

The Gospel of Women, Homosexuals and other LGBT

Fabrice RENAR
F.R RENARD MAISONNEUVE
DE THOMAS DE VALLUS

THE GOSPEL OF WOMEN, HOMOSEXUALS AND OTHER LGBT

Essay in human sciences
and social

This book was published on www.bookelis.com

ISBN : 979-10-359-9000-8

Fabrice RENAR

All rights of reproduction, adaptation and translation,
in whole or in part, for all countries.

The author is the sole owner of the rights and is
responsible for the content of this book.

Preliminary presentation, A friendly wink...

Before we begin this very heated debate, we are going to open up a very nice, and above all vital, discussion about a certain mentality which holds that man - *the male of mankind* - is the origin of woman. Such a view is clearly expressed in the Christian world, across the Bible, in the book of Genesis, chapter II, verses 18 to 23:

"The LORD God said, 'It is not good for man to be alone. I must make him a helper to match. So the LORD God fashioned out of the ground all the wild animals and birds of the air, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them. The man gave names to all the cattle, the birds of the air and all the wild animals, but he could not find a suitable helper for a man.

Then the Lord God made the man fall asleep. He took one of his ribs and closed the flesh in its place.

Then the LORD God fashioned a woman from the rib he had taken from the man and brought her to the man. Then the man cried out, "This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh! This one shall be called woman, for she was taken out of man".

To cut a long story short, men and women have the same number of ribs. The author of this part of the Bible therefore ignored the fact that the skeletons of the two sexes show no anatomical difference in the number of ribs. Consequently, the thesis that woman came out of man can be considered a mere opinion and certainly not the revelation of a divinity at the service of Truth. Nor will we go into the symbolism of the bone to lend credibility to the words of this biblical author; to do so would be to show a lack of loyalty to humanity.

But we also recognise that it would be too easy to go round and round the Bible to eliminate the glaring inconsistencies. Nor should we go too far! In that case, it would be better to rewrite the Bible, taking care to update certain scientific knowledge that the authors of the time did not possess!

We must therefore admit that the Bible is not a complete book, nor is it entirely true... It is simply a collection of opinions imposed by a community that gradually became leading. The Edict of Thessalonica

- also known as the "Cunctos populos"; see also Theodosian Code 16.1.2 - is a flagrant example of this tyranny, so to speak. The following extract is very clear on this subject:

"(...) We want all peoples governed by the just measure of our clemency to live in the religion which the divine Apostle Peter passed on to the Romans and which the Pontiff Damasus and Peter, the Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity, clearly follow.

Thus, according to apostolic discipline and evangelical doctrine, we must believe that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one Divinity, invoked as equal Majesty and benevolent Trinity.

We order that those who follow this law take the name of Catholic Christians.

As for the others, we consider that they incur, by their folly and their error, the infamy attached to heretical doctrines, that their small groups do not deserve the name of Churches and that they will be struck down, first by divine vengeance, then by a punishment which, in accordance with the heavenly decision, we will initiate (...)".

Have you noticed, as we have, that Theodosius' declaration giving Peter the status of apostle to the Romans is a fantasy by the way? Did this emperor ignore the information of the apostle Paul, who was a contemporary of this same "*divine*" Peter, so to speak? The proof can be found in Galatians II from verse 7 onwards:

"On the contrary, seeing that the gospel had been appointed to me for the uncircumcised, as to Peter for the circumcised, - for he who made Peter the apostle of the circumcised also made me the apostle of the Gentiles..."

A Roman being a pagan; so, from a logical point of view, Peter was the apostle of the Jews and Paul, that of the Romans... Now, this Theodosius I knew this because he had already read it somewhere! So, not being an idiot, he had understood what he had read! But apparently he preferred Peter to Paul... That was his absolute right! We must therefore believe that Theodosius I did not want to be affiliated to the spiritual guardianship of Paul according to this Edict of Thessalonica... But why did he prefer Peter to Paul? We will never know exactly. However, we can assume that Paul's mentality towards women, homosexuals and other LGBT people did not suit this emperor in relation to the newly established state religion.

Theodosius I's fixation^{er} on Peter... A little appetiser to start with; why not!

