *Assin* tribe is a tribe of black people, and the *Akan* tribal group of which the *Assin* people are members are also black, thus confirming the black racial and ethnic heritage of the ancient Jewish people before they went to become Jews and Hebrews in Europe. The *Assin* people can now be located in south central Ghana in West Africa. The following discussions would make it all very clear and later, I will reveal the so-called lost tribes of the Jewish people and show that the *Assin* tribe is one of them.

The conclusion here is if one of the lost tribes of the Jewish people is black then it follows that the rest would also be black and that should further confirm the African ethnic heritage of the Jewish people who claim to have originated from these lost tribes. The revelation of the kinship of Jesus and John the Baptist to a Jewish political group that carried an African tribal name not only adds to the evidence of the black racial and ethnic heritage of the Jewish people, but it also confirms what this discussion set out to do, and that is to go deeper into the African tribes that were the Ancient Egyptians to reveal the specific tribal groups from which the Jewish people originated.

African tribal composition of modern Jewish people

I have mentioned earlier that the Jewish people did not originate from one African tribe. People from several African tribes came together to become the Jewish people. This is one of the reasons the Jewish people have refused to reveal who they are because beyond the fact that they were originally black people, they do not have a single tribal identity. I found this out in the transposed African tribal names they have carried throughout their history and continue to carry even today. All of these should not surprise historians, the Jewish people, or Christians because

the Bible tells u
about six hund
anyone who rea
the seventy me
descended from
Egypt. Even if
from somewhere
addition to that,
did not belong t
they now?

What di
Ancient Egypt i
Jacob, and neit
these people ma
could form a na
Egypt into the b
group or skin co
the people that i
different African
Ancient Egypt. 7
this premise. At
Egypt into the b
carry, it evident
mixed multitude
Akan tribe. The
Exodus, and coi
about all these is
found, as recently

The reve
mostly *Akan* pec
the Jewish peopl
later, the word *I*
spoke in Ancient
Bible therefore, t
multitude referre
these tribes from
became the langu
people that left in
people gave *Aka*
modern Jewish pe

Readers :
presented here as
They are facts an
the ancient black
on to the Greeks :

From this
of the Europeans
people of the Bil
evidence that has
The evidence in
the origin of Chr