



General Topics :: More about "The Passion"

More about "The Passion" - posted by Philip, on: 2004/2/17 13:49

Check out this site:

http://www.crossroad.to/articles2/04/passion.htm

It has some interesting links about the Catholic and mystic slant of the Passion. Let me know what you think and if you think that it should affect whether we support it!

Seeking Truth,

Philip

Re: More about "The Passion" - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/2/18 6:55

Quote:
-----It has some interesting links about the Catholic and mystic slant of the Passion. Let me know what you think and if you think that it should affect whether we support it!

Before I read the article I just want to say that I think we should be weary to through in our full support over this movie. Mel Gibson is catholic and personally barely any of the Christians that have seen this movie even comment on the character of Mary. For those who don't know in Catholic belief they worship Mary as essentially divine, and she is the mediator between you and God (Jesus) in most cases.

Quote:
-----"I told Gibson that I am a Protestant, and asked whether his pre-Vatican II world view disqualified me from eternal salvation.

"He paused. 'There is no salvation for those outside the Church,' he said. 'I believe it.' He explained, 'Put it this way. My wife is a saint. She's a much better person than I am. Honestly. She's, like, Episcopalian, Church of England. She prays, she believes in God, she knows Jesus, she believes in that stuff. And it's just not fair if she doesn't make it, she's better than I am. But that is a pronouncement from the chair. I go with it.'"

whoa.. well there you go. Gibson firmly believes that the 'Church' is the institutional setup of the Roman Catholic Church on earth. And all those who are not part of this physical church are doomed, no matter how much faith in God we have. That sounds kinda cultish to me :-P

Quote:
-----Consider Deuteronomy 4:15-16. It warns us that, since we have not personally seen God, we ought not make or recreate His likeness

Personally I don't think its the best and proper thing to do, to show God visually. But to apply that verse and be that legalistic about it really is getting no-where. We are not making an idol of Jesus here to worship its just a visual representation of him in drama. Arguing over statues of Jesus, etc would be valid.

Quote:
-----"We need to remember that the last time dramatic presentations replaced preaching as the main vehicle by which the truth of the Bible was communicated was during the middle-ages when the church refused to allow the translation of the Bible into common languages and when in place of the preaching and teaching of God's word, the common people were given visual presentations such as Passion Plays, statues, relics, and icons. "These things were designed, like most visual imagery, to play upon the emotions and stimulate a response; but the ability to evoke an emotional response via imagery or drama is not the same as successfully transmitting the Gospel."

That's a good point, but no reason to not use these measures such as movies to get people interested in the gospel. Or to be able to contextualize them at first to the message.

Quote:
-----How will the intense emotional experience of seeing this violent movie change affect viewers -- especially children and youth already immersed in violent "entertainment"? Will it further desensitize some to intense violence, build a craving for other emotional experiences, or alter the foundation for their faith?

Well I hope it's a (R) Restricted rated movie if there is that much violence and blood. But this is a depiction of real life events, it will be disturbing.

Quote:
-----Billy Graham in his endorsement of The Passion of Christ said, 'Every time I preach or speak about the Cross, the things I saw on the screen will be on my heart and mind.' This is unfortunately part of the problem with all visual representations of Jesus.

John 20:29 - Then Jesus told him, "Because you have seen me, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed."

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/2/19 17:36

I have been praying about this and have decided for myself that I will not see the movie.

I will not give my money to someone who believes that only Catholics will be saved and I will not hurt my savior's feelings by paying money to see an "image" of Him (that is just someone's idea) being tortured to that extreme.

Is this what our Lord's crucifixion comes down to- a form of entertainment- that we PAY money to see. There is something wrong here.

I have heard people describe parts of the movie and were sick. Was there a reason that the apostles did not get into minute detail about the Lord's crucifixion when they wrote the gospels?

Would we pay money to go back in time and see Jesus crucified all over again?

Something inside me is getting more and more disgusted with everything surrounding this movie. How the churches (Christian and Catholic alike) are acting like hungry, hungry wolves waiting until all the foolish sheep flock in. People making tons of money and benefitting from this movie in other ways also.

I still believe that there are basically
Only 4 ways attract people to Jesus:

LIFESTYLE—Matthew 5—Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven.

LOVE ONE ANOTHER—John 13 & 17—If you love one another, then they will know that you are my disciples...that you might be perfected in unity, so that the world will know that Jesus was sent by God.

BLESS WHEN INSULTED—I Peter 3—Bless those who insult you...then they will ask you for the reason for the hope that is in you.

PERSONAL TESTIMONY—Romans 10—How shall they hear without someone to proclaim the message—someone who speaks his testimony

Here are two more articles that give us some more info. I won't say that I agree with everything in Michael Bunkers article, but it is something very serious to think about:

<http://www.crossroad.to/articles2/04/passion.htm>

http://www.lazarusunbound.com/bunk_thepassion.html

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/19 19:24

In all fairness here are some of the comments from the interview on "Primetime".

Attempted to find the full transcript to no avail.

(http://abcnews.go.com/sections/Primetime/Entertainment/mel_gibson_passion_040216.html) <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/Primetime/Entertainment/...>

Starting to see where things can be taken out of context or not fully explained. The aspects of this mystic for instance that was supposed to be such an influence where not fully explained in these other links. Recall him saying that he had read some parts of her works but they didn't reflect on the movie.

Also the issue over who gets 'in' or not which I myself have referred to from another interview.

I don't know if it was true or not, if he is backpedaling, it was slightly touched on as noted from the other link given in this thread:

"I told Gibson that I am a Protestant, and asked whether his pre-Vatican II world view disqualified me from eternal salvation."

Quote:
----- "He paused. 'There is no salvation for those outside the Church,' he said. 'I believe it.' He explained, 'Put it this way. My wife is a saint. She's a much better person than I am. Honestly. She's, like, Episcopalian, Church of England. She prays, she believes in God, she knows Jesus, she believes in that stuff. And it's just not fair if she doesn't make it, she's better than I am. But that is a pronouncement from the chair. I go with it.'"

Apparently Mel Gibson's beliefs have changed since that interview last September. During his televised ABC interview on February 16, Diane Sawyer raised a question about a scene in the movie. In the Biblical account, Simon of Cyrene, is recruited to carry the cross for Jesus. (Mark 15:21) But in movie, Simon "interlocks arms with the bloody Jesus as they struggle to take the cross." Why?

"It's his brother," explained Mr. Gibson. "It's about another human being. We're all children of God. All of us! It doesn't matter what you are -- whether you've got a bone through your nose or whether you look like a Viking.... or whatever you are. We are all children of God."

A little later, Diane Sawyer asks him about his traditional form of Roman Catholicism, which opposed Vatican reforms such as "more inclusion of other faiths." Would Gibson's traditionalist views bar the door to heaven to Jews, Protestants and Muslims?

"That's not the case at all," answered Gibson. "Absolutely not! It is possible for people who are not even Christian to get into the Kingdom of heaven. It's just easier for -- and I have to say this because it's what I believe...."

"You have a nonstop ticket?"

"Well, yeah, I'm saying it's an easier ride. I have to believe that."

Obviously the theology is skewed.

I watched the interview and found him to be honest, he didn't dodge any of the questions and appreciated his frankness.

In 2000 years, nothing has really changed.

Doesn't it intrigue anyone that this has caused such a stir?

What if we had the 'perfect' Christian in the sense that he held to what we all would consider sound theology. He makes this movie to the letter and the world just sighs, 'big deal'.

What if this ends up doing what a great deal of us have hoped for, shakes up the church?

Causes the nominal Christians to realise what our Lord endured just on a physical level, causes them to really *think* about the enormity of His sacrifice above and beyond the cruelty of the cross?

Surely this all mere speculation and I have waffled back and forth over the whole thing.

Knowing the tendencies of our culture this all may blow over in a few months.

Who knows?

Will still continue to pray for the Lords leading and as of now I am going to go see it with this similar thought in mind from Mr. Gibson "*If you don't like it, don't go. ... If you want to leave halfway through, go ahead.*"

Here's a couple more:

"I hope that most people see it, Diane, as a passion of love," Foxman said. "Maybe when it's all over, in a sobering manner, we'll be able to come back and look each other in the face and say, 'We have to deal with this hatred that's still out there.'"

Gibson, too, wants dialogue.

"Let's get this out on the table and talk about it," he said. "This is what the Talmud says. This is what the Gospel says. Let's talk. Let's talk. People are asking questions about things that have been buried a long time."

"I hope it inspires introspection, and I think it does," Gibson said. "I want to inspire and make people feel."

Come let us reason together.

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/2/20 17:27

I just watched an interview with Mel Gibson where he mentions not only using the gospels as material for the crucifixion, but the writings of Anne Catherine Emmerich. He read two huge volumes of hers. He specifically said that was where he got the details- she was very detailed in what she saw in her visions. This is a "saint" who had many visions, visionary "pilgrimages", and displayed the stigmata. :(

Here is just a portion of her story:

Thus this holy woman, who in her youth had been in the habit of praying for long hours before pictures of all ~ the stages of Christ's painful Passion, or before wayside crosses, was herself made like unto a cross on the public road, insulted by one passer by, bathed in warm tears of repentance by a second, regarded as a mere physical curiosity by a third, and venerated by a fourth, whose innocent hands would bring flowers to lay at her feet.

