Jesuit College Blasphemes Jesus and Attacks Biblical Gender

by Jeremy James

We have long contended that the 'Society of Jesus', known as the Jesuits, a Roman Catholic priestly order, is devoted to the destruction of Biblical Christianity and the creation of a New World Order.

These men are selected with great care and given extensive training in the subtle art of coercion and deception. Most of them come from families that have always been secretly opposed to Christianity. In plain terms many of these individuals are generational Luciferians. For them Jesus is still nailed to the cross, a belief they like to proclaim through their use of three iron nails on their insignia. They venerate the Queen of Heaven and are working hard to have her elevated officially to the status of Mediatrix in Roman Catholic theology.

Military Wing of the Roman Catholic Church
As the military wing of the Catholic Church, they believe they have the right to do whatever it takes to destroy the fruits of the Reformation. The end justifies the means. The most dreadful crimes are excusable if they advance the cause of the Roman church.

They have learned to act as puppet-masters and let others carry out the tasks that might otherwise soil their reputation. For example, during the Counter-Reformation, they made extensive use of the Dominican Order to round up, interrogate and torture anyone who dared to question their authority. It was a capital offense in those days to even own a Bible.
Today the destruction of Biblical truth is pursued with greater subtlety. You are allowed to own a Bible, provided you don't believe what it plainly says. Anyone who does is labelled a fundamentalist, an intolerant bigot whose views divide society and fuel endless dissension. In the Jesuit worldview, especially in the field of education, all opinions are acceptable. The great taboo is faithful adherence to an established doctrine.

**Jesuit Website**

This can be seen very clearly on the website of the College of the Holy Cross, a Jesuit-run university in Worcester, Massachusetts. As an educational institution it enjoys a high reputation. On the *USA Today* list of the Best Roman Catholic Colleges in the US, it ranks Number 2, while on the corresponding list compiled by the *Wall Street Journal* it ranks Number 4. It has a student population of about 3,000 and a high rate of academic success, with a number of Fulbright scholars (14 in 2017) and three Pulitzer Prize winners.

Under the heading 'Broadly and Deeply' (in the section 'Faith and Service', sub-section 'Jesuit Education'), it states:

"A Jesuit, liberal arts education helps free students from prejudice, bias and ignorance. By becoming open-minded, inquisitive truth-seekers, they gain the freedom to make mistakes, question their beliefs and grow as men and women of faith, as scholars and as global citizens."

This is exactly what the New World Order wants, open-minded, inquisitive truth-seekers, global citizens who have been set free from the prejudice and bias of Biblical truth.

Their website shows just how far the inquisitive truth-seeker is expected to go. The events for 2018 under 'Arts and Culture', which students are invited to attend, includes a talk by Eric Marcus. The blurb states:
Marcus is the creator and host of the award-winning Making Gay History podcast, which brings to life the voices of champions, heroes, and witnesses to LGBTQ history. He is the author of a dozen books, including "Making Gay History: The Half-Century Fight for Lesbian & Gay Equal Rights," "Why Suicide?" and "Is It A Choice?" He is also co-author of "Breaking the Surface," the No. 1 New York Times best-selling autobiography of Olympic diving champion Greg Louganis, and "Coming Out to Play," the autobiography of professional soccer player Robbie Rogers.

A few weeks earlier the inquisitive truth-seeker could also have attended 'Stop Kiss', a lesbian play performed at the college theatre, which was advertised as follows:

Diana Son’s poignant and funny play focuses on Generation X-ers growing up and leaving their twenties behind. Callie and Sara meet in New York City at the turn of the millennium. Sara wants to change the world; Callie simply wants to get by. They could be best of friends or even something more — if only they could make a decision.

