
Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 12:33:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Let me say this straight off the bat: This isn't a debate whether of not a bigotted post toward Christianity or Judiasm or any other religion that might come up.

I'm curious, what are some of your thoughts about how this movie was portrayed and what the message that Mel Gibson wanted to get across? While this is an opinion-based topic, it is a controversial one, hence why it's in this forum in case you're wondering.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 20:00:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have yet to see it, but simply from what I've head, the gore tends to take away from the story being told.

Oh, and if this movie is bigoted to Christianity and Judiasm, then Schindler's List must be bigotted towards Germans and anyone placed in concentration camps. But as Javaxcx stated, this isn't supposed to be the idea around the topic.

I'll post something more relevant after I see it.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 22:01:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Passion is the crucifixion of Christ. He's tryin to show what it was like and what Jesus of Nazareth went through for Christians to have eternal salvation. This is not geared to making non-believers instantly believe. This movie is made for the believer to get more of a sense of what happened and what he went through for them. However, this movie is also geared to having the non-believers be interested and having tons of questions about the actual event. In return from having questions, they get the right answers from pastors, well-knowledged chrisitans, and most importantly, the Bible. Which in return would hopefully make them believers.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [almor999](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 23:40:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it was well done..

I don't think the gore takes away anything, it makes it realistic. This is probably going to be the movie with the biggest effect on people(christian or non christain) ever made; when i saw it the theater was dead quiet the whole movie except near the end when some people were crying.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 02:41:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I just saw it, and I can say the reviews were wrong. The amount of "gore" was no where near excessive, and surprizingly enough it was done in good taste. I also went in there trying to find things that were offensive. And as I expected, there was none. Over all I thoroughly enjoyed it.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 04:36:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My views on the film:

First off, it was extremely well done. Warranto is right, and I agree with him completely. This might just be because I am completely desensitized to violence, but I didn't find the gore out of the ordinary. I found it to be more personal because it was Jesus being torn apart, but aside from that, it really wasn't too different than playing a day's worth of Doom2 or something to that effect. When I was in the theatre, there was a young child there, couldn't have been more than 8 years old. She didn't look traumatized for life.

I do however, find the film to come off as anti-semetic, ONLY for the reason that it looks like the Jewish people are being portrayed as antagonists. Of course this is debatable, but that is just my own opinion of it.

While I don't know the Bible in and out, a few things in the film struck me as out of place:
spoilers

Jesus killing the snake in the garden: While I know the snake represented evil, the snake was nonetheless a living creature, so why did Jesus kill?

The seeming infinite amount of blood: Jesus bled so much that IMO he would have either contracted hypothermia from exposure, or simply bled to death. Remember that the guards did beat him after his "chastising". Moreso, even on the walk with the cross; with all the open bleeding wounds, how can his physical body endure so much without failing?

The raven pecking Gebble's (sp) eyes out: While I know that one of the men crucified with Jesus went to Heaven, the other went to hell, I don't remember a raven appearing and torturing him.

The destruction of the Temple and the shattering of the Tabernacle: Again, I don't recall (at least from my Catholic upbringing and exposer) that after Jesus' death, the Temple split OR the Tabernacle shattered. And if this DID happen, wouldn't the Jewish people have reformed?

Just some questions, perhaps someone can enlighten me.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 04:46:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lol.. ya, those were some problems. Not enough to be found "offensive" though.

spoiler

The Snake was evil, being sent by satan himself (yes that bald guy was satan). So it was more an act of defiance. True it seemed like a living creature, but it could have easily been an incarnation. (Thats a guess by the way).

Jesus didn't actually bleed THAT much. Realistic to the wounds or not, the amount of blood lost would have been enough to severely weaken him, but didn't seem enough to kill him. Besides (to use a religious "excuse", he IS the son of God)

I don't remember the raven either, but it was an interesting addition. Not really affecting the realism of it.

Ah, the earthquake. This one I did have a bit of a problem with, only because it seemed a bit excessive. I've never heard of that one either.

Remember though, Gibson is a methodist (or is it mormon) or something like that, so in ignorance, I'm going to say maybe this is true to their version of events.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 04:54:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoiler

Yes, while the snake WAS sent by satan, does that mean that if satan sent say... a moose, Jesus would kill that too? Just a confusion...

Uh, lets see... Yeah, I'm still not really convinced about the amazing amount of bloodloss. Remember, Jesus had to sit in that cold cell bleeding for who KNOWS how many hours while being tormented by people who really didn't seem to have any kind of remorse.

On that note, I was a bit confused on how those Roman's could possibly beat on Jesus so much after they were present to the hearing of Pilot (or were they?) and would have looked on Jesus with as much criminal intent as a crazy begger preaching random sayings -- as opposed to a known murderer. I'm not really convinced that the Roman's could have been so remorseless -- until of course, the end of the crucifixion when they were giving him WATER, ffs. A friend brought up the notion that perhaps they were drunk, and that is possibly the only way I can see them being totally merciless and disregarding of Jesus' well being -- even as a prisoner.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 05:03:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As the Germans learned. the best way to torture someone on a continuous basis is to get someone who loves doing it. The two people whipping/scourging Jesus, and the person in charge wouldn't have been at the hearing, as they would have, I'm guessing, only been called on if they were needed.

As for the moose, it would be hilarious to see. Human nature is to avoid conflict with things bigger than ourselves, plus he had no real way of dealing with it, so I'm not really prepared to say what would happen.

Again about the blood, don't quote me on it this. But I think that when you review the type of wounds Jesus did, the total amount of blood loss wouldn't be so bad after a while. If you noticed at the end, he was only dripping blood from the wounds, a few drop from his arm at a time. I'm only assuming that that's how they bled the entire time.

Edit: not trying to argue this point with you, but rather provide a possible alternative. Plausible or not.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 05:06:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't forget: The same Romans who tortured him also gave him water.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 05:20:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Probably because they wanted him to live longer so he'd suffer more.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 05:21:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Is that why they looked guilty?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 05:23:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ah, but people can change as well. At the end they either felt pity for him as they started to believe, or they started becoming terrified of him as they started to believe. Why did they change their mind and act that way? I don't know, that's something you'd have to ask them.

