

The Jewish Final Solution to the World's Problem - Ethnic Cleansing in Old Testament

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 23 November 2014

Preacher: Marvin Wiseman

[0 : 00] Those of you who were here will recall that a question was asked that was a very worthy question, but it was one that in order to provide any kind of adequate answer at all, it would have required a lot more time than what we had.

So we're going to take some of that time this morning. And the question was raised by Gary Wade, and it has to do with the incidents in the Old Testament that are frequently referred to as the incidents of Old Testament so-called ethnic cleansing, where God had commanded the children of Israel to go into a certain area and wipe out absolutely everything, men, women, children, you name it.

And we've had incidents somewhat similar to that as late as the Vietnam War. I suspect that many of you remember the name My Lai, when there was an unjustified kind of massacre that was carried out there on some of the local population by some of our military.

And they were brought up on charges for it, and it was a very embarrassing thing to the whole nation. So these kind of things have taken place throughout human history.

Humanity at times has been a very, very brutal laboratory in which to live. And we will see some of the details and some of the issues involving that question that was raised, how this can possibly be justified.

[1 : 46] And believe it or not, I am thankful that these things are recorded in the Scriptures. And I'll tell you why. At least at the outset, it gives me an additional reason to believe in the accuracy and the authority of the Word of God.

And if there is anything that I am most eminently thankful for, it's the same thing I was thankful for last Thanksgiving season, and that is for the Word that God has been pleased to give us that reveals Himself and His Son and everything that we need.

I am more thankful for the Scriptures than I am for life itself. And I suspect it will be that way until I die. But it seems to me that if I were going to write a book, so think in terms of the Bible being merely a human book, a book merely written by ordinary people, but people who wanted other people to believe that God was behind it.

I wouldn't include these stories. Would you? I wouldn't include the accounts of murder, mayhem, robbery, cheating, lying, all the rest of it.

Those are things I would leave out. But the Bible doesn't leave them out. Because the Bible is a book of truth, and it relates history as it occurred, and sometimes it's very, very ugly and unsettling.

[3 : 28] But it doesn't sugarcoat the contents of the Bible. It paints man in his true condition, and it is not at all flattering.

Years ago, and by the way, what we're talking about now, in the essence of Gary's question, has to do with how in the world can a God who is posed as a merciful God, as a loving God, possibly order the execution of all of these people, and how can you possibly explain that?

It makes God look like a moral monster. That's the basis for the book that Paul Copen has written. called, Is God a Moral Monster? And I recommend the book, and I'll be sharing some excerpts from it with you this morning because of the noteworthy nature of the question.

We have got today, particularly in the Western world, a kind of upsurge of atheism and atheistic thought.

I do not know that it has ever occurred before that prominent atheists could write a book that would become a New York Times bestseller, but more than one has.

[4 : 44] And perhaps you are familiar with people like Christopher Hitchens, who, by the way, is now deceased. He knows a lot of things now that he didn't know then.

And Richard Dawkins, who is perhaps the most flamboyant and one of the most articulate atheists on the world scene, he's obviously a very brilliant individual insofar as human brilliance is concerned, because I would assume that you have to have some smarts if you're going to serve on the faculty of Oxford University.

You've got to have something on the ball. So I wouldn't take anything away from his IQ, but he is one of the more prominent atheists on the scene today, and he's been on a lot of talk shows, interviewed by a lot of people.

Kind of reminds me of having read earlier of a man by the name of Robert Ingersoll. He was one of the leading atheists of his day, and he lived a few generations back.

But one of his favorite tactics was to tour the country and gather a crowd, because people were intrigued by atheism, since it wasn't nearly as prevalent back then as it is today, and he would dramatically pull his pocket watch out, this gold pocket watch, and he would stand there before these mesmerized people and go into a tirade about this supposed God who didn't actually even exist.

[6 : 24] But this book, the Bible, had succeeded in duping millions of people into thinking that there was such a person, and blah, blah, blah. And he went on. And, of course, people there in the audience, and little old ladies would put their hand over their mouth, oh, I can't believe he's saying that, you know, and this and that.

And then at the end of his speech, he would say, if your God, this wonderful God, this all-powerful God, exists as you say he does, I invite him to show himself.

And here is my watch, and I'm going to give this God, who supposedly can do anything, five minutes to strike me dead.