She was taught in the school of suffering and mortification, and there learned lessons of perfection. She allowed herself no more sleep or food than was absolutely necessary; passed whole hours in prayer every night; and in winter often knelt out of doors on the snow. She slept on the ground on planks arranged in the form of a cross.

The writer of these pages may here be allowed to remark that he himself has, in full daylight, several times seen blood flow down the forehead and face, and even beyond the linen wrapped round the neck of Anne Catherine

Sometimes she asked for the illness of a person who did not bear it patiently, and relieved him of the whole or of a part of his sufferings, by taking them upon herself; sometimes, wishing to expiate a sin or put an end to some suffering, she gave herself up into the hands of God, and he, accepting her sacrifice, permitted her thus, in union with the merits of his passion, to expiate the sin by suffering some illness corresponding to it. She had consequently to bear, not only her own maladies, but those also of others—to suffer in expiation of the sins of her brethren, and of the faults and negligences of certain portions of the Christian community—and, finally, to endure many and various sufferings in satisfaction for the souls of purgatory.

Whilst there she went once to kneel and pray for some hours before the miraculous Cross of the Church of St. Lambert, at Coesfeld. She besought the Almighty to bestow the gifts of peace and unity upon her convent, offered him the Passion of Jesus Christ for that intention, and implored him to allow her to feel a portion of the sufferings which were endured by her Divine Spouse on the Cross. From the time that she made this prayer her hands and feet became burning and painful, and she suffered constantly from fever, which she believed was the cause of the pain in her hands and feet, for she did not dare to think that her prayer had been granted. Often she was unable to walk, and the pain in her hands prevented her from working as usual in the garden.

You can read the rest of this weird story of Anne Catherine Emmerich here: http://www.emmerich1.com/ANNE_CATHERINE_EMMERICH.htm

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/21 6:03

Art Katz checks in on the subject:

http://www.benisrael.org/articles/Mel%20Gibson%27s_The%20Passion.htm

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/2/21 7:25

Quote:
-----If you need a reminder of what Jesus did on behalf of the world, on behalf of you, then **get your ticket now**. Be forewarned, though. "The Passion of the Christ" is an ugly, tear-stained, sweat-stained, blood-stained story.

Buy your ticket.. get your ticket now!! man :-(this is making me sick.. there is way to much commercialism associated with this movie. God please use it.. but don't let unbelievers be offended by the way evangelicals are advertising this movie.

Quote:
-----Many Protestant readers may be concerned that the film is dominated by Catholic doctrine. "The Passion of the Christ" is not about denominational dogma, Gibson said. Rather, it is a portrait of the brutality Jesus endured as the sacrificial lamb, then it testifies that Jesus as Messiah arose from His tomb.

"I hope it makes people think," Gibson said. "I hope it makes them reflect. The movie is about faith, hope, love and forgiveness. If it stirs those things up in people, it will be a success. I hope it makes people ask questions, and maybe even makes them want to read 'the Book.'"

It seems the gibson and others have good intentions behind it.. I pray these are true.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/21 8:15

Quote:
-----Buy your ticket.. get your ticket now!! man this is making me sick.. there is way to much commercialism associated with this movie. God please use it.. but don't let unbelievers be offended by the way evangelicals are advertising this movie.

I am with you, but it is an unfortunate by-product of this culture...wished he would have squashed the more tacky merchandising, trinkets and what not.

Been contemplating much of this.

Went to the main, "Official" site:
(<http://www.thepassionofthechrist.com>) <http://www.thepassionofthechrist.com>

It might be worth it to some to check out what they were attempting to do with this movie from their own perspective. Here's a snippet from the 'Background Info':

"Forty-percent" of the film was shot at night or indoors under wraps in order to get an effect of light fighting its way out of the darkness."

From a link off the site:

"Gibson financed the film on his own precisely due to his determination to realize his own traditionalist Catholic vision of the Gospel story without compromise to the sensitivities of profit-oriented accountants or other religious perspectives. Jewish leaders feel wounded that he never consulted them on the script or historic details, but he also left out Protestant and Eastern Orthodox traditions."

"Do we feel comfortable when some evangelical observers insist that they know more about the real symbolism of our Jewish rituals - emphasizing their supposed anticipation of Jesus the Messiah - than we do? I enjoyed a stimulating interchange with a pastor in Michigan who emphatically argued that the details of the Passover seder all related to Jesus of Nazareth - with the three matzos representing the Holy Trinity. He offers a Christian understanding of Judaism without demanding that our own teaching must be accordingly adjusted. In our pluralistic society, this pastor enjoys perfect freedom to do so. And we remain free to teach a Jewish understanding of the New Testament - with no effort to suppress or attack Christians for their traditional interpretations of their scripture. That's especially true for a Christian like Gibson who provides a vision of the crucifixion that falls unequivocally within the Christian mainstream."

Michael Medved

(<http://csmonitor.com/2004/0202/p09s01-cogn.html>) <http://csmonitor.com/2004/0202/p09s01-cogn.html>

Trying to get some perspective myself and not wield an agenda one way or the other.

Read some of the Anne Catherine Emmerich that was linked to here and it raised some more questions in my mind. In fact parts of the section quoted reminded me of David Brainerds praying in the snow and leaving behind the trail of his hacked up lungs. What about Madame Guyon and even Mother Theresa or even our own 'experiences' with the Lord in dreams and visions and things we believe He is telling us through the Holy Spirit?

I am not equating them all together, just something to ponder...Then there is Tozer and his thoughts on Christian 'mysticism'.

Reading through Mrs. Emmerich's writings is rather tricky, seems to be both the bizarre along with the strangeness of Catholic doctrine and yet also the similarities to much of what we call the 'surrendered' life, serious prayer, fasting, service, a deep devotion to the Lord...hesitant to throw the baby out with the bath water.

edit: open further reading, I don't know what to make of all this

Another musing is the stated account that Mel Gibson was at a point of seriously taking his own life and yet returned to what he *knew*, that being his Catholic background.

So should we vilify him for that?

Seems he has less of a problem with us 'evangelicals' than we do with him.

Don't get me wrong, not defending Catholic doctrine, but is this the end of the discussion or just the beginning? I believe he was the one that said "let's get this on the table".

So will we? Or will we just stew in our opinions?

Before the stones start flying, I am not talking about *compromise* in any stretch of the imagination.

Just questions running through this tangled web of thoughts...

Don't throw 'em yet, let me get my helmet on...

O.K., fire away!

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/2/21 9:48

Quote:
-----Read some of the Anne Catherine Emmerich that was linked to here and it raised some more questions in my mind. In fact parts of the section quoted reminded me of David Brainerds praying in the snow and leaving behind the trail of his hacked up lungs. What about Madame Guyon and even Mother Theresa or even our own 'experiences' with the Lord in dreams and visions and things we believe He is telling us through the Holy Spirit?

Mike, believe me, this got me thinking last night. I was mortified by what I read about Anne Catherine. I prayed that I would not dream about her or the whole issue. It was scary.

I kept questioning everything that happened to her and to those who also have had the stigmata. This is either God or it's the devil- there is no in between. To be bleeding from the head for years and all the other physical signs- ? She "asked for this". She thought it was an honor to feel the "passion"- to feel other's sicknesses, etc...

I think one major difference (not counting the whole Catholic doctrine included) between those who may have dreams, who may be prophetic, etc... is "what is important to that individual?" Do they desire to have "such and such" more than they desire Jesus. If prophetic people love their prophecy more than Jesus, if dreamers love their dreams more than Jesus- if they want these things and hold them in high esteem- then I would question the motives.

Anyone who would claim to be prophetic or have any gift like that should not care much about it- I mean- hold it loosely in their hands- not love it above just loving Jesus for Himself.

Also- does that gift point others to Jesus. Does it bring attention to one's self or to Jesus?

Anne Catherine and others who are "false" ask for these things to be given to them- why? So that others may see how Holy they are? My discernment tells me that she was "mentally not all there". There is no mention of the stigmata or asking for suffering on purpose, or asking for other's sicknesses in the Bible. I don't believe these are scriptural. Some one can correct me if I'm wrong here. We have enough to suffer without asking for it. :)

I read some of her quotes and the first one was "The Roman Catholic Church! The only Church."

The different mystics that I have read (Madame Guyon, Francis Fenelon, etc...) were all killed because they were coming away from the Catholic church in their beliefs. Every book I've read from Francis Fenelon, Madame Guyon, etc... never mentions Mary or the normal "Catholic" dogma. I could be wrong about Mad. Guyon.

This whole thing still makes me think about how the Lord is trying to restore His church back to New testament simplicity. Before man's traditions and ways became intertwined with the Gospel.

When the Romans adopted Christianity as their religion is where it all started becoming twisted. Remember that 1000's of true Christians were killed by the Roman church because they would not be under their authority and rules. We have been making steps to restore what was changed by the Roman church, starting largely with Luther.

I hope this is not a step backwards to keep tradition and man's doctrines ruling over Christianity. I am really looking at the bigger, over all picture here- of what God is wanting to do- what His will is for His people.

I know He wants us free from the arm of flesh and trusting in Him.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/21 10:03

Hi Chanin.

Thanks, was actually going to come back here and just take all of that out. It's there now. Bad analogy's on my part even if there is a few similarities.

The more I read the more disturbing it got. Besides, I have bigger fish to fry here on the home front..too much to go into, I could use a healthy batch of discernment

about now regarding my family. Prayers for wisdom would be welcome.

