

JEWISH CHRISTIANITY IS REAL CHRISTIANITY

The Church was Jewish before it started abandoning the Faith

INTRODUCTION

"Here's one final, commonsense fact: if Jesus, as many caricatures of him suggest, really represented a radical break with Jewish teaching, there is simply no plausible way he would have garnered such a massive following among his fellow Israelites. No one would have believed that he was the promised Messiah if he had rejected the Law of Moses! It seems reasonable, then, to believe the opposite, which is exactly what Jesus set out to do: not to abolish the law but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17)" from www.catholic.com

Today, it is only too easy for Christians to forget the Jewish roots of their religion. The book whose teaching they consider to be the teaching of God thanks to his divine inspiration, the Bible, tells them that the Jewish Law or the Torah, the first five books of the Bible, given by God to Moses is to be followed even today by all who call themselves children of Abraham. Christians claim to be children of Abraham.

When the Jews cried they wanted to be accountable for killing Jesus in the gospel of Matthew, many Christians used this as an excuse for persecuting and butchering the people their God first made his own.

Since the very start there have been many Christians who have loathed the Jews. The monstrous, St John Chrysotom, used to chant that he hated them. Persecution began when the dreadful Constantine feigned conversation to Catholicism in the third century.

Many popes hated the Jews too. In 1555, the wine-bibbing Pope Paul IV published a bull called Cum Nimis Absurdum. It demanded that they be treated as slaves and locked away in ghettos. Their books were burnt by rabid Catholics though surprisingly they were allowed one synagogue in every city.

In the last century, Pius IX, had no sense of justice towards the Jews and even had Jewish babies kidnapped for the purpose of brainwashing them into becoming ardent Roman Catholics.

There is some evidence that the Catholic and many other cults plotted with the Nazis to exterminate the Jews during World War Two. Pius XII did not say a word while Hitler slaughtered the Jews. He could have saved them by breaking his silence but he was too evil to. It might have done little good but it should have been tried.

Despite their antagonism towards the Jews, the Christians follow a religion that is supposed to tell them to become Jews. How ironic.

This book proves that Catholicism, Orthodoxy and Protestantism have rejected Judaism out of badness and not because what they consider to be divine revelation told them to. Early Christianity was a Jewish sect. True Christianity would still observe the Jewish religion, with its feasts, Sabbaths, sacrifices and rites. This book proves that modern Christianity has forsaken authentic Christianity. I hope that it converts Christians to make another great division in the Church so that confusion may reign and Atheism may grow.

NT LAW-KEEPING PROOFS

We have exhaustively demonstrated that the New Testament never contradicts the Law of Moses. Does it go one step further to actually say that the Law is still in force?
It does.

As a Jew, Jesus had to praise all the bloodshed which God had sanctioned because in his prayer and in his preaching he stressed that the scriptures which commanded it were void of error. On the Sabbath, he sang psalms that were eulogies of the wickedness of the Law. If honest he would not have appealed to any Old Testament scriptures at all to add weight to his doctrinal statements if there was anything in them that God had not sanctioned for what is the point of quoting something that could be an insertion from a tampered Bible? If he would have and did he was far from being an honest man.

Suicide rates are high among young gay men and religion which condemns gay sexuality in accordance with the Bible will make sure that it not only stays high but climbs higher still. The condemnation of homosexuality excites much homophobia

and drives many to despair and even suicide. It would be better to speak positively about homosexuality and stop condemning even if it saves just one life but the Church won't do it showing how little concern it has for human life despite bragging about its great respect for life as the most important thing. Catholics who rail against capital punishment on the grounds that human life is sacred are hypocrites. Their dogma forbids them to do that for all God cares about is what he wants and does not mind if people die over the things he directs the Church to teach. How anybody could expect this God to be unlike the bloodthirsty tyrant who commanded that gays be stoned to death in the Bible is a mystery. His commanding the prohibition of homosexuality is proof enough that he wants gays dead and for us to make sure he gets his wish. If we respect God we will advocate the murder of homosexuals for it would be disrespecting him and his law to be inconsistent. The Law claimed the right to command the destruction of Israelites whose cities broke away from the Law to practice idolatry and in effect became new countries with their own Law (Deuteronomy 13:12,15). So don't let anybody dare suggest that the Law of Moses forbids the killing of the criminals God wants dead when it is against the law of the land. This also implies that the Law of Moses was to be imposed on other nations that were not Israelite as well.

The New Testament allowed slavery. It could have been forbidden Christians to have slaves but it allowed it. It is silly to say it had to allow slavery because of the social system of the day for not everybody was Christian. Christians were a minority group and were despised anyway so opposing slavery couldn't have made things any worse.

