

How Jesus blessed and commanded and protected child sex abuse/child rape

Christianity gets its religious privilege by building on a man who is himself built on having the same anti-woman and pro-sex abuse outlook as his society had. It is built on lies that take advantage of a possible child rape or sex assault, Mary's. It is built on callous untruths and half-truths about a culture that bordered on treating innocent vulnerable girls as mere sex objects to breed children. The horror of childbirth in those days cannot be imagined. In poor areas more mothers died while having their babies than survived.

The gospels say that Jesus was followed by rumours of being illegitimate.

Matthew says that Mary conceived before her wedding and Joseph believed he was not the father. We don't know what the expression being conceived by the Holy Spirit means. If Joseph molested her and her virginity remained pregnancy would be possible. I think that the expression that Jesus is being conceived by the Holy Spirit is a euphemism for Mary conceiving by a human sperm without full sex.

When Joseph took her to wife he had to take her that day to the chupa and then present the bedclothes stained with blood from her hymen to the authorities as proof that it was a real marriage and she was a virgin and he was capable of sex.

This is clearly another sexual assault.

Luke has Mary being asked if she would have the baby for God and she consents after a short conversation. That is not consent. It was too brief for that and how could she really think of all the consequences? It is what child molesters do, make a child think she consents. She was only a child. She was oppressed. She was possibly a sickly girl. She was poor. She was malnourished. She is commonly thought to have been twelve but her twelve would have been more like eight. Her body was not ready for a baby. And childbirth in those days was as easily a cause of death as a cause of a baby coming.

Girls like her were made to wed when they were mere children. To walk away from such a fake forced marriage when the mature would be a duty but Jesus reinforced the right to marital rape by banning a girl from divorcing her man. No wonder his blanket ban on divorce horrified his listeners.

In that context we ask what kind of man Jesus was. He did not respect his own mother. He did not admit her victimhood.

The gospel of Luke, Luke 7, contains a story about Jesus healing the centurion's servant, a very young man he boasted of his love of. It has been alleged he was curing the centurion's lover. If so, Jesus then used a miracle to further sex abuse for this lover was certainly underage and a vulnerable male rape victim.

Peter Ould says:

Phang, in *The Marriage of Roman Soldiers* argues coherently that in the period of Roman history this passage occurs, it would have been inconceivable that a Roman soldier would have been permitted to have had a sexual relationship with either another soldier, any freeman, or even a male slave. There is however evidence that some Roman soldiers bought slave boys in order to have sex with them, but the documentation of this phenomenon is scarce. In some parts of the Empire at this time (i.e. Egypt) it was already unheard of for a free Roman to enter into pederasty with a junior. By the middle to end of the third century it was almost eliminated from the life of the army across the Empire.

Luke 7:2 and 7:10 call the lad *doulos* or servant. The Centurion uses the word "pais" which means a few things but child is the best and most obvious interpretation. It can mean son but a servant would not be called a son we think. Jesus then if he let this man call a slave his son was condoning slavery. Matthew 2:16 has it used for child. It is son in John 4:51. It is servant at Luke 15:26 and Acts 4:25.

Pederasty is the best interpretation. James Neill's research backs that up. Even critics agree he could be right even if they do not think so.

It has been stated by Christian supporters of Roy Moore in 2017 that if he tampered with young girls this was not a sin or much of a sin. The fact remains that many people who read their Bibles and know their history is that "God's word" does indeed fail to condemn child sex abuse. It even commands it in marriage for girls were wed to essential strangers at 10 or 11. God requires sex on the first night and a sheet had to be shown with blood on it to prove the female was a virgin. She

was to be murdered by stoning by divine command if she was not a virgin. The bleeding was not necessarily due to a hymen being broken but to the girl being underage. A female child raped in a city was forced to wed the attacker. Attempts are made to deny it is rape but it is for she is a maiden - a child. It is said the marriage was justified for no other man would take a violated virgin! But not all girls did marry!! And it would not be a marriage but a social construct.

There are condemnations of bestiality and adultery and gay sex and no mention of the respect due to the sexual innocence of a child. Silence is consent anyway. But silence is more consent in a holy book which claims the right to be obeyed as the word of God and which encourages people to see that they must obey the book just because it says they must do it.

Here is a quote from *Dangerous Illusions How Religion Deprives us of Happiness* by Vitaly Malkin: As for the legal age of maturity, there has been a curious discussion between the rabbis on this subject. The 'main' rabbi, Judah the Prince, believed that a woman attained maturity when her pubis was almost entirely covered with pubic hair, while the Amoraï Safra (Yevamot 12b) believed that it was useless to wait for so long and defined the age of maturity as the time when a girl had her first two pubic hairs (Niddah 52a). A woman was also considered mature if she managed to conceive and give birth to a child before having any pubic hair.

Those biblical cultures did accept men having sex with girls whose bodies were not ready for sex or having babies. Men married female children. There are several clues in the Bible that a man is allowed to molest the child he "marries." The child at least should have the right to get away from the husband who raped her and abused her and who could divorce her to get his hands on a new child bride. Jesus reinforced these evil paedophilic doctrines by saying that a girl cannot divorce her husband or she becomes an adulteress if she weds another. What is worse is he was being hypothetical for women did not have a right to divorce in his society. Calling her an adulteress was abusive in itself and was virtually calling for her murder for the Jewish God had decreed death by stoning for adulteresses. (And Jesus made no attempt to do away with stoning in his ministry. The adulteress who was brought to him for stoning was brought to him as a test but even then he said she should be stoned but only by worthy accusers. He did not stone her for it was not his place and it was never done by one person. And it was a test anyway.)

