

## Jesus' Anti-Jew Slurs

Though seemingly a Jew, Jesus was an anti-Semite. The gospels are full of anti-Jewish slurs. Jesus did claim to be a Jew but it is not clear if all Jews at the time agreed that he was. The Jews talked to him at times as if he were a non-Jew imposter with a dubious birth.

Anti-semitism is the most destructive form of sectarian hatred imaginable. It is so irrational and prevalent that it is clear religion is the only explanation.

Nobody worries about the antisemitism that will be dished out through the Bible readings - particularly the up and coming ones at Easter in Christian Churches. Catholics for example are annually exposed to the gospel claim that all the crowd calling for Jesus to be killed said - "to a man" meaning everybody - let his blood be on us and our children. That is an insane lie for there had to be plenty of Jews in the crowd who did not say it. Antisemitism needs people to tar Jews with the one brush and that is what was happening there in that lying gospel story from Matthew. If a religion was formed by people like that then it emerged from evil and we cannot be surprised if the evil keeps resurfacing as it has often done. Catholicism has been the worst enemy of the Jews.

The Romans were brutally oppressing the Jewish people and the Pharisees may have been complicit in this if only to save their own skin. The total silence of Jesus on the abuses is telling and is him letting his people down. He was able to speak out against things in a way that put him in danger and he ended up on a cross. But speaking for his people was not one of those things. That is silent anti-Semitism. What was not silent anti-semitism is how the Jews and their leaders were singled out by him for verbal abuse and he even mocked their Temple by rioting in it.

Religions often hurt their own. The Jews liquidated many people such as adulteresses and heretics and homosexuals because prophets like Moses told them God commanded it and God knows best. I consider the antisemite's faith in the Bible as divinely inspired and as a moral book to be part of the problem. I think it's antisemitic of Christians to be okay with what happened to those executed Jews. It is antisemitic to approve of Jesus who railed abuse against the Jews and who blessed the scriptures that oppressed them and even said not a word or tittle of the law and prophets was wrong.

The Christians say that Jesus said that the Hebrews of the past and of his day were so stubborn that God had to let them have divorce even though it was just legally making the woman commit adultery (Matthew 5:31,32). God forced them to do lots of things abhorrent to them and he could have forced one more despised law on them. Jesus was slandering God if the Christians are right. He was saying that God was incompetent. He was also smearing the Israelites by saying that they were so bad that God could not manage them.

He said that it was easier for sinners who were not smug to be saved (Matthew 21:31, 32; 23) and yet he spent his time with sinners and not the self-righteous (Mark 2). A truly good man would have had more interest in the ones who needed him more. And he has the nerve to say he came to call sinners. Think about this, it was the Jewish leaders and the respectable that he had in mind so he was slandering them as if they were beyond redemption which is not true for even the sinners and publicans and prostitutes Jesus associated with had self-righteous sides. Self-righteousness was a sin so what was he thinking of? When you do wrong you are being proud and self-righteous. He was an anti-Semite and so is anybody who approves of him.

Jesus said that he came on earth to call sinners to repentance and not the self-righteous (Matthew 9:13). Some Bibles say the righteous. The context is about insulting the Pharisees who were regarded as sanctimonious so self-righteous is the meaning. It is positively evil and satanic to reserve your services for one kind of sinner only to ignore those who need help far more. The person who does wrong and admits it is in less danger than the sinner who will not admit it. Jesus seems to be implying that the smug cannot be rescued or reasoned with. This was slander for all sin, in a sense, is an act of pride or independence from God - a manifestation of self-righteousness. "I am too superior and wonderful to be submissive to God".

Jesus complained about the people not believing in him as if he were well known and they should which was slander. Herod and others thought that he was John the Baptist back from the dead not knowing that John had been Jesus' forerunner. This proves that Jesus was not big in the public eye.

Jesus told the Sadducees who did not believe in the resurrection that they did not know the scriptures or the power of God (Matthew 22:29) for denying the doctrine. First he was accusing them of stupidity when it was himself who was stupid for he said that God saying that he was the God of the deceased Abraham, Isaac and Jacob proved the resurrection. Secondly, they did know that God had the power to raise the dead for they were convinced that Adam was raised from the dust of the

earth which does not prove they were stupid for denying the resurrection.