Paul taught that every commandment of the Law was holy, fair and good (Romans 7:12). He complained that though he knew the Law was good he did not always obey it (v15, 16). Romans 3:31 supposedly says Paul contradicted the teaching of the Law that obedience to it made you righteous before God and thus fit to enter his presence. The text merely says that faith in Jesus recognises and gives the utmost respect to the law. Faith in Jesus does not contradict the law but validates it. Deuteronomy 18:15

John defined sin as the transgression of the Law (1 John 3:4). So, since it is wicked to break the Law it is right to follow the Law. Christians allege that Paul wrote against Jewish Christians who sought to get Christians to obey the Law of Moses for Jesus had cancelled the Law. They pretend that the Law Paul asked his followers to live under was not the Law of Moses but the Law of God about right and wrong. Their position falls to pieces when it is realised that if they were right Paul would not have used the simple term, "The Law," for both Laws. He and his secretary, Tertius, wouldn't have been so sloppy and confusing. If he were writing to

Christians who stupidly thought they were to live like Jews then he would have known what they would have thought he meant, when he advocated the bending of the knee to the Law. He would have prevented this misunderstanding.

Never does the Bible distinguish between the moral law and the religious law. There is only the Law.

Romans 13:8 says that loving other people fulfils the whole Law.

1 Timothy 1:8 says that the Law is good if it is not abused. To do what is not good is to do what is bad so if the Law is good then it should be obeyed. To call it good means, "Obey it!"

Do these texts mean the Ten Commandments only? No. They were the heart of the Law and all the other commandments came forth from them like spokes. They were not the Law but a bit of it. The New Testament would make it clear it means only these if it did mean them. The Ten Commandments were to be interpreted in the light of the rest of the Law. For example, "You shall not kill", means "Do not kill except in self-defence, when I have prescribed the death-penalty – for kidnappers, adulterers, homosexuals, etc – or command war". It is stupid to say the Ten Commandments can be plucked or followed out of the context of the Law. The first of the commandments says that God is to be worshipped by being obeyed meaning by the Law.

It is stupid to say that you can use the commandment that some render "You shall not kill" to forbid killing animals or capital punishment or anything – a murderer will have been asked by his victim not to kill him and does that mean the victim thinks that the killing will not be a murder. Of course not! Killing can mean murder though not all killing is murder. Yet the Christian Church thinks it can reinterpret the commandments and that God wants them to keep them. Its commandments may have the same wording as God's but they are not his commandments which even the Church admits are still to be obeyed. When the New Testament enjoins keeping the commandments of the Law which are supposed to be the ten it is proof that the whole Law is still in force according to the true Christian religion.

Acts 21 makes it clear that the prophets of the early Church taught that the Law was still completely in power long after modern Christianity says Jesus got rid of it. Jesus allegedly inspired them to do so from on high according to many places in the Bible. Paul was accused by the apostles of telling Jewish Christians not to keep the Law. Obviously, they wanted him neither to teach that they could obey the Law out of custom if they wanted to or that they should cast it aside. To make the

Law optional is the same as telling some of them to disregard it. It is saying, "If you don't want to keep the Law then don't do it." The Law made life harder so nobody wanted to keep it though they supported it. To ask people to give it up when they want would be unfair on those who make themselves keep it. The apostles told him to prove that he was not hostile to the keeping of the Law by undertaking a ritual purity rite – a rite for the removal of uncleanness – and he agreed to. They asked him to prove that he did not regard the Law as abolished or optional. Obviously, the rite was only one of the things they asked for. It was too easy so you can be sure Paul had to do a lot more than that.

So, it can be proved that the barbaric edicts of the Law, such as those that what certain criminals tortured to death, advocate an eye for an eye and the chopping off of the hands of anyone who hurts a man in the groin are as much a part of the correctly understood Christian religion as they are of Islam and Judaism.

The Sanhedrin would not have decided to give the Christians some tolerance if the Church was set against the rites and ethics of the Law (Acts 5:39). They would not have come to believe that a sect like that could be from God like Acts says they did. So, the Church was obedient to scriptural Judaism. If the Christians condemned lying as bad they would have told the Jews if they wanted to arrange things so that they could get people to stop doing what the Law demanded. The Sanhedrin would have made sure that they had no intention of discarding the Law or had a forbidden attitude towards it like, "It is fine to obey the Law as long as you know it is not necessary." The Sanhedrin had met many sects that only seemed to honour the Law and knew they had to be careful. Acts 2 says that the community of the followers of Jesus were looked up to by everyone. This would not have been so if they had been watering down the Law of Moses or making a God of Jesus Christ.

