



Does challenging superstition or faith protect people?
 Is it mistaken to support organised religion in membership or donations?

If people do good because they are human, not because God prompts them,
 is it right to risk giving God any credit when they alone own their good?



Patrick H
Gormley

"JESUS DIDN'T MENTION HOMOSEXUALITY"

Jesus never affirmed even a gay person who was in the closet. Even if he did, it would not mean he approved of people being public about it or having a partner on their arm in public. If gay sex was illegal in places, public homosexual relationships were illegal in even more places.

Gay Christians want to ignore the historical fact that it is part of the Christian faith to reject gay sex. They are not the only revisionists out there so why should we pay any heed to them? Their lies fool no one except those who pretend to be fooled for the sake of a political agenda.

The "Jesus didn't mention homosexuality" line is everywhere. But that does not tell us if he agreed with it, agreed with tolerating it or banned it. What if Jesus could not mention it for he found it abhorrent. The argument can lead to homophobia as well as gay affirmation. It is not the argument but how it is used.

Lies are no foundation for a gay person who wants rights in the Church.

If "gay" Christians are so sure they are right to disobey the Bible or Church then why do they hide their "gayness" so much? Where is their trust? The hypocrite pays homage to the perceived rightness of the values he disparages.

And gay Christians harass and divide the Church over gay rights and their arguments are hollow when they are targeted at the Church and not the Christian God or the Christian Jesus. Why should the Church be condemned for homophobia while Jesus gets a free pass and his role in it is ignored? And Christianity holds that in some real teaching and spiritual sense Jesus IS the Church! Why should living men and women be harassed over Jesus who is dead?

Oxymorons are common in the religious world. Gay Christians are one such oxymoron. The main argument they have is that God made them born gay. Arguing you are born gay so you can have sex with somebody the same sex is irrational. Being born gay or straight does not compel you to have sex with anyone. Gay Christians may help gay rights but they do not help the equally important right we have to get proper information instead of irrationality and half-truths. Gay Christians do not and cannot change the fact that Christianity is not Christians so it is possible for Christianity to be anti-gay even if no Christian is. It is their religion to follow not their religion to change. To worship Jesus is to risk worshipping a homophobe. To promote a homophobe unwittingly is still promoting a homophobe.

They turn to the Bible next. Everything has to be twisted to fit the lies of gay theology.

They would be out of a job if Jesus had chosen a different Torah text to make a point about Pharisees cherry picking the Law. He chose the one about stoning those who abuse or curse their parents. But what if he used the one banning gay sex? "You have let go of the commands of God and are holding on to human traditions. You have a fine way of setting aside the commands of God in order to observe your own traditions! For Moses said, 'If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood is upon them.' But you say that if anyone does that they can be fined instead. Thus you nullify the word of God by your tradition that you have handed down. And you do many things like that."

Jesus used the stoning of the boys as an example meaning he would have used the gay one. He does not care if we use it as long as we don't alter what he meant. Maybe he did use it on another occasion.

Acts 15 has sexual sin "sexual immorality" banned out of respect for the Jewish law by the apostles and as they were on about Old Testament sexual morality homosexuality too was definitely included in this ban which has never been revoked but which is in force for it cannot be revoked. The New Testament affirms it over and over on threat of everlasting damnation.

The assertion by God that gay sex makes the practitioners an abomination is said to be a cultural thing. No sane God would prescribe stoning to death if that is all it was! The reason the Bible sees homosexuality as an abomination is because it threatens marriage between a man and woman so by implication same sex marriage is the biggest gay sexual sin. Gay Christians argue that to assert homosexuals as lovable but homosexuality as an abomination is hate speech but even if it is hate you cannot prove it as long as the asserter says it is the sexual activity that is condemned not the doers. Biblically homosexuality is an abomination and so are the gays who do it. The biggest abomination would be homosexuality rather than homosexuals for without homosexuality there would be no homosexuals.

Incredibly, despite the Bible condemning sexual activity outside of marriage, gays who say they believe in Christ pretend that you can be a practicing homosexual and a Christian! The Bible can only mean one thing by marriage - marriage between a man and a woman.

Jesus made the sin of wanting to kill somebody equal to murder so it is no surprise that he referred to sex outside of marriage as prostitution. When you are that severe about anger why can't you be a bigot regarding gay sex? In the New Testament original writings, the Greek word porneia, prostitution, is used on 25 occasions. Even today the word means prostitution. It is interesting that gay activists try to lie that the New Testament only condemns gay prostitution etc not gay loving sex. Yet porneia meant all kinds of "prostitution" gay and straight.

Shout this, Jesus did not mention homosexuality directly we are told. The truth he is did. He just did not mention it specifically. He lumped it in with the collective term pornea which included even bestiality and incest.