Edit: I'm sure we can think of a few people who acted like idiots at one point in their life, only to change their ways later as some point in time.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 17:13:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the whole event took a total of 12 hours. so he would not have been sitting in a cell that long. romans are heartless and crucifixion was to strike fear in the people's minds, so of course it would be horrible. the temple torn into 2...it's in the Bible, i don't know where, but it's in one of the gospels. after all, jesus is the son of man, the romans realized who he was and what they were doing to him, they had compassion and possibly remorse from their actions. anti-semitic, no, it was the jewish people who condemned him to death because they knew that God was going to send a king to them to rule over them. jesus claimed to be that king, they thought their king was going to be a ruler, and they blamed him for blasphemy. it can't be anti-semitic if it shows the truth. and finally, mel gibson is an extreme catholic. he believes that the bible should only be read in latin (or whatever it is) and done strictly.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 18:10:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hebrew, not latin. Just to clarify that.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 18:13:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well...the Bible was written in Hebrew...but the Catholic church has always read it in Latin, so I was unsure about which version they read.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 19:07:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

True enough.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 12:52:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I believe the part about the earthquake is in the last chapter of Mathew. But from what I recall it was the curtain in the temple God was beleived to dwell behind that was torn in two. Not only that but the earthquake opened graves so the dead could walk out, so it may have been that severe.

I haven't seen the movie yet but I ought to sometime this week.

edit Oh and the romans did tend to give the crucified drink to ensure they live longer. The "experts" on it could keep a person alive on the cross for 30 days.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 19:25:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Would it hurt to read the source and find out?

Yes the curtain seperating the holy of holies from the rest of the temple tore in two, yes there was a massive earthquake, yes the sky darkened and yes the dead rose and walked into Jerusalem where they were seen by many.

Read all four Gospels, as there are slightly differing accounts. (No four eyewitnesses ever see exactly the same thing) You will see four different perspectives of the same event, but they all agree on the main points, and support each other well. Considering they were written anywhere from 10 to 40 years after the account, this is an acceptable margin for disparity. Even non-christian accounts record the death of the christ. See the works of Josephus. He was a Jewish historian during the Roman occupation.

I find it ironic that people will read 4 different sources when debating politics, but when it comes to the Bible, they won't even read the one.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [fl00d3d](#) on Wed, 24 Mar 2004 19:38:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you, Kirby. I was just about to break my silence to say that. And in addition, Satan took the form of a snake in the Garden of Eden at the beginnings of man and was cursed to crawl on his belly (snakes used to have legs?? lol). I haven't seen the movie yet and to be honest I've only glanced at most of these posts, but I am extremely educated in the Bible as I was brought up non-denominational Protestant.

I never even knew this movie was in production until it came out. A movie I will definitely be seeing ... and alone.

-Sean

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Battousai](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 02:46:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did you hear some guy had a heart attack and died watching this movie?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 02:49:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i don't necessarily believe that. it was a powerful movie...but the the reviews overrated the gore and violence. i mean...it could have happened but i don't think it was that shocking.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [f100d3d](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 16:47:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's true.

http://www.fox23news.com/entertainment/story.aspx?content_id=2647B1DE-826F-4CE2-A408-5C1C8D956D31

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 17:06:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have no passion to see the "Passion". Mainly because of Mel Gibsons higher than thou attitude to all religion other than the Catholic. He has been quoted saying "If you are not a devout Catholic you will be going to hell". He also said that his wife is going to hell because she is Episcopalian and not Catholic. He thinks that any non-Catholic is bearing false god(s). Geeze what religion prays to people other than God? I can tell you it is not the Lutheran, but the Catholics pray to Mary and all the saints. Non of which are the body of god and Christ. So I feel Gibson is going to skew this movie to he hard-line views and expect us to take it.

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4224452/>

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 17:34:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ALL Religions say that though. It wouldn't BE a religion if they acknowledged that their way was wrong and you should worship another God.

And, just for clarification, Praying to someone is fine. The first commandment states "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The saints and Jesus' monther, Mary are NOT Gods. Nor do we worship them as such.

Quote:So I feel Gibson is going to skew this movie to he hard-line views and expect us to take it.

Though I'm a little confused by this statement... what is it we're not supposed to take from this movie? It's all taken straight out of the bible. The only stuff that could even be potentially false are the particulars not mentioned. Jesus WAS betrayed, WAS whipped and scourged, DID have to carry the cross, WAS crucified, DID die and was taken down, and DID rise on the third day. Thats all the movie showed, so how i this taking hard-line views and scewing the movie because of it?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 17:49:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoALL Religions say that though. It wouldn't BE a religion if they acknowledged that their way was wrong and you should worship another God.

And, just for clarification, Praying to someone is fine. The first commandment states "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The saints and Jesus' monther, Mary are NOT Gods. Nor do we worship them as such.

Quote:So I feel Gibson is going to skew this movie to he hard-line views and expect us to take it.

Though I'm a little confused by this statement... what is it we're not supposed to take from this movie? It's all taken straight out of the bible. The only stuff that could even be potentially false are the particulars not mentioned. Jesus WAS betrayed, WAS whipped and scourged, DID have to carry the cross, WAS crucified, DID die and was taken down, and DID rise on the third day. Thats all the movie showed, so how i this taking hard-line views and scewing the movie because of it?

It is no secret the the Catholic religion picked and choose what books should be in the Bible and left out several book because they feard it would undermine the power of the Catholic Church.

I have never heard a Lutheran minister say that Catholic's or any other Christian based believers are going to hell.

Sorry will finish later have to go.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 18:55:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

in the Bible, somewhere in the book of Romans (i don't have my Bible right with me), it says that there is only one mediator between God and us and that is the Son of Man, Christ Jesus.

If there is only one mediator, why would you pray to anyone else?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 20:33:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

da_shizin the Bible, somewhere in the book of Romans (i don't have my Bible right with me), it says that there is only one mediator between God and us and that is the Son of Man, Christ Jesus.

You're right about the mediator, but I cannot comment on the book it was written in. A friend of mine wrote a paper on this mediation and when put into proper context, it fits in perfectly to the account that Jesus IS the mediator. I'll see if I can find the URL for it...

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 25 Mar 2004 23:58:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

K9Trooper

It is no secret the the Catholic religion picked and choose what books should be in the Bible and left out several book because they feard it would undermine the power of the Catholic Church.

I have never heard a Lutheran minister say that Catholic's or any other Christian based believers are going to hell.

Sorry will finish later have to go.

I wonder why they wouldn't say that of a Catholic or other Christian based religion... maybe because we all believe in the same God?