There is more evidence in the New Testament that the Law is over Christians than for any of the distinctive doctrines of the Church. The Church only exploits the Bible if it does not reverence it because it would be Jewish Christian if it did.

Christians admit that Jesus never rescinded the moral law (page 14, Sunday or Sabbath).

No case can be made for making a difference between the laws God brings into legislation and moral law. God knows more than we do and can make laws that seem strange to us for morality is about doing the least possible evil or damage. So it was moral then to kill adulterers in Old Testament times. If it is not moral now it is because God is working in different circumstances.

WRITTEN ON THE HEART

If the Law of Moses depends on a rational morality that cannot be done away then it would be true to say that it is written on the heart of every person on earth. They might refuse to see the truth of the Law but it is still written on their hearts.

In Romans 2, Paul wrote that even those who do not have the written Law have its principles written on their hearts. This is a response to the prophecy of Jeremiah 31:33 and Ezekiel which speak of God writing the Law of Moses on the hearts of his chosen people in the future. In their time, they were just written in books but not in hearts for nobody was interested in sincerely keeping them.

He means they know it by thinking for God can't make them believe in the Law if the Law is beyond reason.

Commentators prefer to believe that Paul means that some of the principles of the Law are engraved on their hearts and not all. They are happy to say that all people know stealing and adultery are wrong. But they deny that the laws about cleanness and about the Jewish God ordering the people to put people to death for certain crimes could be written on the heart.

But the lines before give a different interpretation. All the way up to this verse the word Law means the full Jewish Law. In verse 9, 10 he says that the Jew will be punished for not keeping all the Law. When the same word keeps turning up like that we can only take it to mean the same thing: the full Law. Paul already said in Romans 1 that the pagans knew by reason or deep down about God's existence and that God was opposed to homosexuality and a lot of other things many pagan codes found acceptable. He denied that the pagans just knew the commonsense stuff in the Law and nothing more. They knew the whole Law by the power of God. He says they knew too that homosexuals deserved death. That says it all. The New Testament sees the Law of Moses as eminently reasonable so it could not be done away. To abolish it would be to abolish morality.

JAMES WANTS THE LAW OBEYED

James the brother of Jesus who was known for his devotion to the Law according to Josephus seems to have written the Epistle of James. Sources outside the Bible say he was a loyal Jew. This means that the Law he commands adherence to in the authority of Jesus Christ is the Law of Moses in its fullness.

James, in his epistle, taught that the person who offends against the Law in one point breaks all its rules (2). It is thought that the Law of liberty he mentions is another Law. But if the Law of Moses is righteousness then it is the Law of liberty, the remedy for bondage to stupidity and error and evil. He quoted some commandments to show that to break one commandment is to break all and said that this is breaking the Law meaning the Law of Moses.

James declared that anybody who judges his brother unfairly is criticising and judging the Law (4:11).

James 5:12 says that above all things we must not swear but must just answer yes and no. He means that we should not swear when yes or no would do or that we should be so truthful that we don't need oaths. He is not saying that taking oaths is wrong.

James 4:1-3 says that lusts and selfishness are to blame for wars. Some see that as forbidding wars. But even people who believe in war believe that human badness is to blame. The side that is in the right however is not to blame. It is only defending itself or should be.

CIRCUMCISION

Circumcision is said in the New Testament to be the sign of making a covenant with God to keep his Law that he gave to Moses.

When the New Testament condemns circumcision it only condemns the physical act without the spiritual side being taken into account. It stresses that circumcision is worthless unless you intend to circumcise your heart and keep God's Law.

Romans 2:25 says that circumcision is good and right if you can keep the Law of Moses. But once you break the Law you break the contract signified by your circumcision and it is no longer any good. Your circumcision is now uncircumcision. 1 Corinthians 7:18 is the only verse that says one must not be circumcised but it says it in the context of a list of things not to bother doing including marrying or fighting for your freedom if you are a slave for the focus must be entirely on the return of the Lord Jesus.

Circumcision for the right reasons is part of New Testament doctrine for it never explicitly did away with it.

ANIMAL SACRIFICE NOT BANNED

The Bible God says the blood sacrificing Levitical Priesthood is still in force. God made a covenant establishing an everlasting priesthood with Phinehas the grandson of Aaron (Numbers 25:13). The Church says he meant that they would be priests forever not that there would be priests forever. But what would God promise them they would be priests forever for? He was promising that the priesthood would never be abolished.

The New Testament says that animal sacrifice was really useless in itself but only served as a sign that atonement for sin was necessary. Jesus provided that atonement. Now if the sacrifices represented that before Jesus came they can still represent it after.

