



Does challenging superstition or faith protect people?
 Is it mistaken to support organised religion in membership or donations?

If people do good because they are human, not because God prompts them,
 is it right to risk giving God any credit when they alone own their good?



Patrick H
Gormley

JESUS RACIALLY HUMILIATES A VULNERABLE WOMAN

The person who kicks a person when they are down is found revolting in our society both for their bullying nature and for their cowardly brutality.

Many in our society still have the barefaced cheek to honour a person who did just that as the Son of God or at least a wise moral philosopher.

The Jewish scriptures were full of racism so Jesus definitely had to have been a racist for he said these scriptures came from God so everything they said had to be obeyed whether it made sense or not.

The gospels report the following story. Why a story upholding a man giving a woman begrudging help is in the gospels says it all. It is meant to get us to follow that evil role model. The Christian claim that Jesus was glad to help is not in the story at all and contradicts it.

A Canaanite lady asked Jesus to have mercy on her and to save her daughter from the distress that a demon inflicted on her. "But he did not answer her a word. And his disciples came and implored Him, saying, 'Send her away, for she is crying out after us'.

Jesus must have told people to leave him alone before. If he was the gospel celebrity we read about, he had to. But surely it would not work. Desperate people don't listen. He only had a small group around him, they were not even armed. So how could Jesus be in a position to send her away? Threats maybe? Was he sending his men to hit the vulnerable he did not like?

Jesus' silence was rude. Nobody can say he was otherwise engaged for the text says he did not answer her not could not answer her. He did have a minute to speak to her when he was in earshot of her. He did not chastise his disciples for what they said for all of them asked him to get rid of her which suggests they knew he had the time to speak to her when he had time to give them his attention. They knew he was an evil man when they presented such a request to him though he had preached love and patience and knew it only took three seconds to say a word of comfort and cure the daughter. That is very important.

"He answered, I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel". Since this was a reply to their request to send her away it means, "I was not sent to help her". He encouraged the disciples' cruelty. The Gospels expect us to believe that such callous men would not lie about religion and miracles.

But the woman again begged him to help her. "And He answered, it is not right (proper, becoming or fair) to take the children's bread and throw it to the little dogs".

What is the children's bread? Is he saying it is okay to have scraps but throwing the bread the main meal to the dogs is terrible?

The children are the Jews so he is telling her she is not God's child.

It has been noted that the word used, apomagdaliai is the dirty bread that you use to wipe your fingers on at table and then it is thrown to the dogs. What happened was, each loaf had rough ends only fit for waste. So its a double insult. The bread is for cleaning hands and is also junk. It is not something you would even throw to beloved family pets. You throw it to stray dogs. Now you see the full horror of what Jesus was saying! He is saying he will not throw the good bread to a stray dog in the form of the woman's daughter. He uses dogs meaning the mother as well for helping the girl helps the mother.

The bread is not real bread for Jesus did no social work but merely dished out alleged exorcisms and healings. Exorcisms

would be more in his mind here. And helping her was not taking away from anybody else. If he is thinking of the poor children who had only scraps then he was taking them from the children to throw to the dogs.

The fact that he was trying to use an excuse alone shows his racism.

The Jews believing in accordance with their scriptures, claiming to be inspired by God, held themselves to be the top race in the world and the only race chosen by God. They referred to non-Jews as dogs or inferior human beings. Jesus did this as well.

This was snappy. The Jews called non-Jews dogs. Little was a further fist in her face. He was also clear she was not a child of God and the Jews were the children.

The dog referred to could be the woman herself who wants this favour or more likely it refers to the daughter. Anyway to call one the dog was to call the other for they were mother and daughter. Again Jesus had stray dogs in mind for dogs looking for scraps are scavengers.

Jesus when he got her to admit she and her suffering child were only fit to be scavengers not even Jewish pets - scavenger seems the accurate word - said she was a woman of huge faith. This is totally fake and insulting of him because her faith was evident for she kept trying to get to him in her upset state and the apostles had been telling her to get lost and Jesus deliberately deafened himself to her prayerful pleas.

Christians lie that Jesus' treatment of her was about her religion even though the story says nothing about that. She could have been studying to join Judaism for all we know. The gospels mention her race.

Do not forget that the woman was treated publicly by Jesus like a dog. That was how she was treated generally in that racist society which was also so driven by religious prejudice that the Jews hated their close religious relative the Samaritan religion. So there was only one way his lack of response to her could be read. Do not forget there is another victim too - her child! There is extreme badness in somebody that would leave a demon in a child over her race or religion. Jesus probably had both problems with her.

The tale is disgracefully revered at Catholic Masses and in non-Christian Churches through the world.

If God is love, then Jesus was not God for he was a racist. If Jesus was a racist then how could the pope be the Vicar of Christ when he is not of Jewish descent? How could the Church be for all nations and peoples? How could the Church be Catholic? Jesus did not found the Catholic Church.