As for the choise books that go in the bible, as far as I understand, most of them are because they are unable to be confirmed that they were actually about Jesus, and not something made up... though they may be based in fact. Now this is not saying that there may be some that contain stories that undermine the idea the Church is trying to uphold, but I have seen no proof of this. (Dead Sea scrolls aside)

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 05:49:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoK9Trooper

It is no secret the the Catholic religion picked and choose what books should be in the Bible and left out several book because they feard it would undermine the power of the Catholic Church.

I have never heard a Lutheran minister say that Catholic's or any other Christian based believers are going to hell.

Sorry will finish later have to go.

I wonder why they wouldn't say that of a Catholic or other Christian based religion... maybe because we all believe in the same God?

As for the choise books that go in the bible, as far as I understand, most of them are because they are unable to be confirmed that they were actually about Jesus, and not something made up... though they may be based in fact. Now this is not saying that there may be some that contain stories that undermine the idea the Church is trying to uphold, but I have seen no proof of this. (Dead Sea scrolls aside)

One could argue that any of the books were written by who they say wrote them.

Catholics are the only ones in the Christian faith that pray to people other than Jesus and God.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 14:40:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoK9Trooper

It is no secret the the Catholic religion picked and choose what books should be in the Bible and left out several book because they feard it would undermine the power of the Catholic Church.

I have never heard a Lutheran minister say that Catholic's or any other Christian based believers are going to hell.

Sorry will finish later have to go.

I wonder why they wouldn't say that of a Catholic or other Christian based religion... maybe because we all believe in the same God?

As for the choise books that go in the bible, as far as I understand, most of them are because they are unable to be confirmed that they were actually about Jesus, and not something made up... though they may be based in fact. Now this is not saying that there may be some that contain stories that undermine the idea the Church is trying to uphold, but I have seen no proof of this. (Dead Sea scrolls aside)

Do any of you really believe that the creator of the universe is so incompetent that he couldn't preserve what he wanted to keep in the bible, and throw out the rest?

I prefer to think he is quite competent to preserve the integrity of his own word.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 16:10:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We pray to them, yes.. but we don't treat them as Gods. Just to clarify that point.

As for the creator being incompetent, nothing to worry about there. Humans on the other hand...

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 16:22:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoWe pray to them, yes.. but we don't treat them as Gods. Just to clarify that point.

As for the creator being incompetent, nothing to worry about there. Humans on the other hand...

Regarding point one:

Why? Does the Bible call for this? Did Jesus? Then why do it? They are DEAD, and no different than any other dead human. If the son of god didn't tell you to institute a hierarchy, and install men in between him and you, then why do you believe that this method is correct? Surely you must realize now after these scandals, that having intercessors of human nature is flawed because humans are flawed.

Romans 8

33Who will bring any charge against those whom God has chosen? It is God who justifies. 34Who

right hand of God and is also interceding for us. 35Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall trouble or hardship or persecution or famine or nakedness or danger or sword?

Show me where it says MARY or any other human intercedes on our behalf through prayer? And why bother when you could go directly to the son of god? Do the humans have more leverage with him? I think not. This practice is the result of flawed human logic, and rationalization. Not scripture.

Point two:

The competent creator chose competent humans to relate his messages. End result is a relevant, competent and reliable message. Good thing Noah was competent. Same goes for the Apostles. Do you really think God would chose someone, and then not make sure what he wrote was EXACTLY what he wanted in his scriptures? Divine inspiration, and guidance are real, and relevant.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 18:25:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

finally someone who shares the same belief as i do. Catholics are generally correct, but they just have quite a few flaws in their beliefs. they're not major, but they are quite important. not saying that the flaws will make you "go to Hell", but they do somewhat hinder your faith.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 21:13:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, since divine inspiration is real (I wanted to avoid this concept incase some people here would call it a cop-out), then I have two words for you. The Pope. Through divine inspiration, surely the leader of Gods Religion would not cause him to make mistakes. Through scripture, Jesus gave St. Peter authority over the church and whatever he "binds or looses" on Earth will be given Divine Ratification.

Hmm.. I guess then, if the Pope, through the successors St. Peter, is deemed infallible by God, then I guess praying to Mary and the Saints for strength is fine, and the books that never made it into the bible, were never ment to go in! Thanks for making my job easier!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 21:42:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the pope has no power at all, he's just a politcal figure in my eyes.

If the pope says, "Jump!" I'll say "Why ain't u jumpin'?"

Now I need to get help from my teacher with an answer to ur response. All I know is that your statement is false. Not quite sure how I'm gonna support that point by myself.

Kids, this is why it is so important to read your Bible every day.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 22:18:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

what statement is false?

Edit: and if the pope said jump, I wouldn't jump either. Same goes for anyone else that would tell me to. Doesn't make him any less the Catholic's leader.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 22:39:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the fact that you can pray to others. they're dead...they have as much power to give you strenght as if you prayed to your dead dog to help you pass an english test.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 23:11:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wasn't it the Pope who was recorded saying in Vetican One that "I can never be wrong"?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 27 Mar 2004 00:05:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

that statement's blasphemous. no one can be perfect except for God (Christ Jesus included as God).

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 27 Mar 2004 00:31:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

da_shizCatholics are generally correct, but they just have quite a few flaws in their beliefs. they're not major,

Seems to me that an arrogant Pope is a major flaw...

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 27 Mar 2004 00:55:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well...that's a major flaw in this generation of Catholicism. after pope john paul ii dies off, we'll have a brand new religion of Catholicism. every time there is a new pope, they change the religion more and more. so by me saying not any major flaws, i mean in the overall religion, not the created one.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 07:40:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok as a Catholic I am going to make this as clear as possible.

1) Da_Shiz is not a Catholic and holds some what of a grudge against his former religion. (yes I did type former)

2) Jesus (as I believe) was the son of God and was crucified for our sins. He opened the gates of Heaven to sinners. Formerly people who died went to a place called "limbo" not to be confused with purgatory (which is a place to clear your remaining sins against God). Jesus opened Heaven to us he made us able to enter Heaven and spend eternity with him (I really should not say him because technically God is pure/perfect spirit.)

3) Mel Gibson is a devout Catholic who spent all of his own money on this film and made it all back in about 2 hours after the film was released. He is a man of God and he believed that the film should be put in the actual language of the culture making the movie feel more realistic to the view (I say realistic meaning how you could relate the movie to the actual events).