Do you hear me? And the people would gasp, you know. And he would keep talking, and the clock would tick off. And pretty soon, after the end of five minutes, of course, nothing.

And Robert Ingersoll, puff his chest out, big smile on his face, as if he had conclusively proved that there is no God. He did this one time, I don't recall where it was, but it was a little farming community somewhere.

[7 : 38] And he said something to the effect that there is no God, and I've given him five minutes, and surely he ought to be able to send a thunderbolt for heaven, but that length of time, and strike me dead, and take me up on it, and prove me wrong.

But he hasn't. And a little old farmer standing in the back of the audience, wearing his typical bib overalls with the straw in his mouth, said, Mister, mankind has been trying God's patience for 5,000 years.

You think you can do it in five minutes? Kind of put the old boy in his place, didn't it? Well, let me get into this a little bit, if I may. I'm going to have to just read some selected excerpts, but it perhaps will give you an idea of what the issue is, and some possible answers to it.

Before I do, though, let me give you a little feel for Richard Dawkins, whom I've mentioned earlier. This is his perhaps most notable description of the God of the Bible, says Richard Dawkins.

The God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction. Notice, of course, he considers the Bible fiction. He goes on, Jealous and proud of it, a petty, unjust, unforgiving, control freak, a vindictive, bloodthirsty, ethnic cleanser, a misogynistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, philicidal, pestilential, megalomaniac, sadomasochistic, capriciously malevolent bully.

[9 : 31] That's what he thinks in his description of the God of the Old Testament. And, of course, there are some who come along who make a distinction between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New, and they say such things as the God of the Old Testament is somewhat tyrannical, somewhat bloodthirsty, somewhat unforgiving and harsh and can be downright cruel.

But the God of the New Testament represents a real switch. He is loving and kind and generous and so on. So, in essence, they comprise two deities from the Bible, which, of course, is nonsense.

And let me just inject this, if I may. The Jesus of the New Testament is unquestionably, undoubtedly, the Jehovah of the Old Testament.

For the record, we ought to know that. To make matters worse, Dawkins points out the ubiquitous weirdness of the Bible. Says he, A drunken lot was seduced by his recently widowed daughters, who eventually bore his children, Genesis 19.

Abraham gave a repeat performance of lying about his wife, Genesis 12 and 19. Jephthah made a foolish vow that resulted in his daughter being sacrificed as a burnt offering, Judges 11.

[10 : 58] David power-raped Bathsheba and engaged in murderous treachery toward her husband, Uriah, one of David's loyal, mighty men.

2 Samuel chapter 11. Then there's Dan Dennett, another atheist. He declares that the Old Testament Jehovah is simply a superman who could take sides in battle and be both jealous and wrathful.

He happens to be more forgiving and loving in the New Testament than it adds and so on and so on. So, well, I'd like to address that particular question about how these things can possibly be true of God and at the same time be worthy of the Christian devotion that is so often ascribed to him.

And this question was germane to the subject that we were talking about in connection with Israel being the chosen people of God and having a key place in the plan and program of God and that they will be very much involved in the future.

You'll recall that the name of the series that we are pursuing is simply labeled the Jewish final solution to the world's problems.

[12 : 23] And, of course, the Jewish solution is one that they themselves don't even recognize in a fashion. I mean, they do recognize that the Messiah is really the solution and that the faithful Jews still look forward to the Messiah coming.

But we Christians are persuaded that the Messiah spoken of by Moses and the prophets has already come. And Israel did not recognize him. In fact, they crucified him. So, all of this is tied in with that whole general subject.

And I want to just lift some excerpts out of this if I may because I can't, you know, can't very well read the whole book. But there is some content here that is brief enough that I think you'll be able to get it.

So, just follow along and give me, if you will, your undivided attention. The book, by the way, is authored by Paul Copan, C-O-P-A-N. It's an excellent volume.

He is a Ph.D. from Marquette University, the Pledger Family Chair of Philosophy and Ethics at Palm Beach Atlantic University in Florida. He's the author of several books.

[13 : 38] And he is a premier apologist. A Christian apologist is one that offers a vigorous defense for the Christian faith. And we are admonished to do that, as Peter said when he wrote to his audience and said that we ought to set Jesus Christ aside or apart in our lives, in our hearts, and be ready always to give an answer to anyone who asks us a reason for the hope that is within us.