Thanks
Mike

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/2/21 10:06

Thank for sharing Chanin, this is alot of good stuff you are thinking about.

Quote:
-----f prophetic people love their prophecy more than Jesus, if dreamers love their dreams more than Jesus- if they want these things and hold them in high esteem- then I would question the motives.

This is a side note but I have had an experience seeing how a Christian who lets dreams run his life and guide his steps rather than Gods Word can go astray from the head (Christ). In better wording 'lost connection with the head.'

Quote:
-----The different mystics that I have read (Madame Guyon, Francis Fenelon, etc...) were all killed because they were coming away from the Catholic church in their beliefs. Every book I've read from Francis Fenelon, Madame Guyon, etc... never mentions Mary or the normal "Catholic" dogma. I could be wrong about Mad. Guyon.

I totally agree, from my reading of Madame Guyon it seems she is very spiritual and even though in admist the Catholic Church, she still saw the true Church, the mystical body of Christ. The Kingdom of God in believers hearts where Christ reigns enthroned.

Quote:
-----I hope this is not a step backwards to keep tradition and man's doctrines ruling over Christianity. I am really looking at the bigger, over all picture here- of what God is wanting to do- what His will is for His people.

I know God will show this to use as we continue to seek Him and show our intentions of being satisfied with nothing but the truth of God. It might not come quickly but He definetly is revealing his purposes to His body in these last days.

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/2/21 10:47

Mike,

I know how you feel. I was overwhelmed by everything I read and then all of the questioning of things. When this happens, I just have to get my focus back on Jesus alone- and "get up- and do the next thing". (in the words of Oswald Chambers).

I think this confusion for people is what the enemy wants. Our focus should not be on things "about Jesus"- not His crucifixion, not on what we want or would like to happen, not on anything but just Him.

I was fed up with all of it last night and have decided to let it all go. Jesus is all that matters to me. These other things are just getting my focus off of Him. I am supposed to be becoming more of Him and less of me. How can I do that when I am thinking and worrying about all of these other things.

I will keep you (and your family) in my thoughts and prayers!

Greg,
once I gave a catholic friend a book with three mystic writers in it. Fenelon, Guyon, and I forgot the other one. I loved it and was moved to give it to her. She loved it also. She said "isn't it funny that these were of the Catholic faith?" and I replied that , yes, but the Catholic church had them killed! I saw Jesus as being their only focus- I guess the Roman church saw this too! :)

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/2/21 14:07

Quote:
-----once I gave a catholic friend a book with three mystic writers in it. Fenelon, Guyon, and I forgot the other one. I loved it and was moved to give it to her. She loved it also. She said "isn't it funny that these were of the Catholic faith?" and I replied that , yes, but the Catholic church had them killed! I saw Jesus as being their only focus- I guess the Roman church saw this too! :)

Yes it is amazing how many people have been killed and persecuted by the Catholic church through the ages. I wonder if there are some good books on this topic? I know of one that has a strong Baptist bias to it "the trial of blood."

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/21 17:04

Quote:
-----I will keep you (and your family) in my thoughts and prayers!

Thanks Chanin.

Re: books on persucution - posted by lyndon, on: 2004/2/22 5:39

Quote:

wrtbooks wrote:
I wonder if there are some good books on this topic? I know of one that has a strong Baptist bias to it "the trial of blood."

There is also one with an anabaptist bias to it its called martyrs mirror, I think you can find some of it on the internet but I'd have to check up on that.

Lyndon

Re: More about "The Passion" - posted by eagleswings (), on: 2004/2/22 7:01

Â“A Lot of PowerÂ”

Thanks, Philip, for the original post, and Chanin for calling particular attention to the supernatural phenomena in the life of Anne Catherine Emmerich.

Quote:
Â“What's particularly interesting is the way God seems to be working in incredible ways through miraculous situations on the set. "There is an interesting power in the script," Gibson notes. "There have been a lot of unusual things happening on this set, good things like people being healed of diseases, a couple of people have had sight and hearing restored, another guy was struck by lightning while we were filming the crucifixion scene and he just got up and walked away. There was even a little six-year-old girl (the daughter of a person connected with the crew) who had epilepsy since she was born and had up to 50 epileptic fits a day. She's doesn't have them anymore for over a month now." He marvels at how this movie has effected or touched most of the cast in some deep and personal way. "And they really give you a lot of hope. It's like wow! I mean, we're not kidding around about this. It's really happeningÂ”.Â”
<http://www.crosswalk.com/fun/movies/1195713.html>

Quote:
"This is not a movie that anyone will 'like'.... It certainly doesn't 'entertain'. There isn't even the sense that one has just watched a movie. What it isÂ... an experience -- on a level of primary emotion that is scarcely comprehensible. Every shred of human preconception or predisposition is utterly stripped away.... Quite honestly, I wanted to vomit. It hits that ha

rd.

"The film grabs you in the first five seconds, and never lets go. The brutality, humiliation, and gore are almost inconceivable - and still probably does not go far enough. The scourging alone seems to never end, and you cringe at the sound and splatter of every blow - no matter how steely your nerves. Even those who have known combat or prison will have trouble, no matter their experience....

"What you've heard about how audiences have reacted is true. There was no sound after the film's conclusion. No noise at all. No one got up. No one moved. The only sound one could hear was sobbing...."

<http://www.crossroad.to/articles2/04/passion.htm>

Quote:

"It is crucial to realize that the images and language at the heart of "The Passion of the Christ" flow directly out of Gibson's personal dedication to Catholicism in one of its most traditional and mysterious forms -- the 16th century Latin Mass

"I don't go to any other services," the director told the Eternal Word Television Network. "I go to the old Tridentine Rite. That's the way that I first saw it when I was a kid. So I think that that informs one's understanding of how to transcend language. Now, initially, I didn't understand the Latin. ... But I understood the meaning and the message and what they were doing. I understood it very fully and it was very moving and emotional and efficacious, if I may say so."

"The goal of the movie is to shake modern audiences by brashly juxtaposing the sacrifice of the cross with the sacrifice of the altar -- which is the same thing," said Gibson. This ancient union of symbols and sounds has never lost its hold on him. "There is," he stressed, "a lot of power in these dead languages."

<http://www.crossroad.to/articles2/04/passion.htm>

360. Why is the Mass the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross?

The Mass is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross because in the Mass the victim is the same, and the principal priest is the same, Jesus Christ.

(a) Christ, though invisible, is the principal minister, offering Himself in the Mass. The priest is the visible and secondary minister, offering Christ in the Mass.

(b) The most important part of the Mass is the Consecration. In the Consecration bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ who then is really present on the altar. Through the priest He offers Himself to God in commemoration of His death on the cross.

362. Is there any difference between the sacrifice of the cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass?

The manner in which the sacrifice is offered is different. On the cross Christ physically shed His blood and was physically slain, while in the Mass there is no physical shedding of blood nor physical death, because Christ can die no more; on the cross Christ gained merit and satisfied for us, while in the Mass He applies to us the merits and satisfaction of His death on the cross.

(a) On the cross Christ was offered in a bloody manner; in the Mass He is offered in an unbloody manner. On the cross Christ alone offered Himself directly; in the Mass He offers Himself through the priest, who is the secondary but true minister, dependent upon Christ.

(b) On the cross Christ suffered and died; in the Mass He can no longer suffer or die. On the cross He paid the price of our redemption; in the Mass He applies to us the merits of His Sacrifice on the cross.

<http://www.ewtn.com/faith/teachings/euchb1a.htm>

“The goal of the movie is to shake modern audiences by brashly juxtaposing the sacrifice of the cross with the sacrifice of the altar -- which is the same thing,” said Gibson.

May we infer that by using a soundtrack which is partly in Latin Mr. Gibson synchronized (“juxtaposed”) elements of the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass (“altar”) with the bloody sacrifice of the Cross, and blended together what is heard with what is seen?

“When I was a kid...I didn’t understand the Latin...But I understood the meaning and the message and what they were doing. I understood it very fully and it was very moving and emotional and efficacious, if I may say so.”
“There is,” he stressed, “a lot of power in these dead languages.”

Roger

Re: Books on persecution - posted by eagleswings (), on: 2004/2/22 7:12

Check out the Church History section on Richard Bennett’s (former Catholic priest) website.

“In this section we wish to give documentary historical evidence of the persecution of Bible Believers by the Roman Catholic Church.”

http://bereanbeacon.org/history_new.htm

While you’re there, read Mr. Bennett’s article, “The Alignment of New Evangelicals with Apostasy.” Greg has provided us with the audio sermon (same title) here at Sermonindex.

That article is very relevant to “The Passion” matter since so many Evangelical leaders are endorsing the film.

http://bereanbeacon.org/articles/alignment_evang_apostasy.htm

Roger

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/2/22 11:04

Still another view:

"THE PASSION - A Challenge to the CHURCH"
-by Andrew Strom.

I had the privilege of seeing an advance screening of the 'Passion' movie at a local cinema last night. It is strange, because yesterday I started getting emails from

Christians claiming that the film is a kind of 'Catholic conspiracy' and vowing that they would never see it. What hogwash! GO SEE THE MOVIE!!