Jesus said that the religious leaders of the Jews were to blame for the killings of the saints from Abel to Zechariah who was murdered between the altar and the temple (Matthew 23:34-35). Abel died before any Jews existed and Zechariah died long before the people of Jesus' time were even born as well. It is argued that Zechariah was the prophet Zechariah who wrote an Old Testament book for Jesus says this one was the son of Berechiah but there is no record that he was murdered in the temple. Jesus was unlikely to have meant a person whose death we know nothing about. It would have been an excuse for accusing him of lying and God would not give Jesus leave to divulge miraculous knowledge that could not be verified at least soon after. Miracles are meant to be signs not wastage of power. Zechariah son of Jehoiada died as Jesus described so it is more likely that it is him and the name of the father was a mistake. The Jews were not to blame for these killings. Christians say that Jesus could have meant that they were to blame in the sense that they would have killed them but they didn't kill him then! And surely they were not so evil that they preferred murdering to exiling?

Jesus unjustly blackened the Jews in Matthew 23. He called them vipers and bastards AFTER commanding the people to obey their preaching. It is said that Jesus attacked them so strongly because he sought to save them from everlasting punishment. If that's true then his actions do not conflict with his rule about loving everybody – but that's not true. Making people angry serves no purpose. And if God is all-powerful there is no need for employing mental cruelty for he has the power to melt the frozen and would not make it harder for himself. Jesus made them very angry which could have prevented them from changing their ways and made it less likely for them to do that. He hated them for he wanted to increase the danger of eternal suffering for them.

If the leaders of the Jews were as anti-God as Jesus makes out then he wouldn't have been able to sanction their religious guidance and even more so when the morality of the Law of Moses is nasty and barbaric. Christians answer that he meant we should obey them when scripture backs them up. But, if we have to go through the Old Testament to test them before we can heed them then why not use the Old Testament only? Was Jesus hinting here that he was not a prophet and so had no right to be revered? Was he showing that he wanted no New Testament?

In Mark 7, it is made clear that the Pharisees and all the Jews observe the traditions of men and thus insult God for man has no authority in religion apart from God. Jesus is plainly talking about all the Jews. The Christians make out that the vitriol against the Jews in the New Testament refers to the Jewish leaders. That is just an excuse for trying to get around how Jesus hated all the Jewish people and abused them. It is mad to say that when Jesus abuses "the Jews" he means the leaders though "the Jews" in many places has to mean all the Jews (eg John 2:13).

Jesus had no right to tell the people that the Pharisees do all they do just for show. He had not risen from the dead yet to prove his mission was divinely inspired and here he was claiming he could reveal what was in the hearts of these men as if he were a super-psychic god. He had no right to because the people had no right to believe what he said at that stage.

Christians who recognise that the Pharisees seem on the basis of historical evidence to have deserved no special criticism argue that Jesus' only difficulty with them was how they did not believe in being friendly to those who they considered seriously immoral. But if they were like that that was more reason for Jesus to be nice to them not less. And is a dishonest tax collector really better than a Pharisee who tries to keep company only with upright people? Jesus never says his main or only problem with them was their holding sinners in contempt. He never says the Pharisee in the tale of the Pharisee and the Publican describes a typical Pharisee.

It is appalling that an anti-Semitic opus like the New Testament can be promoted in our two-faced society. It is supposed that Jesus was not an anti-Semite and the Gospellers said he was one because they hated the Jews who did terrible things to the new religion. There is no evidence for that idea except that Jesus was made up himself. If Jesus existed then he and his Gospellers were as bad as one another.

They say that Jesus was infallible and in doing so they condone his racism. To call him even a medium role model is to do that as well never mind to call him the perfect one!

#### BOOKS CONSULTED

Catechism of the Catholic Church, Veritas. Dublin, 1995

Christ and Violence, Ronald J Sider, Herald Press, Scottdale, Ontario, 1979

Miracles in Dispute, Ernst and Marie-Luise Keller, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1969

Moral Philosophy, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stoneyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans, Green and Co, London, 1912

Objections to Christian Belief, DM Mackinnon, HA Williams, AR Vidler and JS Bezzant, Constable, London, 1963

Putting Away Childish Things, Uta Ranke-Heinemann, HarperCollins, San Francisco, 1994

Reason and Belief, Bland Blanshard, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1974

Robert Schuller, Satellite Saint or High Flying Heretic, Cecil Andrews, Take Heed Publications, Belfast

The Hard Sayings of Jesus, FF Bruce Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1983  
The Resurrection Factor, Josh McDowell, Alpha Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1993  
The Truth of Christianity, WH Turton, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co Ltd, London, 1905  
Why I am Not a Christian, Bertrand Russell, Touchstone Books, Simon and Schuster, New York, undated