The Templars, Sionists, and the Freemasons

Book One - Episode 6

The Benjamins



This work is a translation of a book written and published originally in Turkish.
The book in whole consists of 23 episodes.

Previous Episode: The Merovingians

In the 1st century, perhaps during the most brilliant period of the Roman Empire in history, the people living around the Danube in Central Europe were quite reluctantin recognising sovereignty of the Romans over their country. They resisted paying taxes and even killed those who came in to collect them. This behaviour began to annoy the Empire more and more. They were becoming a bad example to others.

These Central Europeans did not know what to do when the Roman army marched on them. Actually, they weren'tanticipating this at all. They had no power to resist the Romans. They could no longer live along the Danube. To get away from the Romans, they migrated towards north-west and settled in the north of present-day Germany. They founded there a new state.

This new state was named as the Frankish Kingdom because the name of its first king was **Francus**.

* * *

In early 5th century, the Western Huns who had emerged from Central Asia and marched westwards through the north of the Black Sea, had snuggled into the interior of Europe along the Danube. They were also moving southwards at places. It was almost as if they were going to invade the whole continent.

No one could stand against these agile and powerful Turkish raiders.

Europeans had two options: Either to submit to these warriors, who behaved very otherwise from what they were accustomed to, and find a way to get along with them, or to leave these places and migrate elsewhere.

As mentioned in the previous episode, there was a continuous movement in the Continent, which is known in history as the **"Migration of Tribes"**. However, it would not be correct to say that this was only due to the raids of the Western Huns. There were also economic factors. When the fear of raiders was added to this, the events of displacement became chaotic.

It was at this time that the Franks also moved westwards and settled in Gaul.



Although Merovech I, after whom the Merovingians in Gaul are named, has been described as a legendary king, the mention of Francus, the first king of the Franks, shows that - apart from the Quinotaur myth, which we have already discussed in the previous episode- the names of the ancestors of this family from much earlier times are well known.Genealogical research on European noble families, in the mid-20th century in particular, has distinctly defined all members of the Merovingian dynasty.

In these studies, a number of old source books and documents, which almost no one was allowed even to see during the Middle Ages, were also analysed and compared. Fortunately, many of these were not destroyed, but just hidden somewhere for centuries.

Even if it may be rather surprising, one of the most important ancient sources on the Franks and their predecessors is the **"Liber Historiae Francorum"** (Book of the History of the Franks), that was written in the year 727.



Tracing the genealogical tree of the Franks and the kings of Central Europe who preceded them, and seeing where it leads backwards, is crucial to the primary subject matter of this book.

However, if we were to list here everyone in that family tree, we would be quoting names of many people you may never have heard of. This would only exhaust you as a reader.

Therefore, in tracing this genealogical tree through the centuries, we will skip around and only mention the names of those who can be considered as more important than others.

One interesting aspects in this regard is, that everyone in this family tree is having been referred to as a **"king"**.

Antarius, father of Francus, the first king of the Franks, was called "King of Sicambria". [There was another Francus centuries earlier, but he is not very important.]

In the genealogies that ascribe priority to theMerovingians, Antenor II, father of the first King of Sicambria, Marcomir I, is shown as "king of the Cimmerians".

This situation does not negate the veracity of the genealogy, of course provided that it is trueindeed... There does not seem to be any contradiction that would lead to unreliability. Only thefollowing is concluded:

Since the Merovingians became kings of the Franks after the middle of the 5th century, everyone in their lineage was referred to as "king", on the assumption that the father of a king must also have been a king.

Can there be any other reason or justification for this?

Yes, it can. In fact, in the laterepisodes of this book, we will observe that the word "king" is employed in another sense as well.

*** * ***

Let's imagine for a moment that we have a history book in hand with thousands of pages and a very large scope.

We opened this book somewhere in the middle. Now we turn its leaves backwards three or five at a time, pausing briefly if we come across a place that might be important to us.

In quite ancient times, a branch of the Cimmerians, who had settled in the north and east of the Caucasus and occasionally penetrated into Anatolia, migrated westward through the north of the Black Sea and settled around present-day Hungary. It is observed in the genealogy of the Merovingians, that their ancestors prior to the period of the Sicambrians lived among them.

Therefore, in the genealogy of the Merovingians, some of them are referred to as "king of the Cimmerians". In fact, they have no genealogical connection; ancestors of the Merovingians have no family connection with the Cimmerians. They just lived together.

