

WHO ARE THE MODERN JEWS?

By Scott Stinson

In this age of brain-dead media programmed zombies, would it still be possible for the facts to speak? If so, there is something worth saying about the modern "Jewish" race, not written by anti-semites, but by Jews themselves—and where else but in The Jewish Encyclopedia! Please excuse me for being so abrupt, but I had to get your attention. You see, this article is worth reading because it has some facts that you need to know about the authenticity of today's Jewish race. The question that must be asked as well as answered is simple: Are the modern Jews really the descendants of the ancient people of Israel? The source of our information is also quite simple: The Jewish Encyclopedia. Hopefully we will not find any anti-Semitism in the writings of these Jewish scholars. However, the reader should be forewarned. Their articles were written long before the age of mass-media social engineering and do not contain any of the familiar buzz-words common to today's new views. In other words, brace yourself for a factual scientific analysis of the racial origins of the modern Jews. Oh, and should you decide to verify any of these facts, you will find them in your local library in the 1901-1905 edition of The Jewish Encyclopedia. So, please, do read on.

At the turn of the last century there was great interest stirring in the science of anthropology. In the wake of this, Jewish scholarship turned its watchful eye upon itself and began to examine the racial claims that modern Jews make to the ancestral heritage of ancient Israel. The results were startling. The religious community found itself completely alienated by its scientific counterpart. The scientific method was coming face to face with religious traditions and there was a great unsettling in the land. The facts were telling a different story than what had been heard for centuries in the local synagogue. In his article on Purity of Race, Joseph Jacobs relates something of the dilemma that was gripping the Jewish community at this time. He writes: ***"The question whether the Jews of today are in the main descended from the Jews of Bible times, and from them alone, is still undecided"*** (Jew. Enc. X (1905), 283). What a startling statement to come from a Jewish scholar and to be printed in The Jewish Encyclopedia! However, scholarship must have its reasons. Let us look further to see what the scientific community had discovered that would warrant such a radical and perplexing statement.

In his article on Purity of Race, Jacobs gives several important facts that were forcing anthropologists of his day to reconsider the modern Jew's racial claims to be Biblical Israel. In the study of craniometry which involves the measurements of the skull, the evidence was clearly

mounting against the modern Jews. After extensive samples were taken from a broad spectrum of Jewish groups world-wide. The conclusion was evident. Jacobs writes; ***"They are predominantly brachycephalic, or broad-headed, while the Semites of Arabic origin are invariably dolichocephalic, or long-headed"*** (Jew. Enc. X (1905), 284). Simply put, all known Semites have historically been long-headed, but the modern Jews were predominantly round-headed! While Jacobs avoids drawing any personal conclusions, he relates a prevailing view of his time: ***"Some anthropologist are inclined to associate the racial origins of the Jews, not with the Semites, whose language they adopted, but with the Armenians and Hittites of Mesopotamia, whose broad skulls and curved noses they appear to have inherited"*** (Jew. Enc. X (1905), 284). The findings of some anthropologist were leading them to conclude that the modern Jews were not in fact Semites at all. but rather descendants of the ancient Hittites. Jacobs however was personally hesitant to confess that the Jews were not the Jews, simply because of the profound implications it imposed. He also wrote the article on Anthropology and there declared: ***"Much turns upon the preliminary question whether contemporary Jews are of the same race as those mentioned in the Bible"*** (Jew. Enc. I (1901), 619). Jacobs obviously realized the implications of the data he was receiving. It suggested the revolutionary idea that the Jews were not in fact the Jews. He again presented the anthropological evidence the cranial measurements of the modern Jews, stating: ***"Their skulls are mainly brachycephalic; that is, the breadth is generally over 80 per cent of the length. This has been used as an argument against the purity of race, as most Semites—like the Arabs and Syrians—are dolichocephalic, or long-headed"*** (Jew, Enc. I (1901), 619). Jacobs avoids any personal conclusions. He was the former president of The Jewish Historical Society of England and obviously could not bring himself to break with the great strength of the "Jewish" tradition.

But Jacobs was not the only Jewish scholar of his day that was attempting to come to terms with the startling discoveries of his time. After all, it was the talk of the Jewish community. The haunting question persisted, Were the Jews really the Jews? In his article on Craniometry, Jewish scholar Maurice Fishberg provides a more comprehensive treatment of the "Jewish" cranial findings that were turning the Jewish world upside down. Moreover, Fishberg was a licensed medical Doctor and a medical examiner in New York City. He was clearly an expert in his field and eminently qualified to comment on the data at hand. Unlike Jacobs who was tied to the Jewish historical society, Fishberg presents the facts much more objectively. Forthwith, he declares: ***"As is at present accepted by nearly all anthropologists, the shape of the head is the most stable characteristic of a given race"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 335). The article by Fishberg is thoroughly educational as well as informative. His

