

## WAS JESUS HOMOSEXUAL OR INTO YOUNG BOYS OR BOTH?

Page 132 of the excellent *The Psychology of Religious Doubt* by Philip Helfaer, Beacon Press, Boston, 1972, says "Homosexual feelings and fantasies, and feminine submissive longings, can be channeled into the relationship with God." And also that a man's "intense love for Jesus may be a homosexual, narcissistic object choice, sometimes overriding any other object choice in the individual's life." This means that the Law of Moses which utterly damns gay sex and deliberate coveting for gay sex rules out adoring this man. Jesus though a homophobe - and his religion which shows what it is by bearing homophobic fruit - is still in a way the best friend the gay orientation ever had.

Gay groups who argue Jesus would not have been anti gay need to recognise that if he was okay with male to male sex then it would have most likely have been sex of the men with boys type for relationships of the time started getting sexual when one partner was just a child. His own mother would have been 11 or 12 when she gave birth.

True acceptance of gay sexuality in Christianity requires that gay sex be seen as a form of worship perhaps in private but if sex is sacred then why not in public as well? Until you bring God to your sexual acts and others let you there is no proper acceptance. If Jesus was gay then to worship Jesus is to worship gayness just like to worship his sacred heart is to worship him. Jesus was not perfect but we worship him because of his imperfection. It is homophobia to fail to worship him for being gay if he was gay. Why worship his imperfection as a man and not his sexuality?

The Bible states that homosexuality is a very grave sin. The Book of Leviticus tells us that God commanded that if a man lay with a man both were to be stoned to death without pity. It does not give any reasons for this rule or any restrictions so it must have commanded this because it was regarded as intolerably evil. Jesus stated that this book along with the other four books of the Law was infallible scripture.

Did Jesus live up to its standards? There is evidence that Jesus was an active homosexual though he certainly refused to admit that the murderous laws of his Bible that wanted gay men stoned was evil.

Satan tempted Jesus three times in the desert. It is telling how Satan never offered Jesus the love of a woman to tempt him into sin and making Satan's temptations even more tempting. It is as if Satan knew there would be no point. He didn't offer him the love of a man for he felt that Jesus would have been put off by society's hostility to homosexuality.

The Church kept portions of Mark's gospel back for fear people would surmise that Jesus was homosexual upon reading them. We have the edited version of Mark. It is only in recent years that a fuller account, called the Secret Gospel, has been known of. It was claimed that there was a verse in the Secret Gospel running: "Naked man with naked man" which implied that Jesus was naked with a young man he sort of raised from the dead. Church Father St Clement of Alexandria alleged that it was a falsification. He did not give any evidence - he just made a bare assertion. He even ordered Christians who saw the complete gospel to deny any knowledge of this gospel, the secret gospel of Mark, even under oath and to promote the shorter version that we currently have instead. He was certainly capable of lying and this is the kind of man Christians honour as a saint. It is possible that the verse really did belong in the gospel. Clement when he advised lying, could have been lying about this. Also, when Clement wanted lies and secrecy to surround the content of the secret gospel it would make you think that his cleaner version of the secret gospel was not what he wanted to hide. He was embarrassed at the homosexuality of Jesus. The secret gospel says the young man begged Jesus to be with him that night and the young man came to Jesus wearing a robe over his naked body and Jesus taught him a mystery at night. The homosexual overtones are there.

The Secret Gospel says Jesus seemingly raised a lad from the dead. Jesus took his hand. This was unnecessary for a shout had come from the tomb before Jesus went in indicating that the lad was not dead at all. The handholding was then probably sexual for it can't otherwise be accounted for. Also if Jesus was single and unmarried he would not have been holding hands with men except in a romantic way! He would have known how onlookers would read this and didn't care. That says it all. And we are told that the lad immediately loved Jesus upon looking at him. And wanted to be with him and the pair lived in his house for a while. This certainly does look like homosexuality being described euphemistically. Granted the word used for love is not the word for sexual love but for the sake of euphemism that fact may be irrelevant. What would looking have to do with loving outside of a sexual context. It is telling how the Jesus held the lad's hand and how it is said the lad loved him upon looking upon him - sexual love and romantic love is caused by looking. No wonder the tale was taken out of Mark in the second century.