There is no definite statement in the New Testament that the Jewish feasts are done away. They had to be kept under obligation to divine law. A God who does them away would make it clear. Acts 20:6 shows the apostles still observed Judaism and the feasts after they were supposedly done away. The proof texts against the keeping of feasts refer to man-made feasts not the divinely instituted feasts of the Law of Moses. See Galatians 4:10. Galatians was not written against Jews but against heretical Jews who said that you have to be circumcised to get into Heaven. Old Testament doctrine however teaches that circumcision is not about Heaven but about the right to be Jewish and to inherit the Holy Land.

Some of the feasts required sacrifice of animals so animal sacrifice is still needed.

CONCLUSION

The Law of Moses with its superstitions and cruelties is still in force according to the Bible. Jesus could not and did not teach that the days which we have to obey it are gone. The Law is said to be no longer obligatory for us in the sense that we want to obey it so it is no longer like a Law and in the sense that if we fail Jesus has obeyed the Law for us in our place so we are still counted as obeying the Law perfectly. The fact that we need Jesus to do some of the work for us indicates that the Law has his sanction as being fair and correct.

The Law of Moses is not for the Hebrews alone but for the world.

The Bible is an evil book that deserves to have its pages torn out and used to shine windows. Any other use is criminal. Stop calling it the good book. It should be banned for it opposes social order.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible, John W Haley, Whitaker House, Pennsylvania, undated
- Christ and Violence, Ronald J Sider, Herald Press, Scottdale, Ontario, 1979
- Christ's Literal Reign on Earth From David's Throne at Jerusalem, John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, undated
- Early Christian Writings, Editor Maxwell Staniforth, Penguin, London, 1988
- Essentials, David L Edwards and John Stott, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1990
- Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven, Uta Ranke-Heinmann, Penguin Books, London, 1991
- God A Guide to the Perplexed, Keith Ward, OneWorld, Oxford, 2003
- God's Festivals and Holy Days, Herbert W Armstrong, Worldwide Church of God, California, 1992
- Hard Sayings Derek Kidner InterVarsity Press, London, 1972
- Jesus the Only Saviour, Tony and Patricia Higton, Monarch, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, 1993
- Kennedy's Murder, John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 1964
- Martin Luther, Richard Marius, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1999
- Moral Philosophy, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stonyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans, Green and Co, London, 1912
- Not Under Law, Brian Edwards, Day One Publications, Bromley, Ken, 1994
- Radio Replies Vol 2, Frs Rumble and Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1940
- Sabbath Keeping, Johnie Edwards, Guardian of Truth Publications, Kentucky
- Secrets of Romanism, Joseph Zacchello, Loizeaux Brothers, New Jersey, 1984
- Set My Exiles Free, John Power, Logos Books, MH Gill & Son Ltd, Dublin, 1967
- Storehouse Tithing, Does the Bible Teach it? John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 1954
- Sunday or Sabbath? John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, 1943
- The Bible, The Biography, Karen Armstrong, Atlantic Books, London, 2007
- The Christian and War, JB Norris, The Christadelphian, Birmingham, 1985
- The Christian and War, Robert Moyer, Sword of the Lord Murfreesboro Tennessee 1946
- The Encyclopaedia of Bible Difficulties, Gleason W Archer, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982
- The Enigma of Evil, John Wenham, Eagle, Guildford, Surrey, 1994
- The Gospel and Strife, A. D. Norris, The Christadelphian, Birmingham, 1987
- The Jesus Event, Martine Tripole SJ, Alba House, New York, 1980
- The Kingdom of God on Earth, Stanley Owen, Christadelphian Publishing Office, Birmingham
- The Metaphor of God Incarnate, John Hick, SCM Press, London, 1993
- The Plain Truth about Easter, Herbert W Armstrong, Worldwide Church of God, California, 1957
- The Sabbath, Peter Watkins, Christadelphian Bible Mission, Birmingham
- The Ten Commandments, Herbert W Armstrong, Worldwide Church of God, California, 1972
- The Truth that Leads to Eternal Life, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, Brooklyn, New York, 1968
- The World Ahead, November December 1998, Vol 6, Issue 6
- Theodore Parker's Discourses, Theodore Parker, Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, London, 1876
- Those Incredible Christians, Hugh Schonfield, Hutchinson, London, 1968
- Vicars of Christ, Peter de Rosa, Corgi Books, London, 1995
- War and Pacifism, Margaret Cooling, Scripture Union, London, 1988
- War and the Gospel, Jean Lasserre, Herald Press, Ontario, 1962
- When Critics Ask, Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, Victor Books, Wheaton, Illinois, 1992
- Which Day is the Christian Sabbath? Herbert W Armstrong, Worldwide Church of God, California, 1976