

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CRUCIFIXION OF THE CHRIST

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

This paper is an antithesis written in response to a fifteen page booklet entitled *Who Was Responsible for the Death of the Messiah?*, by Matthew Janzen, 3470 E. Hightower Trail, Conyers, GA 30012. In his treatise, Janzen shows his utmost inability to reconcile the context of the Bible by making some of the most outlandishly bizarre statements imaginable. In theory, his object is to interpret Scripture in such a way as to make "the men of [true] Israel" legally liable for the murder of the Messiah. On pages 4 and 5 Janzen says the following:

"However, sadly to say, sometimes among great truths there can also be great error. For instance, Most [sic.] Biblical believers who do not adhere to the previously mentioned beliefs, still maintain that the Messiah shed his blood for the remission of sins, and in doing so justified us freely for those sins committed. This is a very scripturally sound belief, and can be proven quite easily; Isaiah 53 comes to mind. The point is that just because one doctrine they teach has great truth, it does not mean everything they teach is an absolute. And so it is with many in the 'Identity' movement today. Many, who understand that Yahweh, wrote His law, on physical Israel's hearts and minds, have made a giant leap in another area of Biblical identification. Instead of focusing in on the real problem, some ministers have begun to teach that the identity of the people who were responsible for Yahweh-shua's death were not the Israelites, but rather the very offspring of 'Satan' or descendants from Esau... Edomites.

"It is not my intent to delve into how they attempt to prove such a belief, let me assure you, this belief is out there. We should however examine this belief with the measuring stick of scripture. Does the Bible inform us of who killed the Messiah by hanging Him on a tree? Or are we left to wonder, and possibly accept this 'Satanic-Edomite doctrine'?"

"What Saith the Scripture? (Janzen asks)

"A person must always realize that when he is searching for truth all biases must be laid aside. We do not judge truth by our emotions or experiences, or by what we feel in our heart. Truth is judged by Scripture and Scripture alone; there is no appeal to the authority of Yahweh's word. If we are willing to accept what the Bible has to say on this

issue, then it should be rather easy to determine just who was responsible for the death of the Messiah.”

That Janzen has suggested that “Truth is judged by Scripture and Scripture alone” is exactly the course we are going to take on this subject! On pages 5-9, Janzen then quotes several passages from the book of Acts out-of-context, in order to establish his erroneous position that it was members of the true tribes of Israel who were *legally* responsible for the crucifixion of our Redeemer, (those passages being Acts 2:22-23; 3:12-15; 5:29-30 & 7:51-53). Janzen continues thusly on pages 5-9:

“ Acts 2:22-23: ... On this particular Festival [Pentecost] there were ‘... *dwelling at Jerusalem Judahites, devout men, out of every nation under heaven...*’ These <sic. were the> men <sic. were> whom Peter addressed his sermon to in Acts 2:16-21. After his quotation of the prophet Joel, Peter says to these Israelite men:

“22 **Ye men of Israel**, hear these words; Yahweh-shua of Nazareth, a man approved of [the] Almighty **among you** by miracles and wonders and signs, which [the] Almighty did by him in the **midst of you**, as **ye yourselves** also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of [the] Almighty, **ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain**: [Acts 2:22-23]

“Notice who <who sic. upon whom> the Apostle Peter staked the blame for the Messiah’s death upon <sic. upon>: none other than the men of Israel. Are we willing to accept the inspired statements of one of Yahweh-shua’s very Apostles?

“ Acts 3:12-15: Peter not only made that one statement in the second chapter of Acts, but he gives us another witness in Acts chapter three. This witness comes right after a certain lame man had been healed in the name Yahweh-shua of Nazareth. This man went away ‘... *walking and leaping and praising [the] Almighty...*’ The men who were eyewitnesses of this miraculous event all ran toward Peter and John, and as they drew near Peter spoke up and said:

“...**Ye men of Israel**, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? The Almighty of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, **the Almighty of our fathers**, hath glorified his Son Yahweh-shua; **whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate**, when he was determined to let *him* go. 14 **But ye denied the Holy One and the Just**, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; 15 **And killed the Prince of life**, whom God hath raised from the dead: **whereof we are witnesses**. [Acts 3:12-15]

“Peter and John would mock at a teaching which claimed someone other than Israelites were responsible for the death of the Messiah. As Peter says here; they were witnesses of **these very things**.

“ **Acts 5:29-30**: In Acts the fifth chapter we find that a number of the Messiah’s Apostles had been imprisoned, ‘... *but an angel of the Sovereign by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth ...*’ As the high priest requested the Apostles to be

brought out of prison, the officers went to retrieve them but did not find them. One of the officers spoke up and said that the men they had put in prison were actually standing in the temple teaching of Yahweh! The captain and the officers captured the Apostles once again and brought them before the council. This is when the high priest spoke up and said:

“... Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, **and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.** [Acts 5:28]

“Why was the high priest so worried about the Apostles accusing him and his people [Israelites] of killing the Messiah if they were not the perpetrators of the crime? He could have simply showed <sic. shown> the evidence of the ‘Satanic-Edomite Murder’ and it would have been over with.