Sure, there is the odd moment when there is a slight 'Catholic' tinge to things, but it is almost nothing. This film is a majestic and powerful viewing experience that will cause a lot of people to truly consider the claims of Jesus - perhaps for the first time.

Could it cause backslidden believers to turn back to Christ? Yes, I believe so. Could it cause a whole lot of people to start checking out their local churches? Yes, I can certainly see that happening. It is a very powerful film, and I believe God desires to use it greatly.

But here is the crux of the problem. The churches simply cannot carry the 'weight' of this movie. By and large, they represent a different "Jesus" altogether from the one that we see torn and battered in the gospel accounts. A church that has bent over backwards to make its services a "Seeker-friendly" mix of warm homilies and entertaining slickness, has nothing to say to a generation that is seeking the true Jesus of the Bible.

It is just like what happened after 9-11. The people came flooding into the churches seeking a faith that could bear the 'weight' of the momentous events unfolding around them. And they found we had erected a plastic imitation - a shallow, lightweight "Jesus" - complete with ambient 'muzak' and mindless appeals for money. A comfortable Western counterfeit of the real thing. They did not stay for long. And why should things be any different this time?

Every day we hear reports of big churches buying up large blocks of tickets and urging their people to use this film as an "outreach opportunity". I believe it is an 'inreach opportunity'. -A chance for us to look into the face of Christ and find that our shallow pretense of Christianity bears no relation to the real thing whatsoever.

We are nothing like Him - we really aren't.

How incongruous that we plan to use this blood-spattered, shatteringly 'real' movie to invite people back to our comfortable, plush-seated crematoriums - there to be wooed by our utterly "unreal" Sunday pantomimes. I don't think they will be staying long this time either.

As I said, today's Western church simply cannot bear the 'weight' of this movie. It stops our mouths, just as it stops theirs. Our "Jesus" comes out looking like a cheap used-car salesman - for that is what we have made him. We invented him to perfectly fit our 'Laodicean' lifestyle. And so we sit in our lovely buildings with our lovely music and our lovely smiles, wondering why the world cannot get as excited as we do by this

plastic Jesus of ours. Meantime, all the earth sighs and groans for the real thing.

Tell me, church, don't you think it is possible that God intends this movie to challenge us, just as it challenges the unbelievers? Will we be deaf to the voice of God, or will we allow him to begin to dismantle this plastic edifice that we have built - this prison of our own making that prevents us from representing the real Jesus as He really is?

Surely the time has come for another 'Great Reformation' in the church. May this movie be just one of many "shakings" that is sent to remove the blinders from our eyes.

God bless you all.

-Andrew Strom.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/22 12:53

Re:Andrew Strom

Thanks Chanin, boy this sounds vaguely familiar...

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/22 13:46

Thanks Roger,

Read all of the "...persecution of Bible Believers by the Roman Catholic Church."

Had read bit's and pieces, but this was a very good summary of the atrocities of the past.

Wish I could say as much about the article on the movie from the same site:

(http://bereanbeacon.org/articles/mel_gibsons_vivid_deception.htm) http://bereanbeacon.org/articles/mel_gibsons_vivid_deception.htm

He loses some credibility by stretching things to get his point of view across, even if he has some good points. It taints the whole thing.

I don't think it's the Catholic conspiracy he makes it out to be. (also stated by Andrew Strom in this thread)

Example;

*"The goal of the movie is to shake modern audiences by brashly juxtaposing the 'sacrifice of the cross with the **sacrifice of the altar** - which is the same thing,' said Gibson."*

*He then goes on to link *The Church of Rome* likewise juxtaposes the sacrifice of the cross with the **sacrifice of the Mass**, to which Mel Gibson has given clear testimony. She teaches that Mass and Christ's sacrifice are "one single sacrifice". Thus she declares, "The sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the Eucharist are one single sacrifice: The victim is one and the same: This divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, the same Christ who offered himself on the altar of the cross is contained and is offered in an unbloody manner."*

Other examples were disingenuous as well, it seems so unnecessary and weakens his argument in my opinion.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/2/25 10:00

[Image: <http://www.sermonindex.net/images/passion-poster.jpg>]

Feb 25th - THE Passion is out today!

The Passion Movie is out today in Theaters across north america. Pray that the Lord uses the movie to bring conviction and repentance to people christian and non-christian.

Everybody's abuzz about The Passion of The Christ, Mel Gibson's new movie depicting Jesus' last 12 hours before his crucifixion. The film has been in in all the media—secular and religious—and has been labeled everything from anti-Semitic to historically accurate to spiritually inspired.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/25 11:49

Striking that after 2000 years, not much has changed.

With the multiplied millions of words given in opinion and after abosrbing quite a healthy chunk of them myself, here we are.

Yeah I know, it's 'just' a movie.

And tonight I will be amongst the other created beings attending,(why not? I won free tickets!)

Strangely and I might add *rarely* to those who are aware of my ramblings, my mind is in a state of neutrality in as much of preconcieved ideas going in. I pray that it stays that way.

May the Lord use it as He see's fit (hmmm, guess that would apply to both, my mind and the movie)

Will offer up a 'reflections of a fool' review tommorow, at least it might be a bit different then the usual...we shall see :-)

'After all the dust has settled,

The question still remanins;

"Then he began to ask them, "But who do you say I am?" Peter answered him, "You are the Christ!"

Mar 8:29

Yes He is.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/25 18:30

In another little twist on things...

Was reading a bit in CT in regards to '*a long tradition of cross-centered devotion*'

briefly it talks of some of the history of the Moravians and on to the different periods of history and the styles of devotion and so forth.

A really good article with some info that may have been overlooked. Hate to tease you all with this since the link won't be up until tomorrow, but it was hard to resist this little snippet that really stood out.

After discussing a bit on Constantine:

"Christianity became fashionable under later Christian emperors, and the church began to look too much like the world. So men and women began retreating from society into solitary cells and small communities. These earliest monastics sought the road to true discipleship. And they saw their master and model, Christ, as the sacrificial lamb, mocked and slaughtered to redeem sinful man."

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/26 16:43

Here's the link that relates to the last reply:

(<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2004/003/4.42.html>) The Fountain Fill'd with Blood

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/26 17:46

Movie Review?

Good grief,

Where to start? How about this earlier quote:

Quote:
-----I started getting emails from Christians claiming that the film is a kind of 'Catholic conspiracy' and vowing that they would never see it. What hogwash! GO SEE THE MOVIE!! ~Andrew Strom

I'll take off on the 'hogwash' part and leave the rest up to whoever.

Lot of opinions. But for all the questions, warning's and what not...

What a bunch of nonsense.

I learned something through all this, it's really easy to get all caught up with things in your head from maybe even well int entioned people.

And I am slowly begining to see the wisdom of some of our more experienced brethren around here, their silence on so mething like this speaks volumes.

If you want to go see it, go see it and draw your own conclusions. I didn't see anything heretical and sure he took some li cense with some odd bit's, but big deal.

Anti-semitism...please. Enough said.

If anything anti-Romanism as far as the soldiers go, the way they were portrayed, these guy's love their job's too much, li kely would have worked for free. One of 'em reminded me of Goldberg(WWF) and to them this was sport.

Graphic, brutal, you will wince.

All I could think of was that maybe after this, for those who want to loosely throw around

Isa 53:5 But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace w as upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

as a statement of physical healing in the atonement...that's another issue, but I got to wonder if this might cause some re flection. It is one thing to read it, imagine it or even hear someone describe the flogging, seeing it is quite another and it i s incredibly realistic.

For the life of me I am a bit perplexed over why I wasn't affected emotionally, being a somewhat emotional being, strang e. Maybe it will hit me in a couple of days, maybe not.

Will it affect others in this way, surely.

I wondered how this would be taken by the unbelievers of the world. I could guess, but I would imagine the reactions are all over the map.

I have no way of seperating myself from who I am in Christ now to gain that perspective.

It is powerfully realistic.

There is no getting around that.

It didn't seem like a movie in a sense.

It wasn't minipulative.

Still processing.

One other thing, the sub-titles, I forgot all about them. The transition became really natural to where you don't have to thi nk about it.

Is this the great 'evangelism' opportunity that it has been touted as?
Will it drive sinners to repentance?

Who knows?

I didn't come out of it all excited about those possibilities as some have, even those I admire.

But that could change. I may go see it again in a different set of circumstances, with a different mind set and come away with a completely different point of view.

But and here I wan't to share with you all a very remarkable and unforeseen outcome.

After returning from the movie, my step-son Josh asked me what I had thought.

I need to fill in here a bit first.

We haven't had much of a father/son type relationship. We are a bit dysfunctional around here and actually I am glad in a lot of ways.

A lot of the blame belongs on my own head for not dealing with things, putting them off, skimming over issues...

I didn't even really know where he was spiritually, a vauge at best guess. Being a teenager...well if you have one...

But, this kid is different. Great heart, it freaks me out sometimes to see much of myself in him when I was his age.

Yet, we really never *talked*.

Until last night.

From that little inquiry and he had shown a bit of interest in the movie, here and there, sparked the most honest and incredible discussion we have ever had.

We ended up talking late into the night on every conceivable topic under the sun, primarily as to how it relates to faith in God and Jesus Christ our Lord.

Death, hell, salvation, false religion, sham, phoniness and nominal, rote Christianity. "sugar-coated" in his words.

Open, naked and honest..no bs. (that would be 'brazen silliness' :-))

It was like the walls of Jericho fell down.