Jesus expressed huge esteem for the Book of Isaiah which in 3:5-9 goes, "And the people shall oppress one another, yes, every man his neighbour. The child shall be bold toward the elder, and the base toward the honourable. Their very looks bear witness against them; their sin like Sodom they vaunt, they hide it not. Woe to them! They deal out evil to themselves". Does this read like Sodom was vaunting mere inhospitality? Nobody does that. It reads like gays being proud of their sin.

Some think Jesus mentioned homosexuality in Luke 17:

Just as it was in the days of Noah, so also will it be in the days of the Son of Man.

27 People were eating, drinking, marrying and being given in marriage up to the day Noah entered the ark. Then the flood came and destroyed them all.

28 It was the same in the days of Lot. People were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building.

29 But the day Lot left Sodom, fire and sulfur rained down from heaven and destroyed them all.

30 It will be just like this on the day the Son of Man is revealed.

31 On that day no one who is on the housetop, with possessions inside, should go down to get them. Likewise, no one in the field should go back for anything.

32 Remember Lot's wife!

33 Whoever tries to keep their life will lose it, and whoever loses their life will preserve it.

34 I tell you, on that night two **men** will be in one bed; one will be taken and the other left.

35 Two women will be grinding grain together; one will be taken and the other left."

36 "Where, Lord?" they asked.

37 He replied, "Where there is a dead body, there the vultures will gather."

If the text reads two men and not two people as many translators believe, then Jesus could be referring to the Jewish tradition of his time that said the sin of Sodom was men sleeping with men sexually. He says those taken will not be going to a nice fate but will be like vultures about to feast on a body. The vultures are taken away to be put together. But what about the man left behind? He is spared because he is not like Lot's wife and does not try to escape. He spares himself. There is no room for thinking he is judged or not judged. The notion of gay Christians that Jesus is saying one gay man in a bed goes to Heaven and one lesbian grinding with another one as in lesbian sex is total rubbish. Why would Jesus use such an image? It would be too exclusive for the events he describes would affect heterosexuals who are 99% of the population!!! The text talks about a cataclysm not about Heaven or Hell.

When Jesus said marriage is one man and one woman for life as it was planned from the beginning by God that clearly rules out any other form of sexual relationship. It ruled out divorce. He referred to a text in Genesis which says that a man unites with his wife in one flesh and they are bound for life and the reason is that God made woman for Adam to be his partner by making her from his side to be his equal.

This was about marriage as in sexual commitment where they are one in heart to the exclusion of others. He is not primarily thinking of legal marriage. Legal divorce does not imply legal marriage. So it is clear. Committed gay couples are not married in any sense.

Jesus taking this as a model means he would have written 1 Corinthians 11 the way Paul did. There Paul referring to this same text in Genesis says that the man is not of the woman but the woman is of the man. Paul uses the Jewish law to argue that women must show obedience in Church in 1 Corinthians 14:34.

The ban on divorce that this went with is harsher than any condemnation of gay sex.

To argue Jesus was okay with gay marriage would amount to saying that he had no problem with gay divorces on demand and on request.

An indirect condemnation of something such as homosexuality can speak louder than a direct one.

He said a man leaves his father and other and cleaves to his wife and they become one flesh. One flesh refers to how body fits body in heterosexual sex and man and woman are united.

One flesh may have the idea of man and woman becoming one in sex and a new life unifying their bodies appears - a child. A man and woman are united in sex but even then not in the way they are united in making a child. The child is the flesh of both. It refers to man being destined to cleave to woman in sex and in his heart which is a polite way of saying that homosexuality is an illness.

The notion he does not mean all men is only reading modern ideas back into it. He meant all men. If it was anybody else we would be taking all to mean all. Its about male nature not just men.

Adam and Eve then are considered married though they never did a ceremony. The notion is clear. God is master of marriage. This is implied by how Adam is put to sleep. God takes a rib and turns it into woman. As this is a miracle, we can leave aside any nonsense about how male chromosomes were turned into female ones. The idea is that they are made to be by each others side which is why he mines Adam's side. The story is constructed with a deeper meaning. Man with man is out.

He can choose to recognise a couple as married if they are "made for each other" if he chooses. The rule is that Adam and Eve were different for there was no justice of the peace to do the wedding so others need a ceremony. What married them is that they wanted to be one flesh, sexually joined together, and how God made Eve to suit Adam. Sex was their marriage as reflected in how in their embrace penis fits vagina.

In Christianity, you will never understand its teaching on sex unless you see that it is not just about the bedroom and what goes on there. Sex in the book of Genesis as affirmed by Christ is about what you are – man or woman as sexual beings. Sex is your nature expressed in sexual acts and is not just the sexual acts. Jesus and the Bible both say that God created all people male and female and males and females become one in the marital act. This is a nod to how body fits body.