However, we know Peter's mentality... But we also know Paul's; to this end, see the sub-section entitled "The persistent and legitimate doubt about the pseudo-homosexual or at least homophilic relationship between Jesus Christ and the disciple John", in which we talk about Paul's relationship with LGBT people... So we are going to launch into this explanation! We dare to, because those who hold the sources do not always play the game of transparency...

What there is to know about Peter is contained, among other things, in the Gospel of Mary of Magdala. So let this information no longer be a secret! Read the translation by Daniel Meurois-Givaudan :

Peter added: "Is it possible that the master would talk to a woman like that about secrets we don't know? Should we change our ways and listen to this woman? Did he really put her above us and prefer her to us?"

Then Mary wept. And she said to Peter, "My brother Peter, what are you thinking? Do you think I invented this vision all by myself in my imagination? Or that I'm telling lies about the Master?"

Levi (the apostle Matthew) spoke up: "Peter, you have always been a hothead; now I see you [for contextually: "now I see through you"] railing against the woman as our opponents do. And yet, if the master has made her worthy, who are you to reject her?"

The master certainly knew her very well [after all, she was his wife!], he loved her more than we did (...)".

Peter could not stand a woman - *a woman or a transgender perhaps? No one knows* - had authority over a man and, inevitably, he rejected all those who were related to women in his time; in other words, eunuchs. These are the equivalent of today's LGBT people. This is the same Saint Peter that women and LGBT people ignorantly still pray to today! What a bluff!

Now it does not matter, because we have understood the ins and outs of the case! Read this other reference; it is in logion 114 of the Gospel of Thomas:

Simon Peter said to them, "Let Mariam come out from among us, because women are not worthy of Life!"

Jesus said, "Behold, I will draw her, that I may make her male, that she also may be a living spirit, like you males. For every woman who is made male will enter the kingdom of heaven."

Well then! To come to logion 114 of the Gospel of Thomas, Jesus radically opposed Simon Peter... Indeed, when he defended Mary Magdalene, he went so far as to declare that *he would make of her a special kind of man, a "living breath"*.

Implicitly, it is still legitimate to deduce that Christ was admitting that he was going to make Mary a disciple with powers like the others; in other words, that he was going to transform her into a *living breath in the* same way as the twelve, who were also described as "*living breaths*". Mary of Magdala had thus become a woman-apostle, and this reality must be accepted today. But alas! Her apostolic aura has been replaced by that of the Virgin Mary, even though Marian worship was never a practice of the first apostles; nor did Jesus Christ ever advocate it. So it's a drift...

However, one point remains problematic: why does Jesus say in these terms that he will make "*woman become man*"? Are we to understand that the man remains superior to the woman? Superior in what way? Superior why? Had Jesus simply contradicted himself, or was Jesus made to contradict himself in a clumsy and incoherent speech, as if it were some kind of declaration from a fictitious Jesus with a few misogynistic tendencies perhaps? Quite an enigma! Let's check the internal coherence of the exegetical statement in question:

First of all, we have seen that only the direct disciples were chosen to be qualified as "living breath", which implies that not all Christians have this quality. We also assume that there are many individuals who call

themselves priests, pastors, disciples of Jesus, but who are not living breaths.

This is perfectly normal, since this is a degree of initiation that corresponds to a specific mysticism... Even if some Christians claim to be Christians, point out to them the hysterical 'children's crusade' that took place around 1212 in Cologne (...) And then! Isn't it man's imagination that creates the identity of a god or goddess? In short!

So, all these gentlemen and ladies who declare themselves to be "new apostles" and the like, are not living breaths, but seducers, some of whom call themselves "apostles", etc.? Just a moment! There is only one detail that has escaped us; we are first going to shed some light on the term "living breath"...

To tell the truth, we do not have the exact definition of this initiatory expression because we were not present when Christ uttered it... However, we will try to get closer to the mystical meaning of this symbolism. We also know that the original Greek interpretation translated "living breaths", a term whose depth of concept was no doubt not mastered by the interpreter of the specific knowledge of Thomas alias Dydime (this name means "twin"); who was this man's twin? Jesus, symbolically speaking... In other words, Thomas was in a way the master's alter ego.