4) As for the Gore. In our age we tend to sanitize things. Execution is now done by lethal injection. We no longer believe in public execution (at least not in the U.S. or other first world countries). In that time period executions were used to set examples to try and stop crime and for the most part it worked. But the Governor/Pilot was a man who put every criminal to death no matter what the crime he was worried about putting Jesus to death not only because his wife detested the execution. He did not want to lose his job, Caesar was going to put him in a lesser position if he put one more person to death for no reason. But lo and behold he did it anyway to avoid a riot... so it was a lose lose situation for Pilot.

I hope you have enjoyed my short summary of The Passion of the Christ.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 07:45:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The pope is infallible means "The pope cannot be wrong on teachings of the church" NOT and I repeat NOT on politics or other views he is still human and that was vatican two smacktard

ALSO, it was not water he was given it was GALL a terrible smelling awful form of alcohol.

Their is one thing I do not agree with in the Catholic Religion and that is going to a priest to confess my sins. Why in the world would I have to go tell a priest that I screwed up... When God is supposed to be listening to me all the time...

"I/We believe the Communion of Saints..."

Just becuase the Pope makes someone a saints that does not mean they are the only saints. Who says the "people" in heaven cant intercede to God for us. I mean who has been their and been back to tell us about it. Also who is to say the bibles where not flawed. for hundreds of years the bible was past down generation to generation and have you ever played the game telephone. You know how messed up the message gets after going across the room thru all those people. Think about it...

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 14:48:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't have a grudge, I just realize that the Catholic church leaves you feeling empty. I had nothing to believe in when I was a Catholic.

WRONG WRONG WRONG!!!!!!!!!!!!

Christ IS the Son of God, no if ands or buts. The death of Christ is God's renewing of his old testament covanant to His children. Now, you can only get to Heaven through Him and only Him. There was never a limbo...there was a Paradise and a Hell. Paradise is no longer, but Hell still remains until it is cast into the Lake of Fire.

You just don't get it, just because you learn something in school, doesn't make it truth. if i learned in school that God is a purple, flying donkey, then I guess that he must be one.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 16:57:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You're such an idiot.... I won't even argue cuz you're so stuck in your stupid ways and your bible thumping school... You remind me sometimes of the Johovas Witness people....

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 21:40:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

im sorry that me reading the Bible makes me an idiot. ur an even bigger idiot than i thought, Bible

thumping? how is my school bible thumping? we spread God's Word. I thought that's what my faith tells me to do.

OMG...i just read your post again...you're a MORON.

THE BIBLE says that only CHRIST can intercede for us. THE BIBLE IS INERRANT, WITHOUT ERROR. If you don't believe that, then you're not a true believer. WAKE UP AND RECOGNIZE THE TRUTH; it's smacking you in the face so hard that it's making you even more stupid. BTW...the Bible is God's Spoken Word, he's not going to let it get messed up in passing generations. He's not a careless God, he's perfect to the friggen T.

BTW...don't consider me a part of your religion. religion is full of rules and guidelines. What I believe in is my faith, I don't have to believe the same thing as everyone else does. Yes, i do have guidelines and rules to my faith, but it's not like there's a noose around my neck.

One more thing, along with Limbo, where the hell does the Bible say there is a Pergatory? JESUS DIED FOR OUR SINS, we dont' have to work them off, MORON. If we had to work them off, then there's no point in having God's grace and mercy if we can do it ourselves. You need to wake up and read the Bible and try to understand it or else you'll be just as one described in Revelation that will be in front of Jesus and says, "i did all those great things for you in your name." and he will say, "part from me, i never knew you."

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 22:01:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Times like this I'm glad I'm an atheist.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 22:30:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

won't be so glad when u die. eternity of darkness. eternity of being lost. you will be next to people, but you won't even know they're there. just think...BLACK...i mean...BLACK environment, eternity of being lost. imagine being a little kid losing his mother in a supermarket, the fear and the worry that's in that kid. MANY MANY MANY times worse than that in Hell. Think of something that you absolutely feel uncomfortable doing, seeing, feeling. Hell will be many times worse than that feeling.

also, what's the harm in believing in something if we're just gonna end up dust in the wind when we die? i know that there is no end to life. there is a definite end to mortal life. In Hell you'll be suffering an eternal death, over and over and over and over and over and over and over for eternity, NO ENDING. One day after another, one year after another, one century after another, one millenium after another and so on and so forth.

if you believe in no afterlife, what's wrong in believing something? it's not gonna harm you at all because there would be no consequences to believing a higher being.

think about this, how can you have beings appear out of nothing? the big bang, ok, how did the explosion happen, what exploded? how did those come to be in the first place? there has to be some sort of higher being out there. it just so happens to be that THE ONE AND ONLY God that I believe in is the true creator and only creator of the universe and everything it contains. Bible has been proven to be inerrant. And if it wasn't true, why would so many people spend years trying to disprove something that would disprove itself if it was false? how can 1 book with 40 different authors deliver one message and not have any conflicts in it? it's divine, it's the truth, it can't be disproven.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Dishman](#) on Sun, 28 Mar 2004 23:32:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alright, this is kind of old, but about the raven part (forgive me if it's been debated already ;)...

I saw it with some people from a local church, and afterwards the theology professor, who was the host of the outing, said that the raven part wasn't distinctively in the Bible, but it was more of a common occurrence among crucifixions. The criminal would be crucified, and ravens would come to the cross and peck their eyes out, for whatever "nutricious" reasons they had. I think Gibson put this into the movie just to add a more realistic aspect to the whole scene, unless his methodist (If that's what he is) beliefs support the raven occurrence for some religious standpoint.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 01:12:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDeminThe pope is infallible means "The pope cannot be wrong on teachings of the church" NOT and I repeat NOT on politics or other views he is still human and that was vatican two smacktard

ALSO, it was not water he was given it was GALL a terrible smelling awful form of alcohol.

Their is one thing I do not agree with in the Catholic Religion and that is going to a priest to confess my sins. Why in the world would I have to go tell a priest that I screwed up... When God is supposed to be listening to me all the time...

I hope for your sake that you're not Catholic then. Because if the Pope cannot be fallible in the teachings of the Church, how can you possibly disagree with him that confession must be done to a Priest and still be called a Catholic?