The little buger has even been reading a Bible we gave to him a couple of years back.

He has been praying!

He has more faith than I could have ever even imagined and I believe God has given to him a remarkable ability to truly trust Him.

He is a punker and praise God, he can put a bone in his nose for all I care. He belongs to the Lord and that is all that matters.

Last night, everything changed in our relationship.

I am and was so thankful, I could not and cannot stop giving thanks to the Lord.

I know that many of you have prayed for me and my family, from the bottom of my heart, I thank you.

Surely the Lord answered and used different ways of making things happen.

Thanks to Mel Gibson.

For getting the conversation started.

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/2/26 18:09

Praise God, Mike! Like I told you earlier today, I had a feeling I would be repenting about all the criticism. I started having these feelings of regret about two days ago and then very strongly yesterday.

What I kept hearing was that He is God and not me. He can do whatever He wants with this movie- whether it's hyped up or not.

I am not always right- and like you said, it is hard to not get caught up in the criticalness.

I am so glad that you were blessed in some way by the movie. I'm still not 100% sure if I'm going to see it (I go back and forth) I don't want to see it just because I feel "peer pressure" and feel like I'm missing something. I will definitely go if the Lord leads, though!

I hope many Christians come back to their First Love through this. This may be why you weren't quite affected, emotionally as others. You KNOW your First love already- you know these feelings that many others are just feeling for the first time in a long time- if ever.

By the way, my 14 yr. old daughter- she loves the punkers at her school. She says she is more comfortable talking with them instead of the "cheerleader/preppy" type because they know they aren't 'all that'.

Arielle is one who is a "friend to all" and can fit in with anyone- but prefers to befriend the outcasts, the nerds, and the punkers. Way to go, Arielle! :-D

Blessings to you and your family- Mike.

In Him, Chanin

Re: movie review - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/2/26 19:01

Quote:

-----Last night, everything changed in our relationship.
I am and was so thankful, I could not and cannot stop giving thanks to the Lord.

Praise God! What wonderful news!

Thanks also for your input on the movie. I can relate to your experience about getting caught up in things in your head surrounding this movie. I think that God can and will use this movie to His glory, and in ways we do not expect, such as starting the dialogue with your step-son. Isn't God amazing?

I think I will go see this film, perhaps I can convince my wife to go see it with me.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: God's Sovereignty - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/2/27 9:18

It is rare to hear so much talk surrounding a movie, especially one that is religious in nature.

I am thinking it is God's sovereign will to make "The Passion of the Christ" go through so much publicity--both positive and negative.

The end result I see is an increasing viewership and open discussions about Jesus and faith in the public arena.

A year ago, could you imagine that it would actually be cool to ask your gospel friend to go see a movie about Jesus?

So I have no interest in discussing about this or that Catholic or anti-semitic conspiracies! I would rather bring my friends there and spread the good news.

Sam

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/27 22:40

Sam,
Are you sure that you're not a Ron? There are a whole denomination of those guys on this web site, that sound a lot like you when you said:

"So I have no interest in discussing about this or that Catholic or anti-semitic conspiracies! I would rather bring my friend s there and spread the good news."

My reason for not going to see the movie, is directly related to my strict Baptist upbringing! We have our CONVICTIONS regarding Hollywood,going to movies,and supporting YOU KNOW WHO. Besides,I couldn't find a coupon, or get a FREE ticket. Know what I mean Vern? :-D
Clutch :-P

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/27 23:35

So how did you like it Clutch?
:-)

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/28 0:19

Mike,
I get my FREE ticket tomorrow. It's got to be better than that horrible thing Ben AFLAC (Quack, Quack)was in "Pearl Har bour". That's the last movie that I've been to, and I had to get up and leave before it was over (sickeningly unbelievable). I usually don't do well at movies. Have you ever seen those cartoon characters on TV that watch those old "B" movies, and lampoon them as the movie goes along? I'm the one that looks like Bullwinkle. The only other two movies that I've been to are Forrest Gump, and Private Ryan. I enjoyed GUMP, and Ryan was fine until the end of the Movie. I figured out why the Indians,Germans and Japanese never could beat us though. We ALWAYS knew that the bad guys would be putting somebody in the bell tower.But they NEVER figured out that we put people there until it was TOO late. :-o I'll betcha one thing, If I was that German tank commander, I'd have put a couple of 88mm rounds into that tower before I had my infantry running around the town in circles, single file. The Indians ALWAYS did that too,no wonder they lost ALL the time. And let me tell you something else; what do you think the chances are that a P-51 Mustang flying on the tree tops, wings level , at about 400 knots, and with an iron site, drops a single bomb, and on purpose gets a direct hit on a single Tank? :-? You'd have a better chance of winning the lottery. :-D
Clutch :-x

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/28 4:01

Hi Clutch
I have just posted a reply to Mike on the 3 hours of darkness. The Darkness I am not anti-film but I know that Catholicism strongly emphasis a link between physical suffering and salvation; it is basic to Mysticism that sins can be dealt with by physical suffering. (this is one of the reasons I am uncomfortable with Tozer's recommendation of the mystics; I don't trust any of them)

The word 'suffering' in 1Pet 3:18 is pascho which is where we get the adjective 'paschal' form. It means suffering. The physical sufferings of Christ were real and terrible, but it was not this physical suffering which obtained our redemption. Catholicism does not make this separation which is why it introduced penance.

If I go to see it, I'll try not to sit next to you. Two of us mumbling under our breath might just be too much even for those tolerant American audiences. ;-)

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/28 8:30

Yes Ron,

That is sound advise when you said:

"(this is one of the reasons I am uncomfortable with Tozer's recommendation of the mystics; I don't trust any of them)"

Let me see the Mystics.....? Weren't they that 1950's group that sang " There's a Moon out Tonight" (or was it the Bell towers)? Three things Forrest's Mama ALWAYS discouraged.

1. Hanging out with the wrong crowd.
 2. Hanging a bare posterior out a moving car's window.
 3. Sitting near an old GEEZER at the "Picture Show". Pass the popcorn please,
- Clutch :-P

Re: More about "The Passion" - posted by RobertMosteller, on: 2004/3/8 13:03

This is the follow up article to the Michael Bunker "Passion" article MOREOFHIM posted.

Behold: The One World Cult
Posted by Michael Bunker
editor@lazarusunbound.com

***This is the transcript of Michael Bunker's sermon on the prophetic/religious condition of the world today. His sermon is based primarily on the responses to his article on the "Passion". Editing has been left to a minimum, so it won't read like a usual article; it is, for the most part, left like it was delivered. We want to thank the LazarusUnbound.com transcribing committee for their work in transcribing Michael's sermons ***

"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee" (1 Timothy 4:16)

March 4, 2004 - We've had a pretty interesting last 8-9 days since my article on the "The Passion" movie came out. We've had a steady 300% increase in "hits" on the website, peaking on Thursday when we had an 800% increase over our normal traffic. Because of that, there has been not only a lot of questions about my own personal position on the movie, "The Passion," but also questions on the doctrines and the prophetic implications of the movie. I have determined that I was going to discuss those issues today as much as I can.

It is necessary for those of you who are listening at home (around the world), or if you're watching the video tape of this sermon, that you have a bit of background on what it is we are going to discuss; so, if you are able, go to Lazarusunbound.com and read the original article on "The Passion" that is posted on the front page. Secondly, for background purposes, I'm going to discuss some things in relation to a doctrine series that I did where we discussed the doctrine of the Papal Antichrist and the False Prophet. These articles can be found at our website in the "Critical Doctrines" section. If you need to get rehearsed on those, please do.

Those here in the homegroup, if you need to go back through those teachings, it would help you understand what I am going to say today if you understand the historic teaching of the Church (the historic Protestant Church) on who the Antichrist is, who the False Prophet is, and those things. If you can study those it will help you understand what we are going to talk about tonight.

1 Tim 4:16, Paul writing to Timothy warns him and says:

"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee."

Anyone who has even a cursory knowledge of the Doctrines of Grace knows that anything that we do does not (and can not) save us. There is nothing we can do to save ourselves eternally as far as our salvation goes. Paul here is talking about temporal salvation; the salvation from the everyday calamities and curses that can come upon us for disobedience and the hardships that also come upon us for all manner of disobedience. Paul says,

"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee."

We should understand from this (and of course only a hard-core Arminian would come to the conclusion after reading this that it is possible to save yourself) that this is temporal salvation in view, and we also understand from this how important doctrine is and the preaching of doctrine is.

With all the hostile e-mails I have received over the last couple of weeks: last week or so from pastors, I would say to them:

"What doctrine is taught is very important. And, according to Paul, by teaching to proper doctrine, it is possible temporarily to save both yourself and other people. You are responsible for the souls placed under your care and you will give an answer for them, and if you don't warn people about things that are blatantly dangerous then that penalty will be meted out on you personally and on those who you failed to warn."

This is a very, very important thing we are studying here. Christian men throughout the history of the Church, through study, prayer and revelation, have come to the conclusion that the religious system would eventually, through time, evolve into a one-world cult. This has been the teaching of the Church since very early on. I'm going to go back 700 years, starting:

In 1310 with Dante Alighieri,

You can move forward to John Wycliffe in 1379,

1412 John Huss,

1497 Savonarola, who was the Italian Reformer,

in 1522 Martin Luther taught it,

in 1550 William Tyndale, who gave you the text that became your KJV Bible taught it,

In 1553-54 Latimer and Ridley, who were killed for their faith.