Thus, unlike the Cimmerians, .the lineage of the Merovingians extends from Central Europe to the southeast, not to the north of the Black Sea

One of the people whose name appears in the family tree is Priam III in the 7th century BC...

His father, Alexander III, was king of Troy.

While being in Central Europe we suddenly slipped quite far east and ended up in Anatolia. This is because we turned the pages of that history book almost in a hurry.

We know very well that five centuries before that, in the 12th century BC, King Priam I of Troy, whose name is also mentioned in history as Podarces, had to surrender the city to the Spartans. You know, the story of the wooden horse and deception told by the famous historian Homer in his work “Iliad”...

We know very well that five centuries before that, i.e. in the 12th century BC, **King Priam I of Troy**, whose name is also mentioned in history as “Podarces”, had to surrender the city to the Spartans. That story of the wooden horse and deception told by the famous historian Homer in his work **“Iliad”**...



According to Homer, this event occurred when Paris, the son of King Priam, kidnapped the beautiful Helen of Sparta.

In 7th century BC, some Trojans left the ancient city and migrated to Europe. It is said that they crossed the Balkans and moved westward. Later on, they settled in Sicambria (east of the Rhine River in present-day Germany).

According to some, it is not indiscriminate that centuries later a city called “Tricasses” in the Gaul was named as **“Troyes”** (Troy) and a city formerly known as “Lutetia” was renamed as **“Paris”**.



In present-day France, there are said to be many more names similar to these that were taken from the east. Just like Ardennes, that was named after the goddess Arduina... [There is also a hill called **Sion-Vaudémont**. We will have to mention this in a later episode of our book].

* * *

By this means, we have traced the lineage of the Merovingians back to Troy in the 12th century BC.

Two centuries earlier, we come across with King Troas, the original founder of Troy.

His father Erihtonius was the king of Dardania. (Today: “Çanakkale” in Turkey.

His father **Dardanus**, the one who founded Çanakkale. “Dardanelles” was named after him.

Dardanus has come to the north of the Aegean Sea from Arcadia, north of the Peloponnese. However, he is not a native from there; he previously were living somewhere around Palestine.

Now we arrived to the periods of the ancient Aegean civilizations that cannot be certain in terms of historical information... This is where the hypothetical history book we have in our hands begins; it does not give any information about the period before that.

However, the genealogy that we trace backwards in history does not come to an end here.

* * *

Let's go a few steps further back, and come to 15th century BC.

We’re now very close to the trunk of the Merovingian family tree in the east of the Mediterranean.

But now there is only one source of relatively accurate historical information: **The Torah**.

Can the Torah be trusted concerning historical information?

We already have mentioned this before, but it is worth repeating:

The Torah can hardly be trusted in this respect. It was narrated centuries after the dates of the events described therein. Furthermore, its narration took hundreds of years. It is not based on an accumulation of documentary evidence, but on accounts passed down by word of mouth. It was developed by making extractions in and selections from those accounts. It even has quite a number of inaccuracies determined by scientific historians aftter 17th century.

If a certain part one part of it is wrong, how can one trust another part regarding correctness?

We must know that the Torah is not actually a history book. Moreover, it does not directly explain the rules of religion and the principles of faith. Historical information is intertwined with a number of stories that can be considered as allegories...

In fact, the accuracy of the genealogies we have traced up to this point in history is also questionable, as is the reliability of the sources used to compile these and many other genealogies, and the data on which they are based.

Hence there may be as much inaccuracy in all of these as much as the truth.

Nevertheless, let us continue...

The father of Dardanus, called “Darda” in the Torah is Zerah. According to the Torah, he belonged to the Benjamin family, one of the 12 tribes of the Israelites.

Hence, The point that we arrived in this:

The Merovingians trace their origins to the Benjamin family of the Israelites.

The Benjamins are one of the families that continue the lineage of the Prophet Jacob.

According to the first book of the Torah, “Genesis”, chapter 35, the ancestor of this family, Benjamin, was the younger son of Jacob, born by his wife Rachel.

The identity of the descendants is described in chapter 49 of the same chapter as well as chapter 33 of “Deuteronomy”.

Landlords of Jerusalem

Whether the accounts in the Torah are historically “true” or not does not really matter.