And that means we ought to be able to give a good and sufficient explanation and answer for what we believe. You ought to be able to tell someone who asks you, why do you believe what you believe?

Why are you a Christian? You certainly ought to have a better answer than, well, I was raised a Christian. That's no good. That's no answer. That's the same kind of an answer a Hindu or a Muslim could give to justify why he is what he is.

That's no answer at all. The only adequate answer is that you have examined the evidence that is involved and you are convinced that it is true. And on that basis, you believe it.

Nobody should believe something just because somebody else does, even if it's your parents, because they might be wrong. My parents were wrong. My parents raised me to be a law-abiding, upstanding, patriotic young man who was taught that you shouldn't lie, you shouldn't cheat, you shouldn't steal, and very moral upbringing.

[15 : 09] But they did not know the gospel. They did not know anything about real spiritual truth or information. And they didn't give that to me because they didn't have it to give. But I believe what they told me, and yet, what they told me wasn't nearly adequate.

So, and you know, we ought to also take the position, and I believe this very, very strongly, anything that claims to be true ought to be willing to submit itself to the most careful scrutiny and investigation.

If what we say is true, it will stand the test of a rigorous examination. And like the question that was asked by Bill Fay, if what you believe is not true, would you want to know it?

Well, I should hope so. I would hope the answer would be yes, because the only valid reason for embracing anything and taking it to yourself and accepting it as something you will live by is because you are personally persuaded that it is true.

And truth is that which corresponds to reality. Truth is what is. And the error is what is not. But sometimes they're very difficult to determine between them because sometimes a half-truth can look a lot like a whole truth.

[16 : 49] But it isn't. So, it requires examination. And, as I've often said, Christianity, biblical Christianity, is a thinking faith.

You do not come to faith in Christ and then somehow put your brains on the shelf because now all you need is just faith. You're just gullible and willy-nilly believe anything and everything. That's nonsense. That's nonsense.

This chapter is entitled Indiscriminate Massacre and Ethnic Cleansing. And it has to do with the killing of the Canaanites. Probably the most difficult Old Testament ethical issue is the divine command to kill the Canaanites.

Theologian turned atheist Gerd Ludeman wrote that, quote, the command to exterminate is extremely offensive. A far cry from the merciful God frequently proclaimed in Scripture.

Consider just one of these passages. And this is from Deuteronomy 20, verses 16 through 18. Only in the cities of these peoples that the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, you shall not leave alive anything that breathes, but you shall utterly destroy them, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Canaanite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite, as the Lord your God has commanded you, so that they may not teach you to do according to all their detestable things which they have done for their gods, so that you would sin against the Lord your God.

[18 : 32] This is a tough question. And we'll take four chapters to tackle this and related issues. Well, suffice it to say, I'm not going to read you four chapters.

I'm just going to give you some isolated paragraphs. But I will, Gary, be glad to give you the book, and you can spend more time with it. And I'm sure you'll find it very, very profitable.

First, we'll review some introductory matters. Then we'll address two possible scenarios regarding the Canaanite issue. And finally, we'll look at the question of religion, whatever that term means, and violence.

Were the Canaanites that wicked? That's the question. They were to be destroyed because of their wickedness and because of the tendency that they would have to lead the children astray into the same kind of wickedness.

And the question that is asked that addresses the paragraph is, were the Canaanites that wicked? According to the biblical text, Yahweh, or Jehovah, was willing to wait about 430 years because the sin of the Amorite, that was a Canaanite people group, had not yet reached its limit.

[19 : 42] Now, bear in mind, when we're talking about all of these ites, we're talking about what is today the modern land of Israel, sometimes called Palestine, sometimes called Israel, sometimes called Judah, and so on.

In other words, in Abraham's day, the time wasn't right for judgment on the Canaanites. The moment wasn't right for them to be driven out and for the land to vomit them out. Leviticus 18.

Sodom and Gomorrah, on the other hand, were ready. Not even 10 righteous people could be found there. Even earlier, at the time of Noah, humans had similarly hit moral rock bottom.

Genesis 6, and by that time, that's why God brought the whole affair, the curtain down on everything, with the flood of Noah. Despite 120 years of Noah's preaching, no one outside his family listened.

His contemporaries were also ripe for judgment. But it was only after Israel's lengthy enslavement in Egypt that the time was finally ripe for the Israelites to enter Canaan because of the wickedness of those nations.