scientific frame of reference is immediately evident. He includes numerous charts and statistics, a complete inventory of all the cranial data collected on the Jews to date. Fishberg also gives an understanding of some of the basic concepts and terminology. He writes: ***"The cephalic index is expressed by multiplying the width of the head by 100 and dividing the product by the length ...The broader or rounder the head is, the higher its cephalic index, and vice versa. When the cephalic index is above 80 anthropologist term it 'brachycephalic'; between 75 and 80, 'mesocephalic'; and less than 75, 'dolichocephalic'"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 333). Dr. Fishberg then proceeds to present all the Jewish cranial findings in classical scientific form. He writes: ***"Appended is a table of nearly 3,000 Jewish heads, from various countries, measured during the last twenty years"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 333). In the table that follows, there is not one Jewish head that has a cephalic index below 80, and they are taken from a wide variety of countries spread throughout Europe, Russia, and Asia Minor. Fishberg comments on the data: ***"On an examination of the figures in this table a remarkable uniformity of the cephalic index of the modern Jews will be noticed....nearly 90 per cent are between 81.5 and 83 ...Another remarkable fact is the striking absence of the dolichocephalic type, which is characteristic of all the other modern Semitic races"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 334). Dr. Fishberg also presents a large graphic chart which shows the cephalic indexes of the Jews by percentage. This chart peaks upward at the cephalic index measurement of 82, indicating the average Jewish mean. Fishberg comments on the overall percentage factor: ***"What is worthy of notice is the small percentage of dolichocephaly—only 1.58 percent—and the large preponderance of brachycephaly, 76.48 per cent"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 334). The Jewish medical examiner also confirms the representative nature of his findings. He states: ***"The cephalic indexes from which this curve was obtained were those of Jews in various parts of the world"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902L 331). Fishberg then provides a table of cephalic indexes by gender which shows little significant difference. He writes: ***"There appears no perceptible difference between the cephalic index of Jews and that of Jewesses"*** (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 335). Finally, Fishberg addresses the most obvious and confronting problem with his findings, specifically how they relate to the racial claims of the modern Jews. He writes: ***"The most important problem suggested by a study of craniometrical results concerning Jews is the relation of the type head of the modern Jews to that of the ancient Hebrews and to the modern Semitic skulls. The pure Semitic skull is dolichocephalic, as may be seen from a study of the heads of modern Arabs, Abyssinians, Syrians The only way the type of the head may change is by intermixture with other races. If the ancient Hebrews were of the same stock as the modern non-Jewish Semites, and if the modern Jews are their descendants, then a pure dolichocephalic type of head would be expected among the Jews. As has been seen, all results of***

craniometry prove that the Jews are brachycephalic, and that the dolichocephalic form is only found among them in less than two percent of the cases" (Jew. Enc. IV (1902), 335). Fishberg presents an excellent summary of the problem. If the modern Jews are descendants of the ancient Hebrews and are supposed to be Semites, then dolichocephalic skulls would be expected. However, the exact opposite is true. The Jews are predominantly round-headed. Fishberg provides some other cranial data, but draws no further conclusions. The factual data he presents, however, is some of the most incriminating evidence to have ever been collected against the racial claims of the modern Jews.

Like the shape of the skull, the shape and configuration of the nose is another important racial index that was recognized by anthropologist at the turn of the century. It is also another clear sign against the modern Jew's racial claims to be Biblical Israel. It turns out that the so called "Jewish nose" is not Jewish at all, but rather comes from the ancient Hittites, as do also their round skulls. Dr. Fishberg is also the author of the article on the Nose. On the importance of this area as a racial index, the Jewish medical examiner writes: *"The relation of the breadth of the nose to its length, known as the 'nasal index,' has been considered one of the best means of distinguishing the various races of mankind"* (Jew. Enc. IX (1905), 339). Fishberg proceeds to present a table of the nasal indexes of the modern Jews. Their marked similarity to one another and peculiarity to others again predominates in this table. Joseph Jacobs, in his article on Anthropology, also mentioned the peculiarity of the Jewish nose, stating: *"The nose is generally the characteristic feature of the Jews, who have, on the average, the longest (77 mm) and narrowest (34 mm)"* (Jew. Enc. I (1901), 619). In attempting to address this peculiarity, Fishberg presents some of the current thinking circulating among the anthropologist of his day. He writes: *"Some authors show that this form of nose is not characteristically Semitic, because the modern non-Jewish Semites, particularly such as are supposed to have maintained themselves in a pure state, as the bedouin Arabs, do not possess this characteristic nose at all Their noses are as a rule short, straight, and often 'snub' or concave. Luschan holds that the hook-nose is by no means characteristic of the Semites, and contends that the number of arched noses that are found among the Jews is due to ancient intermixture with the Hittites in Asia Minor. He shows that other races also, as the Armenian, for instance, who have a good portion of Hittite blood in their veins, have hook-noses"* (Jew. Enc. IX (1905), 338). Thus, the notorious "Jewish" hook-nose is another clear sign to the true racial origins of the modern Jews.

According to all the racial indicators recognized by leading anthropologist at the turn of the century, the modern Jews have more in common with the ancient Hittites, than with the ancient Israelites. In another early publication written

about the same time, this statement is found in the article on the Hittites: ***"The human type is always brachycephalic [round-headed], with brow receding sharply and long nose making almost one line with the sloping forehead. In the sculptures of the Commagene and the Tyana districts, the nose has a long curving tip, of very Jewish appearance"*** (Enc. Brit. XIII (1910), 537). It should be evidently now that the round-headed hook-nosed Jews of today have a definite racial connection with the ancient Hittites, remembering of course what Joseph Jacobs wrote: ***"Some anthropologists are inclined to associate the racial origins of the Jews, not with the Semites, whose language they adopted, but with the Armenians and Hittites of Mesopotamia, whose broad skulls and cuffed noses they appear to have inherited"*** (Jew. Enc. X (1903), 264). Moreover, a portrait of one of these Hittites taken from a sculptural relief found on the tomb of an Egyptian Pharaoh clearly reveals what looks like a typical modern Jew (Jew. Enc. VI (1904), 427). The resemblance is so startling it is uncanny! In light of this, and all the other scientific evidence, confirmed and verified, it should be enough to convince any rational person that the modern Jews are standing on very shaky ground in their racial claims to be descendants of Biblical Israel. If you don't believe me just read The Jewish Encyclopedia, remembering of course that there is nothing anti-Semitic about it. After all, the Hittites were not Semites at all. hittites.htm

<http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/>