

Answering those who say that Jesus was no misogynist

If you are really for women, you do not lie and cover up for misogynists. You cannot condemn patriarchy and make exceptions of the likes of Jesus. He said the fruits show what the tree is so as he left patriarchy in his wake he was patriarchal himself.

Jesus degraded the people he ministered to who were being oppressed by the Romans. Women and children suffered the most but he said nothing. He just picked on the Jewish leaders. In Matthew 23 he told them they were murderers and would finish him off, a clear attempt to provoke violence against them in the guise of self-defence. Those men had wives and children.

He went as far as to say his flock were an evil generation and it was remarkable that anybody could give a hungry child bread and not a stone. He said in the first gospel that he would not be called Good Teacher for only God is good. To call everybody's motives that dangerous and evil is to justify patriarchal reasoning. We all know male sex pests who think that the women they molest secretly like it. Making out we are godless deep inside as Jesus did, virtually demands that.

There is no doubt that Christianity generally always has and always will downgrade women and worships Jesus for being as bad. In the book *Toxic Jesus, My Journey from Holy Shit to Spiritual Healing* (Marc-Henri Sandoz Paradella), regarding Jesus the misogynist, we are told, "the historic Jesus treated women with respect and consideration, giving them a place among his supporters and even among his nearest disciples and apostles". That would be shallow of him considering he said it was a sin to revise or soften any Old Testament law in Matthew 5 and a more woman hating law cannot be imagined. There is no evidence that Jesus was that close to any woman in his entourage. No deep conversations are recorded.

He snapped at his mother at Cana. He was asked by her to help with the wine and he said no and did it anyway as if to say "I am helping but its my idea not hers."

He let a woman debase herself by washing his feet like she was dirt with perfume and tears and he said he forgave her sexual immorality. He did not tell her he forgave her and to hold her head up high and that he would wash her feet. Feet washing was the work of a slave.

He told a pagan woman she and her daughter were animals and thus risked - or invited perhaps? - racist attacks on her for she was Canaanite. There is no evidence that this was an object lesson and the gospel would say if it were. He praised her faith but this faith was faith as in, "He has the power to do a miracle cure for my daughter". He knew such faith is cruel to encourage as many do not get their miracles.

Men have always had dogs and called women dogs. Jesus is an example of an ancient figure calling a woman and her daughter b****hes. Remember the gospel says Jesus and the others were annoyed by her so that explains the outburst and does not excuse it.

Why did he take the woman at her word when she said her daughter was full of demons and needed them cast out? Because he hated her for her race so it was easy to do that. And the girls consent does not matter either to this bigot.

The gospel says the woman went back home to find her daughter well. But that means little when Jesus said that if the person shows signs again of possession its because they invited the demons back in. A perfect loophole.

He disowned his mother in Mark for the whole family including her thought he was mentally disturbed - the crafty gospel does not tell us that in those days insanity was equated with possession. Jesus tried to make out that anybody who thought his exorcisms were satanic tricks was a lost cause guilty of a sin that would never ever be forgiven.

Magdalene is described as the first apostle to see his resurrection and tell the disciples. In the gospel of John, Jesus appears saying to her, 'Do not hold on to me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father. Go instead to my brothers and tell them, 'I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.' Some hold that this was only Jesus' spirit. By ascending he is saying the body had not being revived yet where ever it was. Early gospel strata shows that resurrection and exaltation to God's presence, a form of ascension, are two sides of the same coin. So she did not see the risen Jesus. He is standoffish with her as if he is all about the apostles and they get a different reception and Jesus supposedly ordains them as messengers who forgive sins and gives them the Holy Spirit. The other gospels only have the women telling the apostles to prepare for seeing Jesus for themselves which makes sense in a culture where women could not count as

sufficient witnesses. Luke goes as far as to omit Jesus appearing to the women. Mark has a forged ending where the women speak about the risen Jesus but the original ends with the women saying nothing.

Jesus lived in and went along with and even validated that age. An age where underage marriage for girls was the cruel norm. It was a norm that meant most first time mothers died in childbirth as their bodies were not ready. Though women could not divorce, perhaps for many of them were too young to be able to assert themselves, he cruelly banned them from initiating divorce. He blocked any conversation there. He blocked progress.

He did not stand with his own mother who was a mere child perhaps of 11 or 12 who owing to her hardship would have been more like an 8 year old and who was pregnant.

He had no right to even mention the sexual choices of the Samaritan woman to her or tell her her religion was wrong. "Salvation is from the Jews and you worship on the wrong mountain." She was clearly under the "wrong" patriarchal authority. Alarmingly Jesus himself was oppressed by his leaders and he wanted women subjected to that! It was patriarchy on steroids in those days.

When the adulteress was brought to him to see if he would agree with God's law about stoning her, all he had to do was shake his head and walk away for those who wanted to stone her were only a mob and only testing him and could not stone her anyway. But he dragged it out and told her at the end she was guilty of that sin meaning she could have been stoned legally later. He made sure this woman was tormented.

He had a purse and there is no hint that it was ever used to feed any poor woman. That purse if he was as popular as the gospels make out had to be bursting.