In the Gospel of Mark, our current version, we read that a young man was following Jesus who had nothing on but a sheet over his naked body on the night Jesus was arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane. That alone makes one suspicious. Jesus knew what the Jews would say for they hated him but that didn't stop him being alone with this young man who was semi-

naked. The crowd who came to arrest Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane found him alone. The young man was grabbed but he left and ran away naked leaving the sheet behind. They could have stopped him but why didn't they? They must have deliberately removed the sheet though Mark says they pulled it off him accidentally. Why would they have let him go if they wanted to hold on to him? Mark is trying to cover something up. They wanted to see if the man had been indulging in sexual activity with Jesus. They must have learned what they were trying to find out when they let him go. They wanted to find Jesus guilty of this crime and they did. Was the man so young that the crime would have been paedophilia? Was that why they let him run away? He was too young to be charged. Maybe a couple of men did run after him and arrest him.

But it might be objected that when they let the young man run off they had found nothing to indicate anything indecent. But he was naked. They wanted people to see him fleeing from the scene to make a show of Jesus. They might have sought him out after that to punish him and especially if they knew he would not be too hard to find again. It was Jesus they were after for the time being. This doubtful for it was not hard to arrest two men. Nobody lets people who should and can be arrested run away.

At that time of year, water was scarce in the area. That puts paid to the speculation of some that the young man was there for a baptism ritual. Plus Jesus never baptised.

One thing for sure is that when Jesus was in a quiet place with a scantily clad young man the pair must have been going to do something of a sexual nature.

The apostles had to contend with many licentious gay Christian groups as the epistles themselves show. If Jesus had been practising homosexual then they would be evidence that he might have been one too. It would also explain why the crowds who welcomed Jesus to Jerusalem turned against him no time later. In that case, he would have been found out in the Garden of Gethsemane when he seems to have been getting consolation in the form of a young man who was not far from naked.

Jesus let Lazarus die in order that he could raise him to life again. At the tomb of Lazarus, Jesus cried a lot making the Jews remark, "See how [tenderly] he loved him" (John 11). You don't waste time over a man you are going to resurrect. Either Jesus did not know that Lazarus was going to come out of the tomb alive or if he did as John says then he must have been in love with him. Love makes a parting tearful and sad.

The rich young man came to Jesus and told him he kept all the commandments (Mark 10). We are told that Jesus looked upon him and loved him. He did not love him spiritually for he told the man that he sinned in being attached to his wealth. To love a sinner except in so far as you want her or him to repent is not loving her or him but rewarding her or his sins and just to desire a person to repent is not loving them for you don't say your enemies love you just because they are glad you are alive so they can pick on you. He could not love him emotionally except falling in love with him at first sight for he hardly knew him. Jesus did not even know why the man called him good. Looked upon him and loved him certainly shows that Jesus' love didn't start until he looked at the young man. There is only one kind of love that happens in response to looking!

The John gospel speaks of the disciple Jesus loved. This disciple only appears near the end as if he were a secret boyfriend. And he turns up at a point where Jesus disrobes and washes men's feet with little on.

You don't speak that way of somebody who is loved the best out of a number of people who are loved too. The gospel says that Jesus loved all his disciples. He said love one another as I have loved you and no man can love better than to give his life for his friends. That was a lot of love. Clearly Jesus' love for the disciple was sexual or romantic. The disciple claimed to have made an input into the gospel or to be its author. He wouldn't name himself as if he were worried about how people would react. React about what? Perhaps Jesus' lover? It alone makes sense. And especially when according to the same gospel, he lay on Jesus' chest at the last supper and was whispering to Jesus. Also at the end of the gospel, the disciple is described by the gospel writer as the disciple who lay on Jesus' chest at the last supper. There was something remarkable about this - it was like two men in love. Why else draw attention to it again?