Thomas Cranmer who was killed for his faith in 1582

1587 John Foxe who wrote "Foxe Book of Martyrs"

1600 King James the 1st who chartered the KJ Bible

1654 Thomas Goodwin

In 1727 by Sir Isaac Newton

In 1754 by Dr. John Gill

Even that hyper-Arminian John Wesley taught this fact in 1764, that the Papacy was the antichrist and that the religious system would evolve into a one-world cult in the end-times.

This is the point I am making here -- if you study history, specifically if we study Christian history, you will come to the conclusion soundly that it is impossible to believe that we are in the end-times, and at the same time deny that the Church has taught throughout history that the last days religious system would be apostate and would evolve into a one-world cult.

You must (if you know anything about history of the Christian Church) come to the conclusion that the most important feature of the last days religious system (if you believe that we are in the last times) is its apostasy.

Why in the world has the world religious system come to the conclusion that we are in a great revival or that this movie particularly is going to be on the forefront of a great revival? The Bible prophesies general apostasy and shows that the religious system will be moving into a one-world cult. When we see that the Protestant Movement is steam-rolling right back to Rome, heading right back to into the arms of the Pope, why in the world do they really believe that we are in the last times?

They've somehow separated in their mind with the teachings of the Church and what is patently obvious about what is going on in the world. All of these great giants of the faith (and thousands more, by the way) were killed by the Papist Church; each pronouncing at the risk of their own lives, that the Roman Catholic Church:

Was the Antichrist of the Bible

That the Pope of Rome was the man of sin, the son of perdition

He was revealed and has been revealed consistently for over 700 years.

For 700 years, the Church of Jesus Christ has come to the uniform conclusion that the Pope of Rome and the Papacy was the Antichrist, and somehow over the last 100 or so years, this has been obscured beyond recognition and so this is an underlying foundation of what I'm going to talk about tonight.

The Great Deception that is spoken about in the scriptures says that "many will be deceived"; in fact if you weren't the very elect, you would be deceived. This is what we need to understand, when we posted the article on "The Passion", our position was very, very simple: the 2nd commandment forbids any images of the Godhead or any member of the Godhead. This was the position of the Church from before the Protestant Reformation. It has been almost uniformly the position (and I am going to read some quotes in a little while of the position of the Reformers) of the Puritans and the Pilgrims and the Founders of this nation, that to even make a picture of Jesus Christ was idolatry and a violation of the 2nd commandment. All I'm saying is that now, if I stand up here in the year 2004 and merely repeat what has been taught in the Church for 700 years, we can find out exactly where we are on God's timeline by looking at how the world reacts to the statements that have been the plain teaching of all our belief system for 700 years.

Histrionics panic, absolute anger, hatred, threatened violence; merely for standing up and saying listen, the Church has always taught:

That we don't make any images of God, and

That the Pope is the Antichrist.

So now we should realize that if one of the Pope's henchman makes an image of Christ, all he is doing is trying to drag the protesting Church right back to Rome. So why did 100 million people have to die if all we're going to do is walk right back into the arms of Rome and act like nothing ever happened? It is important that we not only understand why this is going on, but where we stand prophetically because of what is evidently going on. So-called "Protestant" ministries (it's amazing to me if you look at the people in our group here who have been on web forums that call themselves "protestant" all over the country) have kicked our brethren off of their web forums merely for repeating what the Church has taught for 700 years! They have kicked them off and said that "we will have NO discussion or criticism whatsoever of the Roman church". They say that somehow now, to criticize the Antichrist, is hate and is unchristian. Think about that for just a moment if you would right before you lay your head down tonight; just think about that sentence— in America today it is considered unchristian to criticize the Antichrist. For someone who says "well, we don't believe the Papacy is the antichrist", I say "What you believe is immaterial. It is what the bible says, it's what the Church has taught since the time Christ walked the earth." The Bible teaches, and the Church has taught that there would be the coming of a "man of sin":

That man would take upon himself the name of Christ,

That he would say he is Christ representative on earth,

That he would do away with God's laws,

That he would institute his own laws,

That he would sit as a moderator or some type of intermediary between God and man.

This has been the prophecies that the Church has been watching for 2000 years, and all we're saying is that this has not only happened, but it has happened right before their eyes of the Church! If you'll look around today—to say anything against it (the RCC) today—it makes you a hater. It makes you somehow a "non-christian." So-called "Protestant s" today have united their efforts to legitimize the Church of Rome and anybody who denies that fact is a liar and the truth is not in them.

If you go down the list of those who have supported this movie, you'll not only find a list of people who have continually, throughout their careers, supported the Church of Rome; but they have either passively or actively written or taught that the Church of Rome is a legitimate Church. They will say that although the Catholic Church may have some errors that they are still Christian in nature. I will tell you this; you can be a lot of things at a particular time and still be a Christian. You can be a whore and be a Christian. You can be a murderer and be a Christian. You can commit all manner of sins and still be a Christian. But there is one thing you cannot be and be a Christian — that is Anti-Christian. You can't be Anti-Christ and be a Christian, it is impossible; that is simple logic. I could spend some time here and go through the scriptures and go through that with you, but it is patently true that you can not be Anti-Christian and be a Christian.

Mel Gibson is a Roman Catholic and is blatantly Jesuitical... I'm going to, here in a little while, go back through the history of the Jesuit Order, a real quick run through with you of their history of infiltrating short-robos (Jesuit agents) into different positions, whether it be as activists in the theater and movies, actors, lawyers, assassins like John Wilkes Booth who was a Roman Catholic actor, those types of people... but Mel Gibson has over the past 10-15 years endeared himself to the Christian community, I should say the so-called christian community and the Patriot community, through movies like Braveheart and The Patriot. These movies, even his Conspiracy Theory - (even though at the end of that movie it kind of made a joke out of conspiracies), did expose some interesting things that are truly going on in the world -- but because of these movies and his willingness to make them, Mel Gibson has made himself a hero with the Patriot community and what we'd call the "Resistance - to - Big - Government" community. Now, because of that, this movie was a perfect setup. I quickly saw when the Patriot movement started pushing this movie, that it had been the perfect set-up. You can actually look back and see how they (the Patriot community) were set-up. Some of them were just set-up and some of them are people who have been planted within that movement, agitprops, agents provocateur, etc. Specifically I would mention Alex Jones who is evidently a Roman Catholic -- who sold himself as some kind of patriot leader (who everybody ought to be very, very wary of) who is pushing this propaganda big time. The Patriot community, for the most part was already (and this is one of the reasons I don't participate or have anything to do with the Patriot movement):

Already anti-Semitic.

Looking for a hero.

Mel Gibson stood up to make a movie of a false "Christ" that matches the false "christ" that these people have made up in their heads -- and you can see these people rushing to embrace what they considered (and hoped) to be an anti-Semitic movie. If the Jews didn't like the movie, you knew the Patriot movement would LOVE it. So the movie was tailor-made to take the Patriot movement off the map and to bring them right into the same one-world movement they spend page after page after page on the Internet saying they are against.

So, Mel Gibson captured their imagination, fed right into what was expected of him. The Roman Catholic church has subverted and taken over the Patriot movement (of course we expected this for some time, since the intelligence agencies that have infiltrated and controlled the Patriot movement is all run by Catholics).

Let me tell you really quickly that the whole idea that this movie, from the beginning, that people came out against this movie as anti-Semitic is a lie. Nobody was against this movie. In fact, nobody really knew what was going to be in the movie. The Jews had not come out against previous movies about "Christ", like the Jesus movie, which showed some of the various things that these supposed objectors say they don't like about this movie. The fact is that Mel Gibson began leaking that the movie was going to be boycotted because it was anti-Semitic before anybody ever said anything, over a year before the movie was to be released. It was part of the plan.

Right at the opportune time, a couple of globalist plants in the ADL who were Jesuitical plants (who have always stood up to take the side of that particular New World Order group) stood up and started saying that this movie was anti-Semitic. Now that smells like a plant to me; when nobody is saying anything and Mel Gibson suddenly comes out and does interviews and says he is being attacked and his father has been threatened because his movie is anti-Semitic; then all of a sudden you get a couple of talking heads in the ADL who pop up saying the movie is anti-Semitic. This has been a diversion from the very beginning to take attention away from the fact that the movie is Anti-Christian; it is not anti-Semitic at all -- it is an anti-Christian movie. You see? It is very easy to take people's mind off the real issue when you start talking about something that doesn't even matter. Since when has the Christian Church ever consulted Judaism to decide if a movie is OK? They never have, and all of a sudden this thing blows up and nobody asks the question that's really at the core of this —

ARE WE SUPPOSED TO BE MAKING IMAGES OF JESUS CHRIST?

IS THIS A VIOLATION OF THE 2 ND COMMANDMENT?

That is the real question, you see, but that is the question that can't be asked. The movie is anti-Christian, not anti-Semitic. Nobody wanted to ask any questions about Mel Gibson's beliefs because over the past 20 years, during the time that most of you and I have known each other, the whole religious system has moved towards a full embrace of the Roman Catholic system. If you follow the Charismatic movement, the Promise Keepers or any of these other supposedly neo-Protestant movements, every one of them, has embraced Roman Catholicism; so the fact that Mel Gibson was a Roman Catholic didn't raise anybody's ire or concern whatsoever. Mel Gibson is not only Roman Catholic, but he is a pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic. There have been a couple of words about this on the Internet, but most people don't even know what that means when you say a man is a pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic.