[20 : 52] Deuteronomy 9, 4 and 5. Sometimes God gives up on nations, cities, or individuals when they've gone past a point of no return. Judgment, whether directly or indirectly, is the last resort.

So what kind of wickedness are we talking about? We're familiar with the line, the apple doesn't fall far from the tree. In the case of the Canaanites, the Canaanites' moral apples didn't fall far from the tree of their pantheon of immoral gods and goddesses.

So if the Canaanite deities engaged in incest, we're talking about Canaanite deities, so-called manufactured, imagined gods of the Canaanites.

These gods had, of course, no objective reality at all. They were just the figment of people's imaginations. And then they would fashion an idol in accordance with what they imagined that deity to look like.

And then they would bow down to the idol, worship the idol, etc. And they believed in their belief system, similar, by the way, to the Romans and the Greeks and their gods and goddesses that would come along later, only these predated them.

- [22 : 16] They believed that the gods were little more than human, but that they had the same kind of flaws and failures and characteristics that humans had. In other words, they never had the concept of their gods like we have of our god, who is moral perfection, who cannot lie, who is completely trustworthy, who never contradicts his own nature and character, etc.

Their gods, on the other hand, were fickle, and their gods were capable of reproducing. They would have gods intermarry and produce little gods, and some of these gods would be jealous of other gods.

There was sometimes murder that took place among the gods and so on. So it's just a bunch of nonsense. And by the way, in the New Testament, the Apostle Paul makes it very clear what is behind all of these gods.

And he calls it what it is. He said, the gods that they think they are worshipping are in effect demons. They are demonic beings, demonic spirits, that draw these people into these terrible things.

So, let's continue on. So, if the Canaanite deities engaged in incest, that is, so-called marriage and cohabitation and sexual involvement among the deities, were already related to one another.

- [23 : 42] So, you've got a incestual relationship among these imaginary gods. If the Canaanite deities engaged in incest, then it's not surprising that incest wasn't treated as a serious moral wrong among the Canaanite people.

As we've seen, adultery, temple sex, bestiality, this is sex with animals, homosexual acts, also temple sex, and child sacrifice, were also permitted.

Leviticus 18, 20 through 30. Now, these were things that God condemned and didn't want his people to have anything to do with, but some of the pagan nations around them were engaged in these activities.

Humans are imaging beings. Humans are imaging beings designed to reflect the likeness and glory of their creator.

If we worship the creaturely rather than the creator, we'll come to resemble or image the gods of our own devising and that in which we place our security.

- [24 : 52] And that just reminds me of a verse in Ephesians 5. Remember when the Apostle Paul says that we are to be imitators of God? we are to follow a godly lifestyle.

We are to adopt a value system that is consistent with God's value system such as the sanctity of life and a moral life and all that goes with it.

We look to him as our role model. Well, it was completely to be expected that these would look to their deities as role models also.

But how did they know what these deities did? How did they know that these deities engaged in sex among themselves and produced little deities? How did they know that? They didn't know that.

That was their imagination. That was all imagined. This is what Paul is talking about in Romans chapter 1 when he talks about their foolish hearts were darkened and they gave themselves over to just their imagination and they assigned reality to the things that they imagined.

- [25 : 59] It's kind of like what's going on today. Only we call it create your own reality. It's an old woman in a new dress. That's all it is.

The sexual acts of the gods and goddesses were imitated by the Canaanites as a kind of magical act. Brace yourself for this.

The sexual acts of the gods and goddesses were imitated by the Canaanites as a kind of magical act.

The more sex on the Canaanite high places, the more this would stimulate the fertility god Baal to have sex with his consort, Anath.

Now, if you go through the Old Testament, you'll come across the name Baal. B-A-A-L. A number of times. Major Old Testament deity worshipped by the pagans, sometimes even by the Israelites when they fell into that.

[27 : 09] Baal was the god of fertility. If you made sacrifice to the god of Baal and prayed to the god of Baal, he would increase the productivity of your animals and give you more children, etc., and so on.

Which, of course, is complete nonsense, but if you believe it, hold on. The more this would stimulate the fertility god Baal to have sex with his consort, Anath, which meant more semen.

And do you know how they translate the semen? What they equate that with? Rain. What?

What does semen have to do with rain? Good question. But if you believe it, you're satisfied with the answer.