Furthermore, you're right: it IS blasphemous to confess to a Priest. Priests cannot play a mediator of sins, because Jesus was the ONLY mediator sent by God. So it is Jesus, and ONLY Jesus (or God himself) who can forgive sins. Therefore, Catholicism is flawed, and the Pope himself is wrong, thus Vatican Two (are you SURE?) is not correct. Bearing that in mind, if that can be considered flawed, what else is wrong?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 01:38:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you Java, it's about time that Dark here hears that from someone else other than me. he INSISTS that i'm just stubborn, but he doesn't get it. Maybe now that more than I have told him this, he'll get a whiff of his own crap and wake up.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 03:38:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

da_shizwon't be so glad when u die. eternity of darkness. eternity of being lost. you will be next to people, but you won't even know they're there. just think...BLACK...i mean...BLACK environment, eternity of being lost. imagine being a little kid losing his mother in a supermarket, the fear and the worry that's in that kid. MANY MANY MANY times worse than that in Hell. Think of something that you absolutely feel uncomfortable doing, seeing, feeling. Hell will be many times worse than that feeling.

also, what's the harm in believing in something if we're just gonna end up dust in the wind when we die? i know that there is no end to life. there is a definite end to mortal life. In Hell you'll be suffering an eternal death, over and over and over and over and over and over and over for eternity, NO ENDING. One day after another, one year after another, one century after another, one millenium after another and so on and so forth.

if you believe in no afterlife, what's wrong in believing something? it's not gonna harm you at all because there would be no consequences to believing a higher being.

think about this, how can you have beings appear out of nothing? the big bang, ok, how did the explosion happen, what exploded? how did those come to be in the first place? there has to be some sort of higher being out there. it just so happens to be that THE ONE AND ONLY God that I believe in is the true creator and only creator of the universe and everything it contains. Bible has been proven to be inerrant. And if it wasn't true, why would so many people spend years trying to disprove something that would disprove itself if it was false? how can 1 book with 40 different authors deliver one message and not have any conflicts in it? it's divine, it's the truth, it can't be disproven.

I'm not sure how the "big bang" happened, but, I'm not going to replace it with some fictional god that I have absolutely no proof exists.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 03:58:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

have you really taken the time to just look at the great outdoors? take a look and see the beauty and deep think about how it came to be? how can you tell me that someone didn't create it? how can everything work out so perfectly and just happen? everything has order, nothing really seems out of place, except for evil and sin. how can you tell me that how my body works, how sex works, how life works without seeing order and perfection? what are the chances that i take 200 pieces of paper and some clear thin plastic and throw it up in the air and it all of a sudden becomes packaged and neat like those 200 sheet packs of paper? better yet, a watch, tons and tons of little components, it didn't just come to be. it was created. u could sit for centuries with all of the parts right in front of you waiting for them to join together and become a watch, it's not gonna happen unless someone puts the components together in a fashion that the watch starts to tick.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 04:03:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If the bible said purple flying bitch monkeys created the earth, would you believe it? Untill there is solid proof that god(s) exist, I'm not going to let a story book tell me my values.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 04:16:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

has any story book had 40+ authors and have not one of them conflict with each other? it's an impossible feat to have 40+ authors write about different subjects and have not one of them conflict with another, unless it was divinely inspired. it takes faith to believe what i believe. most athiests are brilliant people, but they let their minds get in the way of letting them see the truth and letting them believe in the simplest of ideas that are the hardest to grasp. like $1+1 = 2$. it's so simple, but how does it really work? what is "1" and how come when it's added to itself it equals this other number, the number "2"? we learn that is just is and that's how we get by. but with faith and superior beings, we can't let it be just that simple. it somehow has to be turned into this huge search for the truth and yada yada yada. that is why kids are so easy to believe, is because they don't understand, they just believe. aren't kids the happiest out of everyone? that's because they don't over think things. if you just look at the simple facts and believe for the sake of believing, you'll be more likely to grasp the idea and then actually understand.

It's time for me to hit the sack, i will be more than happy to continue this discussion tomorrow.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 04:21:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We let our minds get in the way of seeing the truth, eh? You want us to blindly follow some shitty little book without using our minds? That makes a lot of sense... :rolleyes:

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 07:48:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CwazyapeWe let our minds get in the way of seeing the truth, eh? You want us to blindly follow some shitty little book without using our minds? That makes a lot of sense... :rolleyes:

(Quoting the post above me, I know)

Give me proof God does NOT exist.

And since we're on the topic of blindly following what others say... please tell me. With your own eyes, have you seen a billion dollars, an atom, the core of the Earth being made of molten/solid iron, Jupiter, an electron, your great (times 10) Grandfather? (And this does NOT include pictures)

If you answer no to any of the above, then I guess according to you, they don't exist. Right?

Oh, but wait, science tells us they do. But then again, are you going to blindly follow what a book tells you without using your minds?

But then, once again, there is a reason Religion is a belief structure, and not a science... the "fact" that there is no proof. Either for, or against.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 13:19:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:And since we're on the topic of blindly following what others say... please tell me. With your own eyes, have you seen a billion dollars, an atom, the core of the Earth being made of molten/solid iron, Jupiter, an electron, your great (times 10) Grandfather? (And this does NOT include pictures)

No, I havent, but there is scientific proof these things exist. I don't mind if people follow their respective religions, but, when people start making jackass comments such as "but i feel that victory at all costs is applicable" I start to wonder, does this include murder of innocent people?

He is beginning to talk about Homosexuals as Hitler talked about the Jews, a "deterioration of our standards".

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 14:17:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i meant a victory at all costs pertaining to people approving of me or not. i took it a little far with that statement, but i don't care what people think of me as long as i am fighting for what's right.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 15:10:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CwazyapeHe is beginning to talk about Homosexuals as Hitler talked about the Jews, a "deterioration of our standards".

You know, quite a bit of Hitler's thinking was derived from Darwin's theory. "In starting and waging war it is not right that matters, but victory." - Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf, Ch. 14 "Survival of the fittest," perhaps? Hitler basically used God and Christianity as a tool to ensnare the masses to support him.

Now back on topic, people. We're supposed to be talking about the movie.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 18:32:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

seriously...it is a deterioration of our standards. imagine a time where homosexuals were something that people were absolutely afraid of admitting because of fear that they won't be accepted by others. seems like a far away place doesn't it? it was only a few decades ago that it was unacceptable to be homosexual, and now, we can be? u can say times change, and i agree, but there are absolute truths and one absolute truth is that a marriage is strictly between a man and a woman. it is deterioration of our standards if we can start to allow homosexuality to be a new normal. we're even making the homosexuals out to be somewhat like heroes, that they're coming out of the closet which is supposedly a hard thing to do. they're being rewarded for being homo, i for one, will never accept it or award their actions.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 21:04:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm beginning to believe that EVERYONE has a TINY PIECE of the truth, yet they all blow it up to be the absolute, no contest, one-and-only way to live. If you think you know the entire truth of existence, you are as flawed as those you criticize.