What else? The other master who succeeded him! It is this Dydime who holds the doctrine of the master thinker Jesus Christ concerning woman and man, among other things! In this sense, he is his twin in mystical language, of course! He was certainly not his genetic twin, and even less his look-alike. And let's not forget that all the names of the disciples of Jesus Christ had a mystical significance... Sometimes, certain evangelical interpretations can prove to be a real danger because of their imprecision, camouflaged under extravagant concepts...

Here, we sincerely believe that to understand the term "living breath", we must refer to the first verses of Genesis in the Hebrew language; in particular, the famous expression "ruah Elohim" which means breath of God/gods. The expression used by the initiates, "living breaths", is therefore equivalent to that of "life-giving spirits".

So Jesus endowed his disciples with powers that transformed them into life-giving spirits! So how *can* a human being *become a spirit*? From a concrete point of view, do you even know what that means: to *become a spirit*? It's very important to understand this passage!

The life-giving spirits are "energies" that can connect to your consciousness; it is important that you read

our book entitled "A people, an authentic knowledge, a therapy, the Kalinago - Volume I".

You have not yet understood what we want to bring you!

Jesus' direct disciples were therefore 'possessed' by all the spirits (energy beings) of which the master was aware, since it was he himself who assigned these spirits to the consciousness of each of his disciples; a veritable ritual of a quantum nature - before you laugh, wait until you read our other book quoted above - including the impure spirit that he did not release from Judas' existence! The term "life-giving spirits" is therefore the expression of a quantum principle, a wave principle, for those who do not know it; being "possessed" is also a matter of quantum science... Jesus' disciples did not walk 'alone', so to speak! This quantum knowledge, which can be used simply and humanely by human beings, is also found among certain Amerindian peoples, and so on.

So get rid of this conventional Christianity! Instead, seek out true Christianity. The one you are approaching today...

We repeat: you will not find the answers in Greece, Rome or Israel! What's more, pastors and priests have ended up creating a false Kingdom of Heaven! What a disgrace!

Jesus Christ had denounced Peter's mentality...

Continuing,

At the time of Jesus Christ, discipleship was nothing more than a degree of initiation. All the more so since the apostles had become *living breath disciples* in a progressive manner; hence the idea of an inner journey until mastery of a prior mystical teaching; otherwise these men would never have been qualified as "*living breaths*". Jesus therefore trained his disciples, including Mary of Magdala, despite Peter's displeasure... So now how do we explain the Master's statement: "*I will guide her to make her a man*"?

Was he talking about a change of sex or clothes? Of course not... Did it refer to the disappearance of Mary's breasts or menstruation? Of course not... Was it about her hair growth? Certainly not! So we can admit that Jesus was not talking to Mary, but rather wanted to make his male disciples understand that every woman who has become a living breath is equal to a "*living breath-man*". The real Jesus therefore broke the male-female taboo by demanding that a disciple consider himself neither male nor female; more precisely, Jesus Christ wanted his disciples to place themselves above the male and female phenotypic dimensions in order to approach the true notion of the soul. Instead, he wanted them to

consider the feminine and masculine dimensions that attach to beings.

So by saying *"I'll make her a man"*, the master thinker also meant *"I'll give her access to the male dimension"* by making love to her, for example. And why not! By the way, the master was ridiculing his stubborn disciple!

In any case, if Jesus Christ proposed to intervene to bring her into contact with the male dimension, it was not in order to justify Mary Magdalene, his official companion, but rather to mock Peter, so irritated was he by Peter's down-to-earth reasoning. Such a position is tenable for two reasons:

First of all, when you read between the lines of Simon Peter's statement mentioned above, you will see that Jesus simply refuses to give in to the mentality of this disciple, who wanted women to be considered inferior at all costs.

By way of example, the Master did not hesitate to say to him, no doubt out of provocation: *"I will make her a man"*; that means: "I will make her the equal of men; the implication is: *"of you too, Simon Peter!"*; so Jesus was not concerned about the sensitivity of this disciple during this exchange. In a way, he shut him up

without any possible compromise! Full stop...

On the other hand, from the case of Mary, Jesus moved on to that of all women.

Such reinforcement meant that he was setting himself up as a defender of women's dignity against machismo... By the way, this kind of behaviour is nothing new! Here the master's message is very clear.