The early Church had more success among non-Jews than Jews. Indeed the apostles of Jesus commissioned to teach for him and to whom he promised his inspiration so that they would not err said that these non-Jews were turned into Jews spiritually in God's reckoning. So you still have to be part of this racist Church of Judaism to be a Christian. Christianity has racism at its core.

All many Christians can say about this episode in which a man who boasted that he was meek and gentle (Matthew 20:28) is that he was joking. He was not for the woman had to insist for him to help. She didn't think he was kidding. And it was no time for joking. To joke then and that way would have been most uncouth indeed. She was in distress and would have been hurt to hear herself and her daughter being called animals just because they belonged to another religion and race.

There is no hint in the passage that Jesus was joking. There is no evidence for a sense of humour in the gospels at all which confirms that he was serious. When Jesus went to the trouble to explain why he could not help her he must have been serious. He explained instead of taking three seconds to heal her daughter.

The other line is that Jesus was testing her. She had to work up more faith and persist for Jesus seemed to be ignoring her and then she gave impressive indications of faith which Jesus commended. The gospel in context gives no hint that Jesus was reading people's minds. The story first appears in Mark which gives no hint that Jesus had any magical ability to read hearts.

It was nothing to Jesus to do what she asked. Giving to a person in need is as cheap as breathing when you can just fix things instantly as if by magic like Jesus supposedly could. This compounds and accentuates how racist and mean Jesus was. He talks as if it cost him power or energy as if he were a magician who had to sacrifice his own power to achieve some effect. If that was how he had to do things then there was no guarantee that the demon would leave the girl. He hated the victim so much that he delayed putting the demon out and only dealt with it reluctantly.

Whoever feels like that about demons and would let them stay in a person is for them. This is the man who said that letting demons stay in is supporting Satan's kingdom for if Satan puts demons out his kingdom will not last. So possessing was

very important to Satan. Jesus was probably only telling the demon to stay but hide better. Then he was passing that off as an exorcism!

The woman replied that even pups eat from the master's table. She is saying that she and her daughter are dogs, inferior to Jews. She is sanctioning Jesus' racism.

Then Jesus said, "O woman, great is your faith! Be it done for you as you wish". We read that her daughter got better from that moment. Jesus refused to notice her faith until she degraded herself and her daughter to please him. He was not rewarding her for her belief that he could cure for she had that before and he knew that and ignored her.

He was rewarding her for being willing to hold that a black crow was white if he said so. The faith she was praised for was not faith in general but the willingness to agree with Jewish doctrine that she was not valued by God for she was in the wrong race. Keep the context in view please!

Jesus said it was wrong to help a pagan though he helped the pagan centurion's servant and later commanded that the gospel be preached to all. Christians say that Jesus is God and since we are his creatures he can do what he likes with us. But Jesus said it was right to be nice to your enemies to bring them to God. It is not right to treat persons in an undignified way and that holds true even for a creator God.

We do not know what race the servant was so remember that!

Jesus said that it was not right to do the healing for the girl and then he did it. He admitted that he could do wrong. The woman even said he would be giving crumbs off the table if he helped her or wasting a miracle or doing an illegitimate one and he approved of what she said so much that he blessed her for it by making her daughter better.

This man indicated that his miracles were evil and merely superficially good. He believed in evil miracle powers and these were the powers he used. He was baptised in the powers of darkness. He had no respect for his exorcism power when he spoke of it in such a disparaging way as junk for scavengers. He said dogs but we can think of rats too so it gets worse. Scavengers are scavengers. With this episode, we see that he agreed with the Jews who said he was using evil powers to do his miracles after all. And this was the man who said that saying he was using Satan to cast out Satan was an unforgivable sin!

Some would say, "We cannot say that Jesus did what he thought was wrong in healing her for her display of faith and her pandering to his humiliating ways changed the circumstances for him and made it right." But he saw her faith before for she was shouting for him and making a nuisance of herself and believed despite his cruel behaviour. She already treated herself as a dog before Jesus got her to call herself one.

Perhaps he treated her that way for some indirect good? No for he told her it was not right to help her. His helping her only when she showed him her faith shows that he did not have the magical knowledge to consider that good. And the gospel never mentions Jesus ever working for the indirect good so it is most likely it never thought of it. You can explain any evil miracle that way so we need to be told that the indirect good was before we can use that excuse.

The miracle was done to verify the woman's faith which impressed Jesus and this faith was that she was not a Jew and so was inferior in the eyes of God. Christians would attribute such a miracle to the Devil. It is evidence for Jesus' satanic connections.

The racist interpretation of this event is right for there are other hints of Jesus' racism. Haley said that the texts which say that Jesus came to minister only to the Jews (Matthew 19:1; Mark 7:26,27) are not contradicted by the places where Jesus preached to the heretical Samaritans (page 119) for these exceptions proved the general rule that he was to preach only to Jews.