Quote:u can say times change, and i agree, but there are absolute truths

Times DO change. For several centuries after the death of Jesus, it was absolutely unacceptable to be a Christian. The Roman Empire used them in gladiatorial games, just for something to kill. Now, Christianity is the single most powerful religion in the world. 2000 years ago, it didn't even exist. And you somehow presume that you are any more "right" than anyone else is?

Would you take away womens' suffrage, just because they did not have it 100 years ago? Would you allow parents to beat their children, just because it was once an accepted norm?

What was that the Bible said about NOT judging others? You continue to rag on how one person or another has no right to do this or do that, when in reality you are doing the same thing. Is that not hypocritical? FFS, there isn't one Christian church which remembers exactly what the message of their supposed savior was. "Love thy neighbor..." yeah, but only if they're not gay, atheist, pagan, or anything else we don't agree with. Don't be so eager to examine others' flaws when you have just as many of your own.

Everyone wants to believe that theirs is the one and only truth, but they are simply afraid to accept that there is more than one way to go about living. That goes for ALL religions. NO EXCEPTIONS. If you want to believe something is wrong, go ahead; that is your right. Just NEVER assume that everyone else must believe in the same version of truth.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 21:20:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

first of all, im not in a religion. i am a part of the christian faith. and who says i don't love thy neighbor? just because i don't like them personally, doesn't mean i dont' love them. i love them as another human being, i don't have to stomach them. where in the Bible does it say that I must like everybody? it only says that i have to love them. people don't have the same rights as everyone else. rights are determined by the choices that are made, not necessarily the ones that we make, but for the most part it is. take, for example, a murderer. He commits a murder, and because of that choice, he doesn't get to have freedom and live without boundary. now, homosexuals choose to act upon their desires, and therefore should not have the right to marry. athiests and other believers, they choose not to believe in the truth, so therefore they dont' get the privelage of eternal life.

you can go about living any way you want to, but it is not necessarily right. i take it you're an athiest. you believe in nothing after death, of course you're gonna see living any way that you want to to be acceptable.

my faith IS the only faith that will lead you to salvation. there are different variants on my faith that will lead to the same end result, but you have to agree on basic absolute truths. religion is a dangerous thing and is full of corruption. luckily, i am not a part of a religion, as i have stated, i am a part of my faith. my faith allows me to view different aspects of the world in different variations and yet still be correct.

i don't know the entire truth of the existance, i know that we were created by a higher being, who

happens to be the one and only God of the universe. He sent his only son down to die for our sins. go ahead and believe what you will, but until you believe those two ABSOLUTE TRUTHS, you will not be in the same place as i will be after we both falls victims to death.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 21:48:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:you can go about living any way you want to, but it is not necessarily right. i take it you're an athiest. you believe in nothing after death, of course you're gonna see living any way that you want to to be acceptable.

Wow, you ARE arrogant. You assume you know what others believe even before they've told you. While you are correct in that I am an atheist, you are dead wrong everywhere else. I DO believe there is an afterlife- but I do not make the assumption that I know what it will be like. And I certainly don't think I know what yours will be like.

Living "any way you want" is only acceptable if you (and pay attention, this bit is important) do not infringe upon the rights of another human being. That looks incredibly apathetic on the surface...yet even this way, certain things are definitely unacceptable. Murder or robbery for example...by committing those crimes, you piss all over someone else's rights; therefore you cannot do either. Only things which do not impede another being's rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness may be done.

Quote:my faith IS the only faith that will lead you to salvation. there are different variants on my faith that will lead to the same end result, but you have to agree on basic absolute truths. religion is a dangerous thing and is full of corruption. luckily, i am not a part of a religion, as i have stated, i am a part of my faith. my faith allows me to view different aspects of the world in different variations and yet still be correct.

And yet you miss the point. Do you truly believe you have the divine key to the universe in your set of beliefs? The world is not quite as simple as right and wrong, believer and nonbeliever. Consider this: your faith may be the only one that will bring YOU salvation. The same does not necessarily apply to every other person you see walking down the street; there are a lot of other people out there, all claiming they have the one and only truth (unfortunately, I am no exception; I will never be able to believe in a supreme being, just as you will never be able to believe there isn't one). All I think people should consider is that perhaps, just maybe, and very possibly, their truth applies only to them.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 21:54:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yes, i did assume, but whatever.

you're missing the point, my faith IS the only way, i dont care about what other religions believe. the Bible, which is the source for my beliefs, tells me that there is only ONE God and you can only have salvation through Him and ONLY through Him. believe what you wish, but like i said, until you believe those two absolute truths that i outlined, you will not have eternal salvation. i also do know what the afterlife is going to be like in generalization. Heaven will be bliss, better than anything you are able to imagine. Hell is going to be horrible, going to be eternal death.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 23:03:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:believe what you wish, but like i said, until you believe those two absolute truths that i outlined, you will not have eternal salvation. i also do know what the afterlife is going to be like in generalization. Heaven will be bliss, better than anything you are able to imagine. Hell is going to be horrible, going to be eternal death.

So go ahead and believe that. While you're busy "knowing" what will happen to me when I die, I'm busy "knowing" that you haven't quite grasped the concept that truth is not defined by your beliefs alone. YOUR truth is not the same as MY truth. Get it yet?

On a side note: I'd rather wind up in eternal pain than be told what to believe, and if that's what happens...so be it. I ceased worrying about that long ago; what happens after I die will be dealt with when I get there. At least I'll go to my grave knowing that I lived my life in a way that I felt was meaningful and enjoyable.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 23:09:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

your view of "truth" is different than mine, but the absolute truths are the same for the both of us. whether or not you accept that fact is up to you, but the fact still remains that truth is truth no matter what we believe.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 23:19:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The absolute truths, interestingly enough, change whenever a new religion becomes the dominant one in the world. What you choose to accept as truth is up to you, but yours isn't the only truth out there. Everyone's got their own brand of absolute truth to peddle- the only problem is that none of them are absolute. Your truth, my truth, and everyone else's as well, are all dependant on the different ways in which we have been brought up, what choices we have made, and even the chemicals bubbling around up in our brains. Had I been raised like you, I would probably think the same way you do. Had you been raised the way I was, you would share my beliefs. "Truth" is

subjective.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 23:20:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There is no "Absolute Truth" to Religion. If it were, Religion would be a structure of science rather than a set of beliefs. We BELIEVE that our religion is right, yet we have no way of knowing whether it is or not. There is no proof for it, as well as no proof against it. Yes I am a Christian, and yes I BELIEVE that our way is the best way (if, at least, it's not the perfect way), however, I do not KNOW it to be that way.