Vatican II, which happened in the mid-1960's, changed the way the Roman Catholic Church operated. Prior to that, in the historic Roman Church, the masses were done in Latin. According to many of the most conservative members of the Roman Church, because of those traditions, the miracles that they believe happened during the Mass, happened because of the tradition. So if the Mass is properly done in Latin, by a properly ordained priest, then they believe that transubstantiation actually happens during the Mass. Now, according to Mel Gibson, in his TV interview with Diane Sawyer, he believes that when they stopped doing the Mass in Latin, transubstantiation stopped happening. So he believes, other than in a few scattered places, those miracles have stopped happening in the Roman Catholic Church. Most people don't realize that the Pre-Vatican II Catholics believe that this Pope -- John Paul II -- is the AntiChrist, and they believe that the Vatican has become AntiChrist. I get emails all the time from Pre-V2 Catholics who send me info and agree with me that the Roman Church is the antichrist; but I have to tell you that whenever you see insurrectionist groups -- like pre-Vat

ican II Catholics — you can always find the black robe (Jesuits) somewhere around there.

The Pre-V2 movement has been infested with Jesuits since the very beginning. They don't mind hating a Pope that goes against their power. The Jesuits have killed at least 2 Popes. You can find that information in "The Vatican Assassins", by Eric Phelps. Any time there has been a liberalizing movement in the Catholic Church, the Jesuits have started a counter-movement just like they did with the pre-Vatican II movement at the time of Vatican II. And so there is no surprise then to see Mel Gibson rise up out of the pre-Vatican II Jesuitical Movement that happened about that time.

Mel Gibson says he believes that transubstantiation has not happened (except in a very few places) since the Vatican II. So he opened his own church that does the Mass according to the old ways, according to the Old Latin. Because of that, he believes that the miracle of bread and wine actually turning into Jesus, happens at his church in California.

Some of you may be saying, "what does that have to do with what we are talking about?" It has everything to do with what we are talking about because those miracles and transubstantiation in particular, are what causes -- according to the pre-Vatican II Catholics -- the Catholic Church to have the authority to act against those who are heretics. You see if you are a heretic yourself, you don't have the authority to burn another heretic, but if you are doing things right and the miracles are happening and transubstantiation is happening in your church, then you then have the authority to act out what the Jesuits proposed in the 15-1600s, which was the destruction of all non-Catholics, even to the point of murdering them or burning them at the stake, which is why they had the Inquisition.

We ought to be very, very careful of this pre-Vatican II movement, even if it seems on the surface like we both are against the Vatican. Sometimes war makes strange bedfellows, but do not find yourself in bed with a pre-Vatican II Catholic just because you both think this pope is the Antichrist. That is what has happened quite a bit (especially in the Patriot movement).

This is a classic dialectic. Let me tell you how this works. In Soviet Russia it was quite common to do what was called "the thaw." What would happen is Stalin, or Krushchev or Brezhnev, or whoever was in power, would start to liberalize and he would give power and greater freedom to the intelligentsia and to the literary giants to act with more freedom, and when he found out who his enemies were (this happened in both in Russia and China too) they would round them all up and kill them or put them in the camps. That is how they found out who your enemies are; you say, "oh, we've been too harsh, we've acted too rashly, so we want to open things up." Then you round up anyone who sticks their head out. If you get a book called, *New Lies for Old* (I've got it here in the library), written by a man named Anatoly Golitsen in 1985 before the fall of the Soviet Union, you will find that he said that Perestroika and Glasnost was actually this same type of movement, only on a bigger scale. They were going to feign and fake the fall of the Soviet Union. They were going to put the West asleep and at its most vulnerable time they were going to attack and destroy the U.S. That book was written and published in 1985, and I have the book here in the library if anybody here wants to look at it. This tactic of pretending like you're weak when you are actually strong, actually (supposedly) came from the Chinese writer named Sun Tzu. There are several books out there show where Sun Tzu never really wrote *The Art of War*. It was actually written by a Jesuit priest, and perfectly describes Jesuitical tactics. This is a Jesuitical tactic to pretend like you are weak and that's when you strike. So the Catholic Church has taken from Sun Tzu and from Stalin and from Krushchev, this idea of pretending like you are weak.

Now if you'll follow the liberalization movement that has happened under Pope John Paul II (and going back to V2) you'll know that every time that a major disaster hits the Catholic Church — such as the problem they've had with priest's fondling little boys — it's actually when the Roman church is on the move to ecumenicalism. The biggest moves they make to infiltrate and destroy the Protestant Churches is when they show themselves to be weak. So, you have the

great movement like the Promise Keepers and all these ecumenical types of movements (like the Charismatic movement which is purely Jesuitical) happen while the Catholic Church acts like they are weak. When they have scandals and these types of things is when you have to watch them, because that is when they are making inroads into destroying Protestantism. This has happened continuously — this dialectic where you act like you're weak and when the inevitable conservative backlash comes — you can say, 'we are getting rid of this old guard that was touching boys out there behind the altar.'

The conservative wing of the Catholic Church is the Mel Gibsons' pre-Vatican II Catholicism. Everybody is sick of the Catholicism that's around today. So who is going to complain when the Catholic Church says, 'hey listen, we've lost our bearings, we've lost our direction, we need to go back to the old ways'? When you hear that and when they bring back those things, that is when you have to be very, very careful.

The dialectic is there. The plan started during the Reformation and I wrote about this in *Swarms of Locust*, and we also have some videos available (*Swarms*, *The Papal Presidency*, etc.) If you haven't read *Swarms of Locusts*, you need to read the book. The counter-Reformation was started in the 1540's at the Council of Trent. At the Council of Trent they decided they were going to destroy Protestantism no matter what the cost. By doing so, the Jesuit Order was put in control. They would infiltrate:

Universities

Colleges

Protestant seminaries

Acting groups and guilds

Doctos

Lawyers

All different manners of businesses

By doing so they would subtly push Protestantism to embrace the basic doctrines of Catholicism without having the name and the evil weight that was associated with those. That is what *Swarms of Locusts* is basically about... the doctrines.

Counter-Reformation began to accelerate at the end of the 1500s and you saw people like Robert Bellarmine, Alcazar and Francisco Ribera begin to put forth prophetic views that were designed to protect the Papist Church from the accusation that the Pope was the Antichrist. You have to put yourself back in that time. By the 1590s it had already been taught within the protesting groups for over 200 years, that the Pope was the Antichrist, the Papist system was the Antichrist. You've got a huge problem if you're a Roman Catholic priest at this time because the scripture is plain that all of the things that the RC Church was doing was a fulfillment of prophecy about the "man of sin, the son of perdition." So they put the Jesuits to work (and this is all a matter of record), one on them, Alcazar, came up with the idea of 'all prophecy has been fulfilled back in 70 AD, there is no more prophecy to be fulfilled.' It's called Preterism. Modern Preterists don't like that fact, that their pet beliefs are Jesuitical, but it is historical fact. Then you have another guy, named Francisco Ribera, and his friend Robert Bellarmine (both Jesuit priests) who said, 'wait a minute, all prophecy is not going to be fulfilled until the very end of time, so we don't have anything to worry about now.' So either you believe it all happened in 70 AD, or it isn't going to happen for 500 more years; either way, according to them, the Pope is not the Antichrist.

Brilliant move.

Those teachings began to infiltrate through people like Scofield (and his Jesuit Bible); they infiltrate the seminaries throughout America. At the turn of the century, around 1900, is when these things began to infiltrate the US. They also, at the same time, began to infiltrate the security apparatus of most of the western nations: spy agencies, police forces, the entire intelligence establishment, and the media through their schools. Here in the U.S. the Jesuits run 33 major universities, like Georgetown University, Loyola, the University of Pittsburgh, Xavier University. You can go down the list and some of the most prosperous Universities in the U.S. are owned and operated by the Jesuit Order.

The intelligence apparatus of the U.S. began recruiting almost solely at these schools in the '50-60s. Many of the people who you see that run the FBI and the CIA, all graduated from Georgetown University: George Tenet, the heads of the FBI, people just like Bill Clinton, are all graduates of Georgetown University which is a Jesuitical University. Their recruiting out of these schools guaranteed that they had people who were like-minded and who were also willing to advance their movement from stations of power.

All this began to come together over the last 20 years when we saw the rise to power in both the Democratic and Republican parties people who either came out of these same schools, or came from schools like Yale University (and most people are aware of the Jesuitical/Masonic connection with Yale University). Two "Yalies" are John Kerry and George W. Bush who has now been heralded by the entire so-called Protestant community, as a savior, as a "christian" despite all of the evidence to the contrary, despite all the evidence that his Christian beliefs are really more of a political ploy than they are legitimate (if you have an opportunity we have a videotape called "The Papal Presidency," that shows this president's connection to the Vatican going back through his father and his father's father, all the way back to Nazi Germany).

Those of you who aren't aware that Hitler (he was a Roman Catholic who was controlled by the Jesuit Order) modeled his SS after the Jesuit Order.