Those who are firm believers in one of the so-called celestial religions -whichever one it may be- consider them to be *“the absolute truth”*. Therefore, they regard them as very important. However, what is really important with respect to history or sociological sciences is this fact:

These having been regarded as *“the absolute truth”*, and then the spread of this belief to the mass of people, leaded both social and economical as well as political occurrences in history throughout centuries.

As told in the 18th chapter of the book “Joshua” in thea Torah, immediately after arrival of Israelites in the Promised Land and settled there, the country was divided into 11 territories, and was ascribed to a separate tribe. One of the 12 tribes, the Levites, were excluded from this distribution because they formed the “priestly” class among them all. Each of the other 11 became the owner of a specific region.

Don't raise a question such as *«What about the 13th tribe?»* That is a completely different issue. What concerns us here is the narrative in the Torah; hence the 12 tribes...

Each of these regions is well described in detail in the Torah, as from where to where.

Jerusalem was given to the Benjamins.



This is the focal point of the whole series of events that we have described so far.

According to the Holy Bible, whch is referred to as the most precious and important source as well as being unquestionable, Jerusalem was belonging to the Benjamins...

* * *

We have mentioned that Godfrey de Bouillon's lineage goes back to the Merovingians.

But that din’t matter much for him. Later, the fact that his roots were in the Merovingians was more important to the members of other families that also base on the same lineage.

However, things changed when the Merovingian lineage was traced back to the Benjamins.

Imperative changes occurred…

Godfrey de Bouillon's participation in the First Crusade to Jerusalem, and even selling out everything he had, using all his wealth for this mission, was not at all due to being a "good Christian".

We have already mentioned that it can be questioned whether he could be regarded as a "good Christian" or not.

Godfrey's real purpose, or the goal that was imposed on him was, being a Benjamin offspring, to go to the country he had learned was his actual homeland, and claim it as his own.

In fact, he finally did so…

But the significance of this ownership claim was even greater in others' point of view. The world was always an area of profit. The actual beneficiaries of this attempt were those around Godfrey, better to say, the persons behind him.

*** * ***

That hypothetical history book of ours…

Let's go back to the beginning of that history book, to where we left off.

This time let us turn the pages forwards, towards more recent dates.

Centuries are chasing each other... We're now in late 11th century BC in Jerusalem.

As mentioned in 19th chapter of the book titled "2. Samuel" of the Torah, Saul from the family of Benjamin became the first king of the Israelites who had settled in their land. During his reign, close ties were established between Benjamin and Judah.

According to the book of "1. Kings", chapters 11 and 12, upon death of Saul, David of Judah family became king. At that time there was not yet complete peace in the neighbourhood. Even Jerusalem could not yet be considered as fully controlled by the Israelites.

For many years, **King David** fought against other people, the Philistines in particular, to ensure the future security of his nation. In the end he emerged as victorious. He made Jerusalem his capital and settled there. That is why the inner citadel of the city is called the "Tower of David".

The Benjamins were upset. They felt that King David had taken up residence in their part of the country. Here is a summary of their attitude: *"The land of the tribe of Judah is the area south of Jerusalem called Judea. If David is going to choose a capital city for himself as king, he should havepreferred it in Judea. Moreover, that area is much larger."*

They thought so, but did not raise much objection. They already had some conflicts concerning religious reasons; they just preferred not to make a fuss about it among the tribes, but to get on well. They consoled themselves by saying, *«If the king of the people of Israel dwells in our land, it will be an honour for us.»*

King David was wishing to build a great temple in Jerusalem. He even started preparations for this, but his life was not sufficient. This mission was left over to his son Solomon.

*** * ***

Let’s turn a few more pages…

The date is 9th century BC... [This is not dated in the Torah, but by information from other sources, it appears to coincide with this period].

A great schism occurred between the Benjamins and the other tribes of the Israelites. Such a great schism that may easily cause a civil war.

In Torah, it is written that the wife of one of the Levites died consequent to a rape, and that the Benjamines protected those responsible of this event, so the Levites blamed them for this crime. However, between the lines, it is understood that the cause of this civil war was actually the tendency of Benjamins to abandon the religion brought in by Moses and return to the belief in Baal. [Baalism is a polytheistic primitive religion that was common in eastern Mediterranean and Mesopotamia in antiquity, the most important deity being known as **“Baal”**].



All these accounts are given in Torah, chapters 20 and 21 of “Judges”.