Why did Judas betray Jesus with a kiss? The kiss is inexplicable for all Judas had to do was to point at him or hug him. Interesting that Jesus had to be identified and he was allegedly exceptionally well known. Anyway, Judas would want to arouse needless contempt by kissing a man to give him into the hands of those who hate him. Judas must have set Jesus up by offering Jesus himself sexually in full view of the men hiding in the bushes in the hope of duping Jesus to prove his homosexuality. When the men saw the kiss they were repulsed and decided to arrest Jesus. The gospels ask for our interpretation. All books necessarily do. If it fits it can be believed. But it must be said that this does more than just fit the narratives. It makes sense of them.

The gospels do not say if Jesus was married which strongly implies that he was not. For a man like him to be single was truly astonishing in those days where the single life was considered almost as a crime. God incarnate or the Son of God

could get married. It is stupid to argue that such a person would not marry a creature when he was the maker. If Jesus was man and became man there would be no degradation in that. Jesus' celibacy would seem to indicate a strong dislike of physical contact with women. The New Testament says he was troubled by all kinds of temptations so he did have a sex-drive.

Jesus might have forbidden divorce only because he did not like to see men being happy if they took wives. There is absolutely no justification for his eccentric divorce ban so some prejudice caused it. It hurt him to see men being married while he could not touch them. The apostles said that it is better for a man not to marry at all when they heard Jesus banning divorce. He didn't tell them they were wrong but rather said that whoever can accept this teaching must do it.

Jesus rose from the dead not resuscitated. The returned Jesus is a transformed one whose body is like a ghost or can materialise and change how it looks. So Jesus can be a woman today and a man tomorrow and gender fluid every other day. Oh he can be a she-male too! The Church and Jesus despite their anti-gay bigotry accidentally turned him into an LGBTQ+ icon!

Jesus complained that Mary Magdalene touched him after his "resurrection" but he had no problem with being felt up by Thomas and other men! He had been known to refer to two pagan women as little bitches in Mark 7. He didn't like women and Mark says he didn't get along with his mother.

The Gospel of Philip says that the disciples complained when Jesus was kissing Mary Magdalene. He told them he loved them like her meaning they should not be complaining about his sexual kissing of her. He must have meant that he had done it with them too but was focusing more on her at the moment or that he would like to but was just kissing her not them. You would think this gospel says he was possibly bisexual. There was no need for it to say this at all so it only said it because the writer thought it was true. He would certainly have been gay if he only liked one woman and loads of men!

If Jesus had no father then Jesus despite perhaps having the look of a male body must have actually been genetically female and probably attracted to men. What would you expect if it was an egg growing without a sperm?

There is reason to believe Jesus was homosexual if he lived. The sins Jesus commits in the gospel of John where he miraculously provides wine for men who were already drunk and lying to his brothers about not going to the festival in Jerusalem indicates that early Christian traditions had Jesus down as a libertine. If so, if he was interested in men he would certainly have had sex with them.

Jesus was not the Son of God if he was gay for God forbade homosexuality under very severe penalties in the Jewish Law. He said no man with a defect could be his priest. Clearly no man could be his Son and superior to the priests if he was gay which God would have considered to have been a defect.

Christians who deny they are homophobic would not react kindly to the suggestion that Jesus was homosexual even if he didn't practice. Catholics wouldn't be happy if somebody suggested that the Virgin Mary could have been gay. This shows how they suspect that it is dirty and perverted and evil to have a homosexual inclination.

The antinomian tendencies of the John Gospel which has Jesus doing wrong things and still pleasing God would indicate that Jesus could have been a practicing homosexual. Antinomians believe that Jesus did away with the law of God so that we can have sex, lie for a kindly reason and get drunk if we wish. The gospel presents Jesus as providing alcohol for a wedding party that was already drunk and lying to his brothers.