Now a general rule does not have exceptions. General by definition means really that it is preferred to preach only to the Jews but meeting non-Jews will happen so you can preach to them. General means the rule is not rigid so you are not breaking it.

Exceptions never prove the rule. When you cannot keep the rule that is not an exception but another rule. Exceptions are really just breaking the rules.

So with the woman, Jesus hated her so much and her daughter that he could not face talking to her and he helped in the end but this was not the exception proving the rule. If it was he was racist for he wanted what he did to reinforce the rule - which is what the proving the rule stuff claims to do.

In the first account, in the gospel of Mark, we read that Jesus is on a break and failed to escape notice by her and others so

how could he have the power to test her? It is a human story. Jesus was a racist.

It is possible that when Jesus lived in a Jewish country and had enough Jews to work with so he didn't have to meet non-Jews. Maybe he could be two-faced. Jesus knew it was wrong to be racist but didn't let that stop him.

The Infidel Delusion page 104 states that the episode was not about race but about religion. The story is meant to teach so when it does not say which it means we should assume it was both. Anyway her religion is not mentioned. So it is either both or just racism.

This book says Jesus did not want to help the woman because she was a pagan. The implication is that pagans are necessarily bad and should not be helped for they will only misuse that help. The implication is that Jesus did not use the term dogs in the Jewish racist sense. But even if it is not racist, does that improve the story? Is a person who discriminates against a person because of their religion better than one who discriminates against other races? If you would do one you would do the other. Christians say that as she was a pagan she could convert to Judaism so Jesus' attitude to her was not racism. But racism can take different forms. Sometimes a person hates for example gypsies until one marries into his family and becomes a settled person. She is only accepted because she is not a gypsy any more. The man is still a racist.

There is something else about the story. I have to print this in capitals to shout it out to everybody. THE GOSPELS GIVE NO INDICATION THAT IT WAS ABOUT RELIGION NOT RACE. The gospels say the woman came from another country. It does not say she was pagan. She could have been studying to become a Jew for all we know. Her belief in Jesus the Jew's power might indicate that she was at least considering conversion. Or she might have just lived her life without religion. The gospels put the story in the context of where she came from and what race she was. Religion is not mentioned.

Jesus's hate crime against the woman was nothing compared to the damage validating the racist culture of his time would do to her and had done to her. The apostles were as bad which shows what the culture was like. He was both directly racist and a validator of the wider evil culture. The latter was the worst aspect.

Calling the woman a dog is hardly a great validation of animal rights either! Jesus as a Jewish minister would have segregated women in worship and had Gentiles flung out. Jesus started Matthew 23 with praise for the religious teaching of the Pharisees and the scribes though such hate was among their core principles. He told the Jews to obey them.

With racists such as Abraham Lincoln we say they were men of their time and should not be judged by today's standards. Actually there is no excuse for racism and culture is no excuse. The argument does not care about the victims or even the perpetrators but about saying, "How great am I for I know better." It is not about you. Lincoln being condemned for that side of his character does not stop us honouring the man. It reduces honour but does not cancel it. One huge driver for such arrogant thinking that there is an excuse for racism in figures of the past is the evident racism of Jesus. Nobody wants to admit it or excoriate him for it. And while that is happening other figures such as Lincoln get a patronising condescending insulting free pass.

Even if the argument were right about Lincoln it cannot apply to Jesus. Lincoln only ever claimed to be an ordinary man. Jesus claimed to have the right to command things we might think are wrong just because he claimed to know the complete picture. And Lincoln did not claim to be somebody who should be the prime and greatest and divine role model for every child in the universe. Jesus did. Catholics even baptise children who don't know any better into the name ie authority of the Son of God Jesus. So he becomes their boss and role model and he makes the decisions in faith and morals for he knows the truth while the rest of us have to scramble towards it. Baptism and religious membership should be their choice when there is an issue with Jesus and they have no right to be praised for making that choice.

The story is simple. It makes no effort to avoid giving a racist impression therefore it is racist. Christian solutions are based on reading things into it that are not really there in the text. The solutions show they are conscious of the potential racism and try to cover it up.

It is known that as the Jews of the time believed they were the chosen race regarded a Gentile as a wild cur and it was thought that going near a Gentile passed on some kind of impurity to the Jew. Jesus never once condemned these attitudes. He had no friendship with Gentiles and he never encouraged them to join his entourage. Any that asked must have been ignored. His meeting with the Samaritan woman at the well was not staged or intended and he insulted her religion by saying salvation was only possible from the Jews. She was under the "wrong" male patriarchal authority.

Exorcists, particularly ones who are as irresponsible as Jesus, predictably regard people with gay feelings as possessed. Was that what he thought happened the girl?

Jesus was a racist. We demonise many racists who have not ever gone as far as he did. We don't know if people were beaten up or murdered over his example. From comparable cases, we can be sure they were...