“Peter, and the other Apostles with him, answered the high priests comments with these words: ‘... We ought to obey [the] Almighty rather than men. The Almighty of our fathers raised up Yahweh-shua, **whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.**’ [Acts 5:29-30] It was these very Israelites who had not forthrightly accepted Yawheh-shua [sic] as the Messiah and King of Israel, who were responsible for his hanging.

“**Acts 7:51-53:** ‘ I know the answer! It’s that Peter; he’s the culprit of these lies!’ This very well may be the claim some would now try to make. ... It’s easy for them; if they don’t like what the Bible says, throw it out! This is what is called smorgasbord Bible study. A Bible study which condones picking and choosing what one might want to believe, and trashing everything which contradicts one’s own personal doctrine.

“However, we do encounter a problem if one simply chooses to throw away Peter’s statements we have examined thus far. The problem is that in Acts 5:29-30 it was not just Peter making a stand, but the other Apostles with him as well. Also, in Acts seven, our beloved brother Stephen gives us yet another witness. In Acts chapter six Stephen had been falsely accused of speaking ‘... *blasphemous words against Moses and against [the] Almighty.*’ False witnesses were even set up, proclaiming that Stephen spoke against Yahweh’s temple and law. Stephen then gives his defense in chapter seven of Acts. Reading this chapter through should show anyone that Stephen was being falsely accused, and that he was also addressing Israelite kinfolk in his speech. At the climax of his speech Stephen states the following:

“Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers *did, so do ye.* Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed <sic. shewed> before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers: Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept *it.* [Acts 7:51-53]”

SCRIPTURE PROVES PETER AND THE OTHER DISCIPLES DIDN'T UNDERSTAND WHO THE TRUE ISRAELITES WERE!

At this point in his diatribe, Janzen assumes he has made a really significant point, but Peter and his companion Disciples, at this point in time in Acts, had little realization who all the true Israelites were! This is apparent in Peter's vision at Acts 10:10-16 & 11:5-10!

Acts 10:10-16: “ **10 And he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, 11 And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth: 12 Wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. 13 And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. 14 But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. 15 And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. 16 This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven.**

Acts 11:4-10: “ **4 But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them, saying, 5 I was in the city of Joppa praying: and in a trance I saw a vision, A certain vessel descend, as it had been a great sheet, let down from heaven by four corners; and it came even to me: 6 Upon the which when I had fastened mine eyes, I considered, and saw fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. 7 And I heard a voice saying unto me, Arise, Peter; slay and eat. 8 But I said, Not so, Lord: for nothing common or unclean hath at any time entered into my mouth. 9 But the voice answered me again from heaven, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. 10 And this was done three times: and all were drawn up again into heaven.”**

The conclusion to the matter of this vision is found at Acts 11:1 & 18, which say the following: “ **1 And the apostles and brethren that were in Judaea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God ...18 When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.”**

Before Janzen starts to condemn everyone else of “picking and choosing”, he should read the rest of the book of Acts, for Janzen is guilty of the very thing he accuses others of doing! These passages which I have just quoted have nothing to do with “cleansing” the unclean creatures forbidden to be eaten in the Old Testament, but the “cleansing” of the wrongly translated Latin term “Gentiles.” This term in the Greek is *ethnos* from which we get our English word “ethnic.” The translators should have translated *ethnos* as “nations”; in particular the “Israel nations.”

The bottom line is: Peter and Stephen were not totally aware of who all composed true Israel at the time they made their utterances at Acts 2:22-23; 3:12-15; 5:29-30 & 7:51-53! Not knowing the so-called “Gentiles” were actually Israelite “nations”, Peter and his companion Disciples considered them as “unclean”, and they

were not about to take the Gospel to non-Israel people! Had Peter and his companion Disciples known the so-called “Gentiles” were Israelites, the vision wouldn’t have been necessary! All this demonstrates that Janzen and his ilk are unskilled in Biblical matters, and should be taught rather than teaching others! Of course, that also goes for his mentor, comrade Ted R. Weiland! All this garbage which Janzen and Weiland are fostering gets rather serious, for such confusion scatters rather than gathers the Israel sheep!