And what does more rain produce? More fertility on the ground. More crops. Better crops. Can you see the convoluted kind of crazy reasoning behind this?

[28 : 25] That could actually involve in a bumper crop and more productivity? We look at that and we say, well, that's just plain nuts.

Yes, it is. But it is no nuttier than believing that if you succeed in killing a bunch of infidels, you have an automatic ticket to heaven, and you will go there and be entertained at your disposal, 72 dark-eyed virgins.

We're talking about the same category of nonsense. But all that matters is that the people who follow it believe it. Because if you believe it, you act on it.

And if you act on it, it is perfectly logical for you to take a fully fueled 747 and crash it into one of the twin towers. Makes perfect sense.

If this is what you believe. This is all the same stuff. And it is nothing but pure, simple, evil, demonism that is behind it all, whether in the Old Testament or whether today in Islam.

[29 : 36] Same thing. No difference. Let's add to this blood lust and violence of the Canaanite deities.

Ain't it? The patroness of both sex and war reminds us of the bloodthirsty goddess Kali of Hinduism who drank her victim's blood and sat surrounded by corpses.

And you know people, people make such inane, stupid statements like, you're supposed to respect the religion of all people. Did you ever hear such a crock in your life?

Respect the religion of all people? Respect this? Admire this? What planet are you from anyway?

Now, I fully agree with we are to respect all people. Because all people, no matter how wrong they are, or how evil they are, if they are a human being, they bear the image and likeness of God.

[30 : 44] And that makes them objects of our respect. That means you should never mistreat people, you shouldn't be unkind to people, you shouldn't be cruel to people, you shouldn't intimidate or threaten people, you certainly shouldn't kill people.

You should be respectful to people. But to say you should respect all beliefs is one of the most nonsensical stupid things any human being can utter. We have an obligation to respect what we know to be true.

We owe no allegiance and no respect to what we know to be untrue. That's crazy. But yet, that's what's taking place here.

And that's what's taking place today, too. But if you say something or speak out against it, then you know what that makes you? A hater. You're a hater. And of course, this doesn't fit in with political correctness at all.

Well, this is Hinduism. This Hinduism espouses the existence of 300,000 deities.

[31 : 57] Mind-boggling, isn't it? The blood was so deep that she waded in it up to her knees, nay, up to her neck.

Under her feet were human heads, above her human hands flew like locusts. In her sensuous delight, she decorated herself with suspended heads while she attached hands to her girdle.

Her joy at the butchery is described in even more sadistic language. And it goes on and on. And I'm not going to read that. It's pretty bad.

Pretty bad. Well, let's skip a few pages to this. This is indiscriminate massacre, ethnic cleansing.

And this was eye-opening to me. I never knew what the answer to this issue was. How it could possibly be that these people were commissioned to exterminate, massacre people, men, women, and children.

[33 : 02] And I had never heard this before. I never had encountered ancient Near Eastern exaggeration rhetoric. Well, I know the Near Easterners are given to enormous usages of figurative language.

And I did not know that it included even into this area. But this was new to me. This was new to me. Let me just share a paragraph here.

with you. He's talking about Joshua and his conquest. Most Christians read Joshua's conquest stories with the backdrop of Sunday school lessons via flanograph or children's illustrated Bible stories.

The impression that's left is a black and white rendition of a literal crush, kill, and destroy mission. A closer look at the biblical text reveals a lot more nuance and a lot less bloodshed.

In short, the conquest of Cain was far less widespread and harsh than many people assume. Like his Near Eastern contemporaries, Joshua used the language of conventional warfare rhetoric.

[34 : 04] rhetoric. Now, today, we would liken the ancient conventional warfare rhetoric to two football teams who are talking trash to each other.

We're going to murder you guys. We're going to pulverize you. You'll be lucky if you have somebody on this team standing when we get through with you. You know, just talking trash kind of thing.

These guys. Wow. This language sounds like bragging and exaggeration to our ears. Notice first the sweeping language in Joshua 1040.

Thus, Joshua struck all the land, the hill country, and the Negev, and the lowland, and the slopes, and all their kings. He left no survivor, but he utterly destroyed all who breathed, just as the Lord, the God of Israel, had commanded.

Joshua used the rhetorical bravado language of his day, asserting that all the land was captured, all the kings defeated, and all the Canaanites destroyed.