Reason proves that marrying a female child is not possible for she cannot consent and her body is not ready. Jesus banned her from remarrying implying that her null and void marriage was real. Annuling underage weddings is a Catholic novelty.

Jesus saying that he wanted little children to come to him does not mean he cared about the sexual abuse of young girls in marriage for lots of Rabbi's welcomed children as well.

I repeat: the fact remains that these female children were forced into marriage, were too young as well and had every right and perhaps the duty to leave their husbands. A male could easily divorce his child bride and marry another so that you have serial child molesting of serial child-brides.



A young man was found with Jesus in suspicious circumstances the night he was arrested. A young man [boy] wearing nothing but a linen garment, was following Jesus and alone with him in the garden. When they seized him he fled naked, leaving his garment behind. Read Mark 14. Note: young man is neaniskos, meaning he was in the prime of his life, perhaps 15 to 25 years old. As boys married young the young man was behaving like a single lad. So he was very very young. The New Testament hardly ever uses neaniskos - it prefers other words - which shows it was trying to communicate how young the boy was. If Jesus had not been liquidated for sedition it would have been child molestation. Naked always is associated with degradation and shame and a symbol for sexual abuse. Mark did not need to mention the nakedness so we have innuendo here. This is not a problem for Mark for he was clear that Jesus' message mattered not Jesus for Jesus even told a man he was not a good teacher as in good person. The other gospels leave the story of the boy out for obvious reasons! Matthew for example liked to use Mark's work and adjust it in places in order to make Jesus look good.

Papias stated that Mark the gospel writer "neither heard the Lord nor had been his disciple." Christians have had their own reasons for trying to make out the young man was Mark. One is they need to explain how it was known about the young man and two why he was mentioned in the gospel as if it went out of its way to tell us. They think people would surmise that if it were holy Mark dirty minds would be kept at bay. Dirty minds had to have been labouring which helps explain why the other gospels left the tale out - especially Luke who claimed to be thorough and who certainly had read Mark.

Jesus took responsibility for what his Church does when he said you tell a bad prophet who is a wolf in sheep's clothing only by the fruits that follow them. If there is no incriminating evidence against the prophet you must look at what his followers do for they are his spiritual brethren. Was Jesus a paedophile himself when his religion has had such a huge problem with that issue?

Jesus facilitated a culture that commanded and celebrated and protected rapists of female children. He didn't have to validate it but he did.

Posted online in 2017 response to Roy Moore's defenders trying to use the Bible to justify his alleged sex abuse of young girls

APPENDIX ON NEANISKOS

The uncensored Gospel of Mark uncovered by Morton Smith suggests Jesus was interfering with a young man, neaniskos, whom he "raised" from the dead.

The word normally translated "youth" in the New Testament is neaniskos. Neaniskos is derived from the word neos, meaning "new" and usually means a youth or a young man.

In Acts 20, a neanias named Eutychus fell asleep during one of Paul's long sermons. Bruce speculates, "Perhaps he had put in a hard day's work from dawn to sunset, and now in the stuffy atmosphere not even the words of an apostle could keep him from falling asleep."

He fell from the third story window. It appears Eutychus was killed, and Paul raised the neanias from the dead (Acts 20:9). He is referred to as a child [paida] later in the story (Acts 20:12), so it seems likely Eutychus was young, perhaps a young teenager.

Mark wrote of a neaniskos who, on the night of Jesus' arrest, followed Jesus clad only in a linen cloth. Some of the church fathers believed the neaniskos was Mark himself.

When soldiers grabbed him, the neaniskos lost the cloth and ran away naked (Mark 14:51). Lane suggests that the language Mark used "designates young men who are exceptionally strong and valiant, or faithful and wise."⁷¹ He identified this as a fulfillment of the prophecy in Amos 2:16: "And he who is stout of heart among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day" (ESV). Even the valiant young men were scattered the night of Jesus' arrest.

Paul uses a form of the word when he warns Timothy to "flee youthful [neōterikos] passions and pursue righteousness, faith, love, and peace . . ." (2 Tim 2:22). Mounce believes that while "youthful passions" could include "the sensual lusts of youth," the context better fits a "youthful temperament and the possible difficulty of avoiding arguments." Such issues seem more easily associated with "faith, love, and peace" (2 Tim 2:22). John offers insight into the role and expectations of the neaniskos when he addresses the church as children, fathers, and young men in 1 John 2, I am writing to you, little children, because your sins are forgiven for his name's sake. I am writing to you, fathers, because you know him who is from the beginning. I am writing to you, young men [neaniskoi], because you have overcome the evil one. I write to you, children, because you know the Father. I write to you, fathers, because you know him who is from the beginning. I write to you, young men [neaniskoi], because you are strong, and the word of God abides in you, and you have overcome the evil one. (1 John 2:12–14).

Twice John repeated that the neaniskoi have "overcome the evil one" (vv. 13, 14). He casts the young men as warriors. Because they are forgiven, they can overcome the devil. Stott writes, "The forgiveness of past sins must be followed by deliverance from sin's present power, justification by sanctification. So in both messages to the young men it is asserted that they have overcome the evil one. Their conflict has become a conquest."

In verse 14, John explains why the neaniskoi have overcome: they are "strong," and "the word of God abides" in them (1 John 2:14). Kruse indicates that the reason they are strong is because the word of God dwells in them. He writes, "Believers' victory over the evil one [is] achieved because God himself abides in them and his Son, Jesus Christ, protects them, and as a result they are able to overcome the evil one through their faith in God."

Paul told Timothy, "Let no one despise you for your youth"