It is said that in fact the Benjamins did not come up afterwards with this situation. This was not a new dilemma; it has existed even in much earlier times.

According to the Benjamins, the monotheistic belief system brought by Moses as a “prophet” may have been an option that could be adopted, but it was considered as an “exception”, not the “primary rule” at all. Moreover, this fact did not necessitate the Benjaminites to break away from the other tribes of Israel. As long as everyone respected others in their own religion and belief, no problem xould arise.

As far as they’re concerned!…

Now you will say, *«But isn't there a contradiction here?... Aren't Jews supposed to be both descendants of the same lineage and believers of the same religion?»*

Yes, you’re right, it is true, but that is an obligation institutionalised in the Jewish community at a much later period. There was no such rule or custom yet at those times.

The Torah tells that when Solomon was the king of the Israelites, but after the completion of the construction of the temple in Jerusalem, i.e. in mid-10th century B.C., some people again leaned to be “idol worshippers” and deterioration increased.

According to chapters 20 and 21 of “The Judges”, this is why the Benjamins fell out with the other tribes. The rape event seems to have been a pretext.

But the Levites constitute the “priestly” class among the 12 tribes.... When the subject matter is “religion”, whatever the Levites say is true, and this is the only truth!

The disagreement, which initially wüs observed at the level of discussion and reciprocal accusation, gradually reached the level of a quarrels and turned into a conflict.

Most of those from the Benjamin family were killed. Ones who survived had to flee from Jerusalem; they became refugees by the Phoenicians.

Since the Phoenicians were also practitioners of the Baal beleif, they welcomed the Benjamins and protected them against the other Israelites.

However, the Benjamins did not find themselves secure enough in Phoenicia either. Because they were still very close to the other Israelites, who still regarded them not only as “enemies of religion” but also as “enemies of life”, they had to go even further away in terms of life safety; as far away as possible...

At those times, the Phoenicians were very advanced in seafaring... The Benjamins boarded the ships of the Phoenicians and sailed with them to the Mediterranean.

Some preferred to stay in Cyprus, Rhodes and the Aegean islands.

Some of them landed in the Peloponnese Peninsula, others in the Aegean coast of Anatolia.

Those who landed in the Peloponnese moved somewat northwards and got mingled with the Arcadians. [**Arcadia** is the central part of the Peloponnese. It will come up much later in this book within another important topic].

Those who landed in Anatolia travelled to **Troy**, where their descendants had migrated and settled centuries earlier without any compulsion.

There were also some who had joined the Lydians who settled a little further south.



* * *

You may have noticed especially in these recent narratives that almost always grammatically the "past perfect tense is used.

The reason for this is, that the information about this period which may be regarded as a very old period of history, those which were transmitted from the Torah in particular, are not reliable enough.

If unreliable, why are we telling them?

Let us reiterate the reason for this account once more by additional emphasis, and furthermore let us underline it:

Because large masses of people believed these or were made to believe in them.

Apart from pure and authentic religious beliefs, the history of humanity has revolved around dogmas that were created by clergymen.

[In this respect, you can refer in academia.edu to the article titled as "Does the History of Humanity Revolve Around Religions"]

Maccabees

In 325, when the Roman Emperor Constantine the Great declared Christianity as the official religion of the state, the leaders of the Christian Church assembled in a meeting held in Nicaea. This meeting, known as the **"Council of Nicaea"**, can be considered the most important gathering of the Christian Church in history.

In this meeting, the various Gospels, that from place to place are in contradiction with other, were weeded out and only four books were recognised as valid. As you very well know, these are the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, Mark and John.

The others were not only ignored; it was decided to burn and destroy them all.

This decision has also been put into practice…

Whether it was really practiced or not, centuries later, copies of some, which had been known as destroyed, were found.

This means that there were some people who saved them from being burnt and hid them somewhere. However, even in later periods, as it was too dangerous to uncover these, information concerning the hiding places was lost as well.

Among the discoveries are two books entitled "The Maccabees".

In the first of these, it is mentioned that some of the Jews, after being expelled from Jerusalem, took refuge with the Spartans, a city people in Laconia in the south of the Peloponnese, because they were having a kindred with them.



In the second, an explicit statement that can be reprased as follows is observed:

"The Spartans and Jews are brothers; both are descendants of Abraham."