[35 : 07] Joshua took the whole land and gave it for an inheritance to Israel. Yes, as we see it, Joshua himself acknowledged. Yet, as we shall see, Joshua himself acknowledged that this wasn't literally so.

Well, now, what does that mean? It means it didn't go as far as we are led to believe. Scholars readily agree that Judges, the book of Judges, is literarily linked to Joshua.

Yet, the early chapters of Judges, which incidentally repeat the death of Joshua, show that the task of taking over the land was far from complete. In Judges 2.3, God says, God says, I will not drive them out before you.

Earlier, Judges 1 asserted that they did not drive out the Jebusites. They did not take possession. They did not drive them out completely. And by the way, the Jebusites, you need to know who they were.

Because the name of the city of Jerusalem was not originally Jerusalem. The name of the city that Jerusalem occupies and has for the last 3,000 years, they have just recently celebrated their 3,000th birthday as a city.

[36 : 19] The original name of the city was Jebus. J-E-B-U-S. And guess who lived there? The Jebusites. That was their home turf.

So you're talking about driving people out of ancient Jerusalem. It says, the peoples who had apparently been wiped out reappear in the story. Many Canaanite inhabitants simply stuck around.

And something popped into my mind as I was reading this. I remember they were supposed to have destroyed all of the Hittites. Now this is back in the days of Joshua. So if you destroyed all of the Hittites, that means there aren't any Hittites left.

But when you fast forward a few hundred years, one of the top soldiers in King David's army was named Uriah.

Remember? He had a drop-dead gorgeous wife by the name of Bathsheba. You know what Uriah was? Uriah was a Hittite.

[37 : 27] Where did he come from? They were supposed to have all been wiped out. All the Hittites were killed. Well, if all the Hittites are killed, there are no Hittites having little Hittites. But hundreds of years later, we've got Uriah the Hittite.

So we know of at least one survivor, don't we? And we suspect that there were many more. Of course. And Joshua was just saying he had fairly well trounced the enemy.

On the other hand, Joshua says there were no Anakim, that's A-N-A-K-I-M, Anakim, left in the land, Joshua 11. Indeed, they were utterly destroyed in the hill country.

Literally? No, not according to the very same Joshua. In fact, Caleb later asked permission to drive out the Anakites from the hill country. And again, Joshua wasn't being deceptive.

Given the use of ancient Near Eastern hyperbole, he could say without contradiction that nations remain among you. He went on to warn Israel, not to mention, swear by, serve, or bow down to their gods.

[38 : 31] Again, though the land had rest from war, chapters 13 and beyond tell us that much territory remained unpossessed. Tribe upon tribe failed to drive out the Canaanites.

And Joshua tells seven of the tribes, how long will you put off entering to take possession of the land which the Lord, the God of your fathers, has given you? And this is just scratching the surface of what we are talking about.

There is so much more here that is deserving of our time and attention, but of course we can't take it now. I have five minutes left, and needless to say, I am not going to begin the message that was originally scheduled for this morning, but I do want to give you a heads up as to what it is about because it is so very, very critical.

And that is this. It is generally assumed by Christendom at large that when you open the New Testament, you of course have 400 silent years behind you where there has been no revelation revelation from God.

That means from the time Malachi put down his pen and finished what we call the Old Testament, there were four centuries that went by that God was not giving any inspiring information to anyone to write anything that we call Scripture.

[40 : 03] there's 400 years of silence. Then when you open the New Testament, bearing in mind that there are four centuries between, the automatic conclusion that most draw, and that I personally drew for many years after I was a Christian, that now when you come to Matthew and you are in the New Testament, you have just entered an entirely new beginning.

No, you haven't. It is not a new beginning at all. Starting with Matthew chapter 1 and verse 1, we have a continuation, not a new beginning.

The New Testament is a continuation of the old. It does not deserve the radical break that we give the New Testament separated from the old.

That's where a lot of our misconceptions come from. I want you to do the best you can to keep in mind, and I will give you some concrete examples in our next session.

why we are convinced that, and by the way, there is no question, I don't think in the mind of anyone, or any scholar, there is no question that the Old Testament, hands down, unquestionably, is Jewish, Jewish, Jewish, Jewish.

[41 : 48] It's all about Israel. And any time it isn't about Israel, it has to do with the people that involved Israel, without exception.