Jesus had been asked when divorce was licit according to the law of Moses. He responded by saying what marriage was a lifelong thing. He talked about marriage not divorce. So it is not about saying divorce is wrong but about saying marriage is for life between a man and woman. Later on he talked about divorce and said that divorcing somebody is causing adultery for it is permitting them to remarry.

Gay Christians reply that he was not saying same sex marriages are forbidden. He was only speaking of context of the times in which the custom was for the opposite sex to marry. This is only an interpretation and is claiming psychic powers of clairvoyance. It is only justified by what they want the Bible to say. But that is no justification.

Nothing in the Bible indicates that same-sex marriages are acceptable. They make their speculations the word of God. When Jesus goes back to the dawn of time to make a model out of how God made Adam and Eve and paired them sexually he makes it clear that the one man and one woman model is for all eternity. He is not speaking in the context of his own time.

Giving a reason that rules out gay sex is stronger than merely saying, "homosexuality is a sin." Jesus was speaking loudly.

Paul says in 1 Corinthians 1:1-3 that anybody that marries should have his or her opposite sex partner and have sex with

them. He also said that he had the support of the other apostles and that their doctrines were those of Christ.

Ephesians 5:31 repeats Jesus teaching that there is male and there is female and the parents raise the male to unite in one flesh sexually with the female. That is the purpose of the male. If the male cannot do it owing to being homosexual or something else it does not prove it is not his purpose.

Genesis uses a story to make the point that if a man wants a relationship or needs a relationship as Adam did in his position, then it is not good for him not to have his woman. That was how moral lessons were taught in those days. The story taught the moral lesson. "It is not good for the man to be alone", is the same as God saying, "It must be a woman".

Jesus referred to Sodom and Gomorrah. The story is that angels looking like normal men went there and were in Lot's house and the males of the city came looking for sex with them. Jesus knew that the story was that the males came looking for sex with the angels and were both big men and small men ga-dowl and miq-qa-ton. The small? That refers to twinks - very young gay males. The angels responded by miraculously blinding them. The Bible says miracles communicate a message both directly and indirectly though symbolism so the blinding of them all is implying that gay people are unable to see how sinful it is to be gay. It is nonsense to say that they needed reminding that raping angels is a sin. The story saying nothing about an intention to rape. It matches how many gay people see nothing wrong in being gay.

Lot had daughters which he was going to give to the mob to save the angels. They were already married when he offered them. Lot is praised in the Bible for his righteousness so it is considered better to let your married daughters be ravished than for men to have sex with men. Did God tempt the men of Sodom by appearing as sexy male angels? In the early Old Testament angels are considered to be apparitions of God. You would probably think they were just plain looking but the homosexuals just wanted somebody new to have sex with. They were lusting after the appearance of God.

It is stupidity like Christian allies of LGBT plus that enables religion/God/Bible based hate. They paint the Bible as misunderstood and inclusive. Yet Jesus had a very nasty judgemental tone. It is strange to be okay with that. Being okay with abuse is being okay with abuse of LGBT plus. It is inviting the judgementals to judge! The notion that Sodom was devastated for inhospitality by God is insane. Jesus referred to that episode with approval. A god attacking a gay city is clearly homophobic even if he doesn't admit it. Even if he denies it. He had to be homophobic for everybody was in that culture. Jesus knew that gays would be judged when he referred to Sodom for his culture took the story to be a proof that the divine will take drastic action against gay communities.

Not a line of the Sodom story he referred to mentions or clearly indicates rape. Allies lie that the story condemns not gay sex but sexual violence. Lot offered his daughters to the mob of men who wanted sex with the angels in his house implying the sex would have been consensual. Lot would not have been called righteous by the Bible if he wanted them raped. Ezekiel mentions the inhospitality but then moans about unspecified abominations in the city.

John Boswell was a "Christian" with a gay agenda who twisted the Bible as if it only condemned abusive gay sex not loving gay sex. That Boswell was a proven liar is an easily established fact. He abused his position as a scholar to fool scholars and only gave the message, "Instead of admitting the Bible should be torn up for hate we will twist it. I will get allies for LGBT and I don't care what will happen to LGBT when those allies end up standing by the Bible despite realising it does hate LGBT. And what about those who decide the Bible is true because the allies encourage such belief?"

The lies seem at times to suppose that unless Christians are manipulated to think LGBT fits their faith they will attack the latter. The desperation is pathetic.

Jesus did mention homosexuality. The aura is homophobic. Jesus certainly did not mention that gay sex should be legal.