And yes, I'm using the literal meanings of belief and knowledge.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2004 23:33:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

whether or not i would grow up believing different truths, that doesn't stop the fact that there are absolute truths out there. the Bible has absolute truths. if you are a believer and you don't believe that, i would say, read your bible again and truly think about what it is you believe then. i can say with confidence that i KNOW that there are absolute truths and that my belief is correct.

Luckily, it is because i believe in my faith that i know there are absolute truths. i have faith in what i believe in and it causes me to believe and know about the absolute truths.

Warranto, i would seriously tell you to read your Bible again. you seem to overlook the fact that in the Bible Christ says, and EXTREMELY CLEARLY, that he is the only way to Heaven.

I don't believe I'm perfect or I am exactly correct on my beliefs, I am far from perfect. There are absolute truths, today's world teaches that there are none and that when times change, so does truth. If truth changes, then in 1000 years is one plus one going to equal 6,000,000?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 00:49:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Warranto, should we go on that "Atheism cannot exist logically" tirade?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 00:57:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By definition, I guess I'm not athiest.. I just am not active in any religion nor do I worship any "saviors" etc..

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 01:00:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Atheism is actually the belief that there is no God(s). While you can actively say you don't believe in any God, that is different than saying "I do not believe that God exists".

On a smaller scale, I don't believe in Paul Martin, but I do acknowledge his existence.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 01:05:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so you believe in a higher being? i don't want to cram the Bible down peoples' throats, but I seriously think it would solve many of your problems.

Most people that i've talked to who aren't believers have tried to commit suicide one or more times. I have never tried to commit suicide and I know that I will never try to commit suicide. Some of it has to do with my upbringings, but generally, I have never been in a deep depression because I have something to hold onto.

I am available for questioning if anyone has any questions on God and the Bible. I should be able to answer most of your questions, but I do not have all of the answers. If I don't know an answer, I will consult my teachers and principal and try to see if they can answer your question. You can talk to me on AIM, MSN, and Yahoo! Messengers.

AIM - reydelaguerra
MSN - j_ball430@comcast.net
Yahoo! - j_ball430

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 02:46:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

da_shizhas any story book had 40+ authors and have not one of them conflict with each other?

As a matter of fact, there is a book that fits that description... it's called the Bible, more specifically the New Testament.

da_shizmost athiests ... let their minds get in the way of ... letting them believe in the simplest of ideas ... what is "1" and how come when it's added to itself it equals this other number, the

number "2"?

Numbers are not a tangible, concrete thing - they are concepts. You do not pick up two ones, glue them together, and hold up a two. It has been proven out of rational thought - if you buy an apple and find another, you don't have one, you have two. Religious concepts do not have their foundations laid on rational thought, but faith, far from a simple thing.

da_shizaren't kids the happiest out of everyone? that's because they don't over think things.

...Which means that kids aren't ready at their young age to transend the "simple" fairy-tales known as religion.

da_shiz... one absolute truth is that a marriage is strictly between a man and a woman.

Your "absolute truth" is nothing more than an opinion, or perhaps an observation of standard societal tradition. Marriage is a very close relationship and union between two people- it just so happens that those two people have most often been of the opposite sex.

da_shizwe're even making homosexuals out to be somewhat like heroes, that they're coming out of the closet which is supposedly a hard thing to do. they're being rewarded for being homo ...

When you have faced, as you pointed out, decades of scorn and hatred, it can be hard to admit to being an abomination in the eyes of society. Are they really being awarded, or just accepted?

da_shizmy faith IS the only faith that will lead you to salvation.

Think you not that all the despicable characters of history have used similiar devices of justifying their positions? Hitler was even mentioned earlier in this thread.

When it comes to religion, nothing changes.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 03:01:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

for one, i WAS talking about the Bible.

another, my faith is concrete like numbers. they are both truths.

religions aren't fairy-tales. they are beliefs that grown men and women have believed for centuries. i was referring to the fact that christians are more christ-like when they have been saved from the time they were kids.

to many, as i have stated again and again and will not change others' minds, my absolute truths are nothing of the sort. i, however, know that they are absolute truths. debate with me all you wish on this subject, i feel that until you try to understand the Bible, you won't get what i am saying.

i do commend their bravery, but i don't reward them with marriage rights. just like when a child lies and then admits to it. the parents are proud and commend their bravery to tell them, but they don't come away with a new bike.

Hitler was trying to use religion as a way to get more supporters (as mentioned earlier). Hitler was using it for evil. I don't plan on using my belief in absolute truths for dominating the world.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 03:12:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:so you believe in a higher being? i don't want to cram the Bible down peoples' throats, but I seriously think it would solve many of your problems.

No, I keep an open mind. Untill I see proof that this higher being does exist, I'm not going to worship him, but untill I see proof he doesnt exist, I'm not going to rule out the possibility.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 03:31:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

THIS THREAD HAS BEEN HIJACKED GET OUT

IT MINE NOW

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 03:32:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

haremanTHIS THREAD HAS BEEN HIJACKED GET OUT

IT MINE NOW

OUT YOU GO. YANK.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 06:38:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

da_shiz, I just want to clarify something. When I use the words "truth", "knowledge" and "belief" I'm using the literal interpretation of them. If you beleive in something, you do not know it to be

truth. If you Know something, then it is truth and you no longer simply "beleive" it to be true. We do not "believe" that $1+1=2$, we "know" that. While I'm not trying to undermine my own religion, or start a conflict with you, it may be possible that Jesus was a fraud and just managed to dupe everyone. Don't get me wrong, I in no way beleive this to be true, but it's still a possiblity, even if it's not a plausablility. I only say this because we don't "know" what the truth surrounding the matter is. Historiic studies that far back are incomplete, hence we don't "know" if Jesus even existed. Recent Bone findings have found a "Son of Joseph, Brother to Jesus", however, once again, there is insufficient proof (last I heard) that it is the same Jesus as the bible dictates, though it is highly likely that it is.