"Stop Kiss" graphic on Jesuit website.
In February 2017, students were even invited to a performance of the *Little Shop of Horrors* by Menken and Ashman. Here is what the Jesuit website said about this "hilarious musical":

"In this musical update of the Faust story, a nerd who works in a Skid row flower shop makes a bargain with the devil in the form of a cannibalistic talking plant named Audrey II that promises him success, both financial and romantic. All the plant asks in return is the occasional fresh corpse."

Homosexual rights, lesbian romance, cannibalistic humor, and a pact with Satan – all with a view to making their students "question their beliefs" and become more "open-minded."

**Blasphemy**
We have provided the foregoing as introductory material only, since without it many readers would have difficulty believing what now follows.

About ten years ago the college created the 'Class of 1956' Chair of New Testament Studies (Seemingly it was endowed by alumni who graduated in 1956). Many academics in the field of Biblical Studies would likely have vied for such a distinguished position.

The current incumbent is professor Tat siong Benny Liew, who was appointed in 2013 and who, according to the *National Review*, is scheduled to become the chairman of the College’s Department of Religious Studies in September. The Department itself includes three Jesuit priests – one professor and two associate professors.
The world of Biblical scholarship is not very large and many academics in the field would know one another personally and be fully familiar with the work of their peers. They would submit articles to the same journals and speak at the same symposia and seminars. Before being appointed to a prestigious position, a senior academic would be thoroughly vetted to ensure he met the standards required. Their published work would be closely scrutinised and their views on key issues carefully established. So, when Professor Liew was appointed to the Chair of New Testament Studies, the College was already well acquainted with his particular approach to Biblical exegesis. In fact it is reasonable to suppose that he was exactly the man they wanted.

The Roman Centurion and his Servant
Professor Liew co-authored a paper in 2004 with the title: *Mistaken Identities but Model Faith: Rereading the Centurion, the Chap, and the Christ in Matthew 8:5-13.* In it he argues for a radical reinterpretation of the incident where the Roman centurion approaches Jesus and asks him to heal his servant. Here is the passage as given in the KJV:

[5] And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him,
[7] And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him.
[8] The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.
[9] For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.

[10] When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

[11] And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.

[12] But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

[13] And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour.

Professor Liew argues that the centurion is actually a pederast whose catamite is sick: "Our first task is to demonstrate the plausibility of reading the centurion's παῖς as his "boy-love" within a pederastic relationship." [p.468] He plays down the fact that the Greek word παῖς (pais) [Strong's G3816] has always been translated "servant" in this passage.

According to Liew, the centurion believes Jesus is possessed by a demon that is more powerful than the one which is causing his catamite's illness. He wants Jesus to expel the demon but to do so without visiting his home. By approaching Jesus, whom he believed to be a fellow homosexual, he was placing himself, as a client, under his authority. He feared that, if Jesus came to his home, he would exert that authority and take the catamite for himself:

"His fear of losing his beloved to Jesus and hence his reluctance to have Jesus enter his house are entirely understandable in the context of his own understanding of authority...The centurion's new patron (Jesus) has the authority to tell him, as a client, what to do, and to order the centurion's subordinates (including his beloved) to come to Jesus and abandon the centurion." [p.485]
Liew goes on to claim that Jesus praised the centurion, not because of his faith in God, but for his faith in himself, having had the courage to approach someone as powerful as Jesus and make such a request.

This entire 'reinterpretation' of an important passage of Scripture is simply absurd. It flaunts every principle of responsible exegesis and plays fast and loose with the text, twisting it in ways that make one question the author's sanity. He is obviously pursuing a personal agenda and has no qualms about using blasphemous innuendo to make his case. He implies that Jesus was a homosexual, that he had predatory inclinations, and that his supernatural power may have been suspect. The Jesus he portrays is that of 'queer theology', the terms used by the LGBTQ community to describe their method of interpretation. He even perverts the spiritual purpose of the passage when he replaces faith in Christ with faith in oneself. In doing so he makes a complete mockery of what the Holy Spirit is teaching through these verses.