We have to admit that Jesus imposes his will on his disciples. This can be read as follows:

Not only will Mary Magdalene be their equal (by which I mean whether they like it or not), but all women can be; by which I mean the category of individuals who have this feminine dimension within them, that is, the eunuch gender.

This category broadly corresponds to today's LGBT... If we have to speak colloquially, this kind of reaction from the master of thought can be translated as follows:

Disciples, I don't care about your prejudices. This is the way it's going to be! Whether you like it or not!

Machismo is therefore the enemy of a spiritual approach to the Truth (...)

According to Jesus, all those who possess the feminine dimension within them have the same value as men...

Let's remember that the exchange between Jesus and Simon Peter, presented in this realistic way, suggests that the latter was confronted with one of the Master's intellectual positions; a vision diametrically opposed to his own... At that precise moment, Jesus put a definitive end to the foolish inferiority maintained by this disciple.

According to the statements made in logion 114 of the Gospel of Thomas, Jesus did not just titillate Peter, he pushed the whole thing into his psyche, and did so without mercy. So much the worse for Peter! What's more, would he have had a bad influence on the organisation of the Christian Church after the departure of his master? Did he prevent Mary from being an apostle?

We also point out that this macho mentality is more cultural than anything else and, for example, we cite the reign of Hatshepsut to demonstrate that the male of the human race does not logically have a monopoly on ascendancy over a society, over a people, just because he imagines himself to be

sexually superior. How human this illusion is; perhaps it is more masculine than feminine! You only have to read the history of certain cultures to realise this! Even in Israel, there was a woman who was judge over the people... Such a status forcefully demonstrates the incoherence of certain passages in the book of Leviticus concerning a certain vision of man, the male, as the centre of human existence.

The truth is that there have been many interpreters and tendencies, no doubt macho, but above all, it must be acknowledged that these interpreters have not consulted each other. And perhaps that's all to the good, because their incoherence teaches us something.

As a result, the biblical composition inherited some of this phallocratic atmosphere, shall we say... For those who did not know that there was *a judge* in Israel, we quote the name of this personality: *Deborah*.

We also invite you to read her short biography in chapters IV and V of the biblical book Judges. This woman's spouse was a man called Barac; so making love with her man and deriving delicious pleasure from it, full of eruptive orgasms, did not diminish her role as a prophetess; a spiritual woman "*fucks*" like everyone else; she can like hard style too; it's

certainly not a sin! Come on! Let us stop mixing brushes...

Our first opinion, ladies and gentlemen, is that the male and the male dimension are not superior to the female dimension, as you have always been told or taught!

This was a delusion of the phallocratic Greco-Romans, among others, and it has been passed on to you by the pseudo-Christianity that came into being with the Council of Nicea... So land from this intoxication! Of course, it is a forced landing in the face of such evidence, which forces us to admit that, in the end, the animal domination of the male over the female made the latter imagine that he was master of the feminine dimension of being... It is the equivalent of a man with a gun who thinks he is invincible. Then, the day he no longer has that weapon, he takes the worst beating of his life... This apostle Peter is the image of such a man! No one knows the full CV of his ministry! Did he die a martyr's death, as some would have us believe? Why in this basilica and not elsewhere? Nobody knows... As far as we are concerned, we dare not speculate on all this on this day of solemn rendezvous with the Truth.

In the end, this Roman emperor, Theodosius I^{er}, chose Peter because he knew that Peter reasoned in

the image of the Roman man: he was a phallocrat... We are not inventing anything when we write this, because the Gospel of Thomas, at least, attests to Peter's mentality. Some will say so!

In addition, this same Theodosius was to impose his vision of the divine on the one that was supposed to have come from Christ: the Church! More exactly: the umpteenth church, because under his reign, Jesus Christ had Caucasian features this time... This emperor then established a Trinity that Christ himself never preached. That was also his absolute right! Is it not? For your information, according to the Gospel of Thomas, there is no mention of *the "Holy Spirit"*; rather, it speaks of the *"Pure Spirit"* who dwells above the Father, who is above the Son; so there is no notion of equality between the three. Jesus himself said in the Gospels that the *"Father"* is *"above the Son"*...