They are the key nation and individuals in the Old Testament. However, when you come to the New Testament, the general consensus among Christendom is that's it for the Jew.

That's over and done. Now we're in this part that is Christian. No, we're not. There is nothing Christian about Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

I know, I know that sounds like absolute blasphemy. There is a lot in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John for Christians. And we need to study it and understand it.

That's why we spent five years going through the Gospel of John, verse by verse. But it isn't Christian. It is for Christians. It isn't two Christians.

[42 : 53] And it isn't about Christians. It's about Jews. All about Jews. There are good, well-meaning Christians, upon hearing what I just shared with you, would literally vibrate because they just can't get their brain around that.

They are convinced that the Old Testament is Jewish, the New Testament is Christian. No, it isn't. We will see, and I think in an unmistakable fashion, the intense Jewishness still focusing upon the nation of Israel exclusively.

And any time non-Jews are brought into the picture, they play a minuscule role, almost absent altogether. And it is not until you get into the book of Acts, and not at the beginning with the day of Pentecost, Acts chapter 2, there's nothing Christian about that.

Nothing. Nothing. In fact, you do not even find the first non-Jewish person being seriously considered as connecting with God, the God of Israel, until you get all the way into the 10th chapter of the book of Acts, and he is a Roman army officer by the name of Cornelius, and he was not well received by the Jews.

Why not? Because he was a Gentile. God doesn't have anything to do with Gentiles. God is only about the Jews. Well, that's not true.

[44 : 39] But many regarded it, many in Israel regarded it as true, and they thought they had a corner on God. God, and whereas they were raised up of God to be a light to the Gentiles, that didn't work out, and they weren't all that willing.

So God had to raise up somebody completely independent of the nation and the leadership and the governance of Israel to do for the Jews, to do for the Gentiles what the Jewish nation was not willing to do.

And even then, even then, he chose a Jew to do it. His name was Saul of Tarsus, and he converted him on the road to Damascus, and he said, I'm going to send you to the Gentiles.

And no doubt, Paul's response was, to the Gentiles? Why would anybody go to the Gentiles? The Gentiles are fodder for the fires of hell. That's all they're good for.

Gentiles are dogs. They are the uncircumcised. They are the unclean. But you know what? Jesus Christ died for the Gentiles, not just for the Jews.

[45 : 49] And that's the message that Paul is going to proclaim wherever he goes. And you know who he's going to take all the heat from? His fellow Jews, who will not appreciate sharing their God with the Gentiles.

And on top of that, he doesn't even require them to be circumcised. He doesn't even tell them they have to keep the Sabbath. He doesn't even tell them they have to have a kosher kitchen. He doesn't tell them they have to keep the feast days.

Can you believe this guy? You know what we need to do with him, don't you? We need to kill him. So they set out and tried to do that. And, well, that's more of the story. So, anyway.

Time is gone, and you've got more than you bargained for this morning. But, believe it or not, this is all related. Maybe you're having difficulty seeing the connections.

But as I've often said, so say I now again, everything in the Bible is connected to everything in the Bible. It's all one related account.

[46 : 54] So we are going to dispense now with any further consideration of this. And if you want to follow up on this because you want more answers and more explanation, let me assure you more is available.

Is God a Moral Monster? You can purchase this at your local bookstore if you want to get one. The author's name is Paul Copan. C-O-P-A-N. He's a very capable writer.

It's published by Baker Books. I recommend it. It's got a prominent place in my shelf of books dealing with apologetic issues. So would you stand with me, please?

Father, we know that there is certainly a lot here to process. And there are things to consider that sometimes we'd rather not even think of. But you've seen fit to incorporate them in your word.

And if they are in your word, we do not have the right to dismiss them. We need to pay attention to what is written because it's all connected. And it's all part of a cohesive truthfulness that you have extended to us.

[48 : 07] We are grateful for your having included these things and not selecting only the good things that man has done.

You have allowed this book to tell the whole truth. Nothing but the truth. And we are grateful. We want to be people of truth.

We want to love the truth and seek the truth and be willing to buy the truth and sell it not. Thank you for the burden you have placed on our hearts for the examination to understand better that which you have been pleased to reveal.

Trust that this will serve as a stimulant to the minds and hearts of some that they might further seek out these things that will validate and confirm the truth that you set forth.

We pray in Christ's name and for his sake. Amen. Amen.