Furthermore, when Janzen quoted Acts 2:5, it showed his utter inability to comprehend or discern Biblical topics. This is how Janzen quoted it: “... *dwelling at Jerusalem Judahites, devout men, out of every nation under heaven...*” Here Janzen substitutes “Judahites” for “Jews” as used in the KJV. Had Janzen done any research on this passage, he could not have made this substitution. The only way we can analyze the term “Jews”, as used in the KJV at Acts 2:5, is to examine the context of that verse!” To begin this process, I will quote from *The Complete Word Study New Testament* compiled and edited by Spiros Zodhiates on the Greek word #2453 translated “Jews”, page 779:

“2453. **Ιουδαῖος**, *loudaíos*; fem. *loudaía*, neut. *loudaíon*, adjective, Jewish, substantive, a Jew or a Judean, from Judea. All the posterity of Jacob were called ‘Israel’ or ‘children of Israel’ from the surname of the patriarch, until the time of King Rehoboam. Ten tribes, revolting from this prince and adhering to Jeroboam, became known from then on as the House of Israel. The two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, remaining faithful to the family of David, were called the House of Judah. Therefore, after the defection of the ten tribes, *loudaíoi*, Jews, signified subjects of the kingdom of Judah (2 Kgs. 16:6; 25:25; Jer. 38:19; 40:11). After the Babylonian captivity, the name ‘Jews’ was extended to all the descendants of Israel who retained the Jewish religion, whether they belonged to the two or the ten tribes and whether or not they returned to Judah ... It is in this extensive sense that the word is applied in the NT (Acts 2:5, 10 [cf. 26:7; James 1:1]) ...”

Therefore the term “Jews” is an ambiguous expression and can mean many things under various conditions such as tribe, nationality, race, religion or a combination of these. At Revelation 2:9 & 3:9, it can mean non-members of the Tribe of Judah. But at Acts 2:5, we must put the Biblical context to the test. Acts 2:9-11 does that for us, so let’s read it: “**9 Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, 10 Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, 11 Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God.**”

This passage is not really speaking of Parthians, Medes et al., but rather Israelites who, after their captivity by Assyria and Babylon, had settled in these places and represented only a few pockets of the Israelite tribes in general. By this time the main body of all the tribes of Israelites were well on their way into Europe. So the Biblical context of the term “Jews” at Acts 2:5 is a remnant of Israelites from various tribes, including their proselytes, who were not necessarily Israelites, nor even pure Adamites. This is an example of how occasionally we must go by the context of

Scripture rather than the letter. So Janzen strikes out again by substituting the term “Judahites” for “Jews” at this particular verse. Surely the Advent of the Holy Spirit at the Day of Pentecost was not restricted to the Tribe of Judah, but was manifested to members of all the tribes of Israel!

Janzen pats himself on the back by citing Acts 3:12-15 (already quoted above), and makes an issue that Peter said “whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate ... And killed the Prince of life.” Then Janzen sarcastically states: “Peter and John would mock at a teaching which claimed someone other than Israelites were responsible for the death of the Messiah.” Janzen either forgets or is ignorant of the fact that many in Judaea were half-breeds at the time and could claim a polluted blood-connection with the Hebrew Patriarchs, but also descended from Shelah, Esau and other vile mixtures.

On page 7 Janzen follows with another harebrained question and idiotic answer:

“ Why was the high priest so worried about the Apostles accusing him and his people [Israelites] of killing the Messiah if they were not the perpetrators of the crime? He could have simply showed <sic. shown> the evidence of the ‘Satanic-Edomite Murder’ and it would have been over with.”

Apparently, Janzen has never read Eusebius or Josephus, or he would never have asked such an absurd question followed by such a silly conclusion! For a retort to Janzen’s foolishness and to confirm such evidence exists, I will now quote from *Eusebius, The Church History*, (I.7), translated by Paul L. Maier, pages 34-35:

“When the line of Jewish rulers ceased, the orderly succession of high priests from generation to generation fell into instant confusion. The reliable Josephus reports that Herod, once made king by the Romans, no longer appointed high priests of the ancient line but obscure sorts instead, a practice followed by his son Archelaus and the Roman governors after him when they took over the government of the Jews. The same writer reports that Herod was the first to lock up the sacred vestment of the high priest and keep it under his own seal rather than priestly control, as did his successor Archelaus and the Romans after him.”

Surely, “obscure sorts” were not Israelite high priests! And the “Satanic-Edomite Murder” is verified at Revelation 12:4: “**And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.**” The “woman” was Israel in the person of Mary, and the “dragon” that “stood before the woman” was Herod the Edomite. So the Hittite-Edomites were right there at Emmanuel’s birth attempting to kill him, and were in control of the high-priesthood when they finally succeeded in that murder, contrary to Janzen (or red Ted R. Weiland for that matter)!

Janzen then proceeds on page 10 to quote Luke 23:34 which says:

“Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.”