By the way, it's a fact that imagining and idealising God is one of man's strong points, and certain behaviours show that God can apparently be made to say anything and everything! Theodosius I^{er} and his Trinity are a flagrant example.

Consequently, if this tendency to delimit the meaning of a concept is valid for our time, it is all the more valid for ancient times, when opinion was confused with divine revelation.

In this sense, God can also be defined as a cultural phenomenon resulting from an imaginative capacity that can be directed according to a targeted interest, even if the object generating the attention seems to be experienced as imposed, conventional knowledge.

On the other hand, the notion of a true divinity corresponds to a different scheme insofar as the shadowy side of this notion leads to complexities that can go beyond the level of foreseeable knowledge.

The false friend "Adam and Eve"; The most perfect illusion...

Now, to return to the story of Adam and Eve, curious as we are, we then looked for the biogenetic equivalent of such a statement establishing that man contains within himself all the hormonal and molecular resources that gave life to woman. That's the question, isn't it?

Indeed, if it is accepted from a molecular point of view that a liger is both lion and tigress, then, according to the biblical declaration, a woman would be a man recombined from himself; necessarily! So man and woman must be of the same composition,

but this will never be the case... What a blunder and what a shame to say anything in the name of God perhaps!

The authors of the Bible could still have checked the consistency of their genetic theory, which would have us believe that the same genes produce beings that are distinct in terms of their constitution; there's no point in even thinking of evoking the genetic theory of introgressions either; that would be nonsense; men and women are different because there's a factor that means that, from a given moment, they had to be different for biological reasons... Anyway! Unless other elements foreign to the man enter into the constitution of the woman; that's the only possible solution... However, such a possibility seems far-fetched.

So in that case, who intervened to distinguish between the two sexes? Some say it was *God*! What's more, this *God* who was conceived as "*male*" wanted women to be more of a creationist gender than men?

What are we to make of the idea that a male God makes woman in the image of his creationist nature, unlike man, who is merely *an object* depositing his seed at the foot of the altar of the womb? Who is truly in the image of God?

And then! Who is God? Isn't there another explanation for this biological distinction between

men and women? Could it be a problem of reformulation between the times of these authors and our own?

Although stunned from the outset, we nevertheless played the game by experiencing such a creation of distinct beings established in this way... But there was still a snag, and this put a definitive end to our rather childish imagination, shall we say. Well then! Landing again...

The chromosomal realities {XX} and {XY} quickly reminded us of the obvious: first of all, men cannot be the *genetic mould* of women! Let us explain:

{XY} being the chromosomal formula of the woman and {XX} being that of the man; the point common to these two expressions is {X} which we also call "*mould*"; it also represents the maternal contribution.

On the other hand, the other isolated values, {Y} and {X}, represent the sex of the individual, i.e. the "*determination of gender*"; bearing in mind that a woman's ovum always contains an X chromosome (the "*foundation*") and that it is the gender of the sperm *carrier chromosome* (X or Y) that is the factor that determines the sex of the embryo. Not forgetting that the {Y} chromosome contains ten times fewer genes than the {X} chromosome; not forgetting that any human phenotypic expression always includes the {X} chromosome; this is therefore proof that the

{X} chromosome plays a central role in human identity.

{XY} being the chromosomal formula of the woman and {XX} being that of the man; the point common to these two expressions is {X} which we also call "*foundation*"; it also represents the maternal contribution.

On the other hand, the other isolated values {Y} and {X} represent the sex of the individual, i.e. the *determination of gender*, knowing that a woman's ovum always contains an X chromosome and that it is the gender of the sperm chromosome (X or Y) that determines the sex of the embryo.

All this proves that, according to chromosomal reality, women play a central role because the feminine within them is apparently at the centre of life... Absolutely! That's why we call our expression "*the feminine within*" "*the feminine essence*".

Hence: the masculine in man (*the male; the masculine essence*) is limited in relation to the feminine essence because *Mother Nature* established it in this way; Mother Nature and this reality which transcends it, i.e. the universe, which is necessarily linked to our existence; we also deal with this subject in our therapeutic work entitled "*Un peuple, un savoir authentique, une thérapie, Le Kalinago - Tome I*".