Spartan men grew their hair long and never cut it. They believed that their strength comes from their long hair; just like Samson... Just like the Merovingians did later... Therefore, it is not necessary to look for another source for this religious tradition of the Merovingians.

* * *

During the westward migration of the Benjamins, some of the Phoenicians had established a colony near Narbonne on the Mediterranean coast of present-day France. Some of those who remained in this colony later migrated north-westwards and settled in the **Languedoc** region.

It is said that there were members of the Benjamin family among these migrants as well.

As mentioned previously, this region was also called "Narbonne Gaul" in history.



Thus, another connection is established between the Celts and the Benjamins through the word "Gaul".

Hyphotheses about these historical connections have long since disturbed the Catholic Church.

But the hyphokheses about such connections are not all these.

Furthermore, as regards the point of view of the Catholic Church, it is beyond the point of being a disturbance; it becomes very dangerous and detrimental.

*** * ***

A further examination of the Benjamins reveals even more interesting points.

It must not be assumed that there were no members of this family left in Jerusalem because they were expelled or fled away upon conflict with the other tribes of the Israelites. St Paul, who proclaimed Jesus as the "Son of God" and gave birth to the Christian religion, has descended from this family. No one else asserts this; he wrote it himself. He was a descendant of a branch that somehow managed to stay in Jerusalem when the Benjamins were expelled. He made this clear at the beginning of the chapter entitled "Romans" in the New Testament.

In spite the fact that his lineage clashed with other tribes of the Israelites, and it is said that this was partly due to idol worship, one of the most important leaders of Christianity in history founded one of the most widespread religions on earth. In the Bible, the Benjamins are given a separate, special, even privileged place.

Now here, of course, you ask this: *«After all, there is a time gap of nearly a thousand years. Did St Paul have to do as his ancestors did a thousand years ago?»*

No!... Of course, no son is obliged to follow in his father's footsteps. Especially when there are too many generations in between, and furthermore when the requirements of the age in which relevant people live are added to this, many things change.

But here, there is another delicacy.

Who says that the Benjamins have converted to idol worship?

Those who accept the Torah accounts as "unmodified truth".

What if the accounts in the Torah are false because of a prejudiced attitude at the time it was written? What if there is something else behind this?

Behold, against the religion of the Jews, St Paul of the family of Benjamin founds a new religion. The taboos of the time have been demolished.

This is a religious revolution...

This is the largest reaction... The biggest protest.

Perhaps, in a way, this is the first Protestantism in the history of religions, but its name is not like that; it referred to as Christianity.

Consequently, even though Christianity adopted the Torah and the Gospel as a whole, calling the former the "Old Testament", the latter the "New Testament", and both the "Bible", from its very beginnings it adopted an attitude particularly against the Jews, that is, a distinctively anti-Semitic character.

Why is it called “Christianity”?

Because it receives its name from “Christos”, which is identified with Jesus Christ. [The root word “Christ”, which is synonymous with the word “messiah” means “king” in some other versions of the word, e.g.Hiristo in Greek.]

*** * ***

We understood that Godfrey de Bouillon was descended from the Benjamins.

Let's say it is true. Let's say that it is accepted to be so, and not only that, it is also scientifically confirmed. What would come of it?

This is the consequence: As already mentioned, when Godfrey de Bouillon, as Duke of Lower Lorraine, left his country, joined the Crusade with his soldiers and travelled to Jerusalem, his aim was not to contribute in bringing the Holy Land under the control of Christianity. He wanted to claim his homeland and to obtain the **“inheritance”** he was convinced he was entitled to.

Inheritance!... Does that word is used to mean something special?

Yes!

What's that like?

Something extremely different.

Isn’t there any explanation in this issue?

Yes, there is!...

Let us go back for a moment and recall the event that led to the puzzling question: At the end of the Crusade, where did Godfrey de Bouillon settle immediately after his victory? On the Mount of Zion (some say on the Temple Mount), over which there was nothing but a few ruins. We left the question as to why he seemed to have stood aside unanswered, contenting ourselves with pointing out that we should not be deceived by appearance.

Let's explain now: He didin’t stand aside. The target for him was not Jerusalem in general. It was specifically and exclusively that hill in Jerusalem.

He had been advised about something in Jerusalem that he must seek and find.

That was the real inheritance!

That “thing”, -whateve it is- has been hid in that hill.

Next Episode: Sion