Matthew as a woman

In the course of the paper Liew also adopts a technique in common use among certain queer theologians. Instead of referring to Matthew, the author of this gospel, by the male gender, he uses instead a female designation. For example -

"Without meaning to imply for a minute that Matthew is a "wooden" writer who knows nothing of ambiguities and synonyms, we do find her to be one who uses and chooses her words rather carefully..." [p.472]

"The idea that Matthew would construct a question...is simply not consistent with her own semantic and syntactic habitus, particularly given the vast repertoire that she has demonstrated to be at her disposal." [p.480]
The arrogance of the man is simply astonishing. He has absolutely no fear of God and not the slightest respect for His Holy Word. He mocks, sneers and ridicules with no apparent understanding of the gravity of what he is doing, crouching all the while behind a cloak of academic respectability.

This is the man the Jesuits chose to fill an important academic position.

As bad as it was, the paper of 2004 was overshadowed by another published under his own name in 2009. It was one of a set of papers released in book form by the Society of Biblical Literature, which he edited with two other academics: *They Were All Together in One Place? Toward Minority Biblical Criticism*.

The article by Liew was titled: *Queering Closets and Perverting Desires: Cross-Examining John's Engendering and Transgendering Word across Different Worlds*. Its contents are every bit as bizarre as its title.
The paper is so blasphemous that we can only quote from its less obscene passages. By even the most generous estimation it is a scurrilous diatribe, a shameless attack on Christianity and Biblical truth – by someone with the gall to pretend that he accepts Christ as his Saviour.

It simply seethes with bile, as though the author made a special effort to cram as much blasphemy as he could into its 38 pages. This is the man the Jesuits chose to fill an important academic position.

Here are just a few illustrative quotations (and they are by no means the worst):

"Jesus' "seamless tunic" betrays, then, his drag-kingly concern to conceal his body in order to perform masculinity." [p.258]

Jesus "talks unashamedly about himself through his well-known "I am" sayings…In addition, he also talks incessantly with many long monologues…what one encounters in the Fourth Gospel is a form of logorrhea by Jesus…In that light, John's Jesus comes across as such a hyper performer of rhetoric, and thus masculinity, that he ends up betraying his imposter status. I am, in effect, suggesting that Jesus' rhetorical excesses are meant to represent the cross-dresser. John is indulging in such literary excesses that his Jesus is performing male transvestitism rather than masculinity. At the same time, Jesus' wordiness also demonstrates his belief in the force of the speech act, and thus the effect of performance in general." [p.260]

"Despite these hints of femininity that I have pointed to, I must emphasize that I am not trying to suggest that John's Jesus is "really" a female…Jesus' cross-dressing body in John is a truly porous and polysemous site/sight in which a collection or a range of gender meanings converge…" [p.260]

"Not only does he copy the Father's cross-dressing or impersonating behavior; he also copies the Father's [sexual] desire and actually becomes the one who engenders children for the Father." [p.265]

"Things do not get less queer as one gets to the other parts of John's Gospel. It is noticeable that throughout the Gospel Jesus and his Father form a "mutual glorification society"…" [p.265]

"…there is also something quintessentially queer here [This is followed by many grossly obscene comments about the crucifixion]." [p.266]

"John's cross-dressing and cross-bearing Jesus literally or literarily becomes a fetish…" [p.267]
"It is, furthermore, important to note that, as a true transvestite, John's Jesus also comes back in other forms." [p.267]

[After a reference to homosexual bonding, he says]: "The most telling figure in this regard is the disciple Thomas, who performs the "digital" experiment to ensure Jesus' identity." [p.267]

"I am suggesting that John's constant references to Jesus wanting water (4:7; 19:28), giving water (6:35), and leaking water (19:34) speak to Jesus' gender indeterminacy and hence his cross-dressing and other queer desires…" [p.278]

CONCLUSION
We have given these quotations without comment. They speak for themselves – and what they say about the Jesuits is immensely disturbing.
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