On page 12, Janzen says the following concerning Luke 23:34:

“We also find that those Israelites who were in on the murder of Yahweh-shua received forgiveness, contrary to those who claim that the Messiah stated, ‘Father, forgive them not ...’ If the Messiah did indeed state this, and the Father undoubtedly heard Him, do you not think that the Father would have kept those there from receiving forgiveness? Absolutely! We instead find that those responsible for this death did indeed receive forgiveness, in the book of Acts chapter two. Acts 2:22-23 establishes the belief that Israelite men were responsible for the death of the Messiah; reading on in the chapter establishes the belief that these same men obtained pardon for their sins.”

Janzen’s statement here “Father, forgive them not...” is in reference to what many in Identity picked up from Francis J. Smith, Box 802, North St., Elsworth Falls, ME 04605 which he found in the interlinear *Emphatic Diaglott New Testament* by Benjamin Wilson on page 304, where he read above the Greek words “... Father forgive them not for they know what they do ...” Francis J. Smith made many copies of this page sending them all over the country. The word arrangement is quite different in Greek than in English, and Francis J. Smith didn’t really make the great discovery he thought he had. Correctly translated, Luke 23:34 says “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” The *Emphatic Diaglott* has it correct in the side column in English. Where Janzen is incorrect is that these words of forgiveness were directed by Messiah toward the Roman soldiers in charge of the Crucifixion rather than the Satanic-Hittite-Edomite-Jews who had ordered it, and had taken legal responsibility for it, “... His blood *be* on us, and on our children”, at Matthew 27:25. The Roman soldiers were actually long lost Israelites! We can know that because at Romans 16:20, Paul told the Romans: “**And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly ...**” That happened when Rome, under Titus, besieged Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The Christians were given time to leave and primarily by-and-large the remainder staying at Jerusalem were of Satanic seed, and they deserved everything they got. One exception was the Levite Josephus whom Yahweh allowed to be at Jerusalem to record those terrible events. To show you that Messiah’s forgiveness was directed only toward the Roman soldiers, I will quote from *Ante-Nicene Fathers* volume X, Section LI:

“28 And the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and cast lots for them in four parts, to every party of the soldiers a part; and his tunic was without sewing, from the top woven throughout. 29 And they said one to another, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: and the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, *They divided my garments among them, And cast the lot for my vesture.* 30 This the soldiers did. And they sat and guarded him there.”

Janzen neglected to read the rest of Luke 23:34 where it says, “**And they parted his raiment, and cast lots**”, for the ones forgiven were those casting lots! Though Roman soldiers carried out the Crucifixion, the Edomite-Jews took the legal responsibility for it, and the latter will **never be forgiven**. By this time, you should begin to realize that Janzen and Weiland do not know what they are talking about, and it’s

simply pathetic what they are trying to promote! Maybe Weiland should send some more Bibles to the blacks in Nigeria as he bragged he did!

The Crucifixion was prophesied at Genesis 3:14-15, which says: “**14 And Yahweh Elohim said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: 15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.**”

What else was the Crucifixion but Messiah’s bruising? And was the seed of the serpent “spiritual” only as some so insistently claim? For if His bruising was physical as Mel Gibson so gruesomely portrayed, so also was the “seed of the serpent” physical! To downplay the seed of the serpent is to downplay Yahshua’s bruising, and if there was no bruising of Messiah, there is no Redemption! Isaiah 53:5 prophesied: “**But he was wounded for our [Israel’s] transgressions, he was bruised for our [Israel’s] iniquities: the chastisement of our [Israel’s] peace was upon him; and with his stripes we [Israel] are healed.**”

While it is true that we Israelites are the recipients benefiting as a result of His bruising, it is highly irresponsible to place the blame for Christ’s death on us as Janzen and Weiland do. It is true that we Israelites deserved that “bruising”, but we miss the whole point of the matter when we fail to comprehend that Yahshua took that bruising in our place. Hence, it is quite impossible for Israel to play both roles as the bruiser, and those benefiting from that bruising! Yet, Janzen foolishly makes Israel both the bruiser and recipient of blessing. That’s tantamount to charging the average citizens of rural Kansas with the war crimes of George Bush and his party of “Jewish” and black “neo-conservative” advisors, for the blame must be placed on the **guilty** party! A minor few true Israelites may have unwittingly played the part of executioner, but the descendants of the Satanic-Cain-Kenite-Hittite-Edomite-Jews took the full **legal** responsibility! For anyone who doesn’t understand this fact hasn’t studied Old Testament law in its entirety! Not only did these Satanic people willingly take the **legal** responsibility for Messiah’s death, but they also willingly placed it upon their children indefinitely forever, and they can never ever be forgiven! Had the impostor “Jews” not found Messiah **guilty**, the Roman soldiers wouldn’t have had any thing to do! If Janzen and Weiland are correct, then Gen. 3:15 would necessarily read: “... her seed ... shall bruise thy head ... and her seed shall bruise his heel.”