So you see Jesuitism rising in the United States through the Charismatic movement, through the great Pre-trib prophecy movement, and you see it growing and growing especially over the last decade. At the same time they have gathered the control of the major intelligence apparatus, the government itself and the presidency over the last 20 years.

Mel Gibson played right into this, knowing that there was an anti-government movement growing in this country in the early to mid 1980's. He began making movies that played right into all of this. At the exact same time, the great apostate religious phenomenon like the Toronto "Blessing", the Pensacola madness that was going on, began what they called "the great new revival in America." It may have been a revival in some kind of religious piety but in reality was nothing more than a revival of Catholic mysticism and ecumenism that has happened over the last several hundred years. We traced that in Swarms of Locust.

So Mel Gibson, as he began to plan the rollout of this movie, played the anti-Semite card and began gaining great attention toward this movie. Jesuit Zionists out of the ADL then came out against the movie saying that it was anti-Semitic, which was a lie both on their part and on the part of Mel Gibson.

So we end up with the entire religious system in America and around the world embracing a film that is not only flawed, not only a bad movie factually and theologically, but one that is the most blatant violation of the 2nd commandment that has ever happened since Jesus Christ walked the face of the earth. They not only are embracing it; they are pushing it, hawking it, as if it is Jesus Christ Himself walking on that flat screen. The indulgence pushers are back, and if you don't think that this is an indulgence you are wrong. You go down there and pay your ticket, and the Catholic Church says that if you believe that movie, then you believe the gospel and you are one of them. There is a quote in my article on "The Passion" by the Pontifical Council which basically says "If you deny this movie, you deny the gospel. If you embrace the movie, you embrace the gospel." That is nothing but an indulgence; an indulgence for the price of a movie ticket. All of this is happening right under our eyes.

The so-called prophecy hawks like Tim LaHaye, Grant Jeffrey and Hal Lindsey have warned us about a coming "ecumenical movement" for the last 15 years, then the minute the most blatantly ecumenical movie in history comes out, they all run down to see it and say if you don't go see it, something is wrong with you.

WHAT IS HISTORY FOR?

Let me ask you a question. What is history for? Why did God even give us a historical perspective or the ability or the desire to record these things that we think and believe through time? What is history for if it is merely to be ignored? What is history for if we don't learn anything from it? If all we're going to do is wake up everyday as if nothing ever happened before then and make all our decisions based on our five senses and what we think (which is to deify the thoughts and sensations of our own brains) then there is no need for history. There is also no need to go forward because tomorrow is going to be just as hectic and as Godless as today. History gives us the idea and the ability to know that there is a plan being worked out through history and will be worked out tomorrow. History is going there. That is our hope.

The reason I know I can trust God tomorrow is because the Holy Spirit has showed me that men trusted Him 2000 years ago. People trusted him all the way to the burning stakes 500 years ago. People trusted Him as they were being killed by the Roman Catholic Church in the late 1500-1600's. 100,000 Albigenses and Waldensians trusted Christ as they were slaughtered by the Catholic Church. Hundreds of thousands of Huguenots trusted Christ as they were nearly wiped out by the Papist Church. Here is a little FACTOID for ya - why do the media get so worked up when some ignorant man like Mel Gibson's father denies the Holocaust (despite all the overwhelming evidence), when the OFFICIAL position of the Church of Rome and their adherents is to deny the slaughter by the Roman Church of 100 million people in the middle ages? Why don't folks write to Mel Gibson and ask him about that? History lets us know that God can be trusted even in persecution and general apostasy. Christian men trusted God when they were shoved on boats and kicked out of Europe in the 1600's. Christian men have trusted God throughout all of history. History has a purpose. That tells me that I can trust God tomorrow and the next day and the next day until my days on this earth are finished. I can trust Him. The only way I can know that is because I know history. Without history we end up in total and complete despair.

There is total despair when there is no history; because if I wake up and I have to decide today what I'm going to believe based on my five senses and what is "happening" to me, then there is no hope for tomorrow. There is no hope at all. I might as well end it all right now. The entire world is committing suicide because they don't know history. They are killing themselves everyday because they don't know history and if all you try to do is tell them, "Let's take a look at what the Puritans said and the Pilgrims said and those of our forefathers said", they say, "I'll have none of that history, I'm going to start off tomorrow like I started off today, ignorant and stupid and fat! And I'm just going to keep killing myself until I go to hell!" They might as well say that. That is exactly what is going on. People are diving headlong into hell. It tells us in 1st Timothy that we have the ability, sometimes, God-willing of course, to stop them, to say to them, "Let's just take a look at scripture and see what that says. Let's take a look at history and see what those men said. Why did they have the strength to carry on?"

There is a love affair

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/9 9:47

RobertMosteller:

The speaker's pushing it way too far -- establishing guilt by association.

Sam

Re: Andrew Strom - posted by lyndon, on: 2004/3/16 23:46

These are Andrew Strom's thoughts about the movies

I had the privilege of seeing an advance screening of the 'Passion' movie at a local cinema last night. It is strange, because yesterday I started getting emails from Christians claiming that the film is a kind of 'Catholic conspiracy' and vowing that they would never see it. What hogwash! GO SEE THE MOVIE!!

Sure, there is the odd moment when there is a slight 'Catholic' tinge to things, but it is almost nothing. This film is a majestic and powerful viewing experience that will cause a lot of people to truly consider the claims of Jesus - perhaps for the first time.

Could it cause backslidden believers to turn back to Christ? Yes, I believe so. Could it cause a whole lot of people to start checking out their local churches? Yes, I can certainly see that happening. It is a very powerful film, and I believe God desires to use it greatly.

But here is the crux of the problem. The churches simply cannot carry the 'weight' of this movie. By and large, they represent a different "Jesus" altogether from the one that we see torn and battered in the gospel accounts. A church that has bent over backwards to make its services a "Seeker-friendly" mix of warm homilies and entertaining slickness, has nothing to say to a generation that is seeking the true Jesus of the Bible.

It is just like what happened after 9-11. The people came flooding into the churches seeking a faith that could bear the 'weight' of the momentous events unfolding around them. And they found we had erected a plastic imitation - a shallow, lightweight "Jesus" - complete with ambient 'muzak' and mindless appeals for money. A comfortable Western counterfeit of the real thing. They did not stay for long. And why should things be any different this time?

Every day we hear reports of big churches buying up large blocks of tickets and urging their people to use this film as an "outreach opportunity". I believe it is an 'inreach opportunity'. -A chance for us to look into the face of Christ and find that our shallow pretense of Christianity bears no relation to the real thing whatsoever.

We are nothing like Him - we really aren't.

How incongruous that we plan to use this blood-spattered, shatteringly 'real' movie to invite people back to our comfortable, plush-seated crematoriums - there to be wooed by our utterly "unreal" Sunday pantomimes. I don't think they will be staying long this time either.

As I said, today's Western church simply cannot bear the 'weight' of this movie. It stops our mouths, just as it stops theirs. Our "Jesus" comes out looking like a cheap used-car salesman - for that is what we have made him. We invented him to perfectly fit our 'Laodicean' lifestyle. And so we sit in our lovely buildings with our lovely music and our lovely smiles, wondering why the world cannot get as excited as we do by this plastic Jesus of ours. Meantime, all the earth sighs and groans for the real thing.

Tell me, church, don't you think it is possible that God intends this movie to challenge us, just as it challenges the unbelievers? Will we be deaf to the voice of God, or will we allow him to begin to dismantle this plastic edifice that we have built - this prison of our own making that prevents us from representing the real Jesus as He really is?

Surely the time has come for another 'Great Reformation' in the church. May this movie be just one of many "shakings" that is sent to remove the blinders from our eyes.

God bless you all.

-Andrew Strom.

~~~~~  
Copyright (c) Andrew Strom, 2004. Feel free to distribute or photocopy.

**Tozer: THE MENACE OF THE RELIGIOUS MOVIE - posted by Christian (), on: 2004/3/18 8:12**

THE MENACE OF THE RELIGIOUS MOVIE

by  
A.W. Tozer

I refer, of course, to the religious movie.

...

1. It violates the scriptural law of hearing.
2. The religious movie embodies the mischievous notion that religion is, or can be made, a form of entertainment.
3. The religious movie is a menace to true religion because it embodies acting, a violation of sincerity.  
...Only the absence of the Holy Spirit from the pulpit and lack of true discernment on the part of professing Christians can account for the spread of religious drama among so-called evangelical churches. A Spirit-filled church could not tolerate it.
4. They who present the gospel movie owe it to the public to give biblical authority for their act: and this they have not done.
5. God has ordained four methods only by which Truth shall prevail---and the religious movie is not one of them.
6. The religious movie is out of harmony with the whole spirit of the Scriptures and contrary to the mood of true Godliness.  
...If he cannot see the difference in kind, then he is too blind to be trusted with leadership in the Church of the Living God.
7. I am against the religious movie because of the harmful effect upon everyone associated with it.  
...Any one who can bring himself to act a part for any purpose, must first have grieved the Spirit and silenced His voice within the heart.

In conclusion:

lack of spiritual discernment...

If God has given wisdom to see the error of religious shows we owe it to the Church to oppose them openly. We dare not take refuge in "guilty silence." Error is not silent; it is highly vocal and amazingly aggressive. We dare not be less so.

<http://www.biblebb.com/files/tozermovie.htm>

Christian Merlino

---

Mr Christian Merlino,  
No man is greater than his prayer life.