Now, the whole religion concept is a system of beliefs. By it's own admittance of it being a belief structure, the religions of the world say that the proof of their set of beliefs are not "Knowledge". There is no "proof" that our religion is the right one, just as there is no "proof" that anything any religion states is true. The changed phrase, "Experiancing is knowing" would apply here. We do not "know" that atoms exist, as we have not experianced them ourselves. We have to rely on others that they exist. The same holds true for religion. We have to rely on others for what could be true. Now, this is not saying atoms don't exist, just as I'm not saying God doesn't exist. However, just because we don't "know" them to exist doesn't mean they don't. We just don't "know" it. An example of this is quazars. We believed atoms to be the smallest thing in existance, infact we "knew" it. Now something smaller has been discovered... the quazar. So now we "know" that to be the smallest thing to exist. Until now that it. We now beleive that something smaller than a quazar exists, strings. So much for "knowing" the "truth", huh?

Edit: and yes, Javaxcx if you want to bring out that Athiest arguement, go right ahead. It's always an enjoyment to watch them squirm.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 16:04:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To save my own time, and without changing any words, I'm just going to cut'n'paste from that paper we did:

Atheism

(Dictionary). Atheism is a philosophy where no God is present, and is therefore reliant on the belief that the universe is dictated solely by logic and the measurement of matter and energy.* The universe however, is obviously too large for any human to measure, and therefore uncertainty takes the place of the unmeasured. The atheist philosophy makes the claim that there is no God, but fails to account for the uncertainty in the universe. For an atheist to say that God cannot exist, without measuring every part of the universe, is premature and illogical. For a philosophy based

logic cannot exist, neither can a logical atheist. If there is no such thing as a logical atheist, what

base a philosophy on the hypocritical logic atheism does, rather promote logistical debates on the conclude it, as no conclusion can ever be reached. It is therefore impossible for any human being to logically accept the atheist concept of God, whereas agnostic atheism allows logistical debate.

*This line does spark an awful lot of arguement. But you must realize, when I say that you disbelieve or deny the existence of God or gods, you must understand that includes supernatural forces that govern us. That includes magic and whatnot. Who/whatever creates them DOES fall into the category of a God or gods because it is a force that humans are superceded by.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 22:09:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, then Im not considered an official athiest...

Hmm... better make my own religion... apeism..

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [setstyle](#) on Wed, 31 Mar 2004 21:18:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/clear all sense of bashing

da_shizfor one, i WAS talking about the Bible.

I pointed out that it fits the description you said it did not - the authors of the Bible do have conflicting stories.

CwazyapeWell, then Im not considered an official athiest...

Giving oneself a label does not do well to keeping a free mind. Liberal, atheist, feminist... they all lump together everyone involved, including any conflicting opinions and beliefs. If I say I am a(n) [insert group], I take on the ideas of all others involved in calling themselves a(n) [insert group].

I do not believe in any god or gods.

With that statement, I cast away labels and definitions to opt instead for the clear definition of me, not a collective. A statement of affiliation can bring with it negative implications, such as many a political party being discredited by the actions of a select few members.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 31 Mar 2004 23:57:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ok...first of all...the Bible isn't a story book. Someone referred to it as a story book and i was mocking that comment. Before someone said it was a story book, I was talking about how the Bible had no conflicts. My mistake, I should have said that, i misspoke on that last post.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 02:37:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It seems to me the bible is a collection of stories and rules that guide some in life...

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 02:56:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

setstyle

I do not believe in any god or gods.

With that statement, I cast away labels and definitions to opt instead for the clear definition of me, not a collective.

You're a human being. If you're an intelligent one, you're also an agnostic atheist.

Like it or lump it, you do fit into a category -- no matter how much of an individual you feel you are.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [hareman](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 14:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Java I place thee in the 0WNT by Hareman Category

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 16:24:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huh? What was that? Hareman trying to hijack me again? Hmm... I guess it was just the wind. Rats.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [setstyle](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 21:23:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Javaxcxsetstyle

I do not believe in any god or gods.

With that statement, I cast away labels and definitions to opt instead for the clear definition of me, not a collective.

You're a human being. If you're an intelligent one, you're also an agnostic atheist.

Like it or lump it, you do fit into a category -- no matter how much of an individual you feel you are.

Of course. We'll all marked by faults.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 22:06:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Categorizing something doesn't mean it has faults.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2004 23:27:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unless the categorizing method itself has faults

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [setstyle](#) on Sat, 03 Apr 2004 19:32:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxCategorizing something doesn't mean it has faults.

Correct, but what I said is that human beings are marked by imperfection.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [hareman](#) on Sun, 04 Apr 2004 17:58:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Speak for thineself mortal lackey

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Mon, 05 Apr 2004 23:01:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok, Mr. Almighty.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Mon, 05 Apr 2004 23:05:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

God is the only Almighty one.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 01:53:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i agree as completely as i possibly can.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [hareman](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 03:33:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NO I AM THY LORD HIJACKER ALMIGHTY

THIS THREAD IS MINE

LEAVE FOUL LACKEYS OF JAVA

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 03:34:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sure thing, Yank!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 03:35:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

defiling a theological debate thread...tisk tisk tisk, shame on you.

besides...God just gave me the go ahead to rehijack this thread in His name.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [hareman](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 03:43:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OMG

I OWNT JAVA

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 03:56:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yes you did, but then I OWNT you.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [hareman](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 01:25:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NO I am the OWNT4G3

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 02:06:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wow....this thread went horribly wrong. Can i ask crimson or someone to lock it before someone slaughters the huguenots or tells the catholics they can't hold land or public office...AGAIN?

A few points: The bible is the official cannon of the catholic church, meant to supplement church teachings. To accept it's authority, you have to accept the authority of the church that created it. (prbly shoulnd't a said that, eh?)

We catholics ask people up there to pray for us to God. Asking a saint/mary to pray for you is no different than talking to your dead grandmother or parent...you're just having a chat through prayer.

The pope is only infallible in spiritual matters ONLY. And this infallibility clause has only been used TWICE in 2000 years. So it's not like the pope-a-rope goes willy nilly with the infa'billy.

I forget the other things i had to had to say.

soap.

poo.

Plastic Bag.

I AM THE DEVIL!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 02:07:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NO, Alkaline IS!!!

Wait...no...he's the OWNT!!!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 02:09:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ah, yes.

okay, you caught me in a lie.

I AM THE DEVIL'S GAY LOVER!

Saddam hussein of course.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 02:09:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They can't pray for you, they have no leverage. It'd be like me praying to Bill Clinton to pray for me.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 02:55:41 GMT

JavaxcxMy views on the film:

spoilers

Jesus killing the snake in the garden: While I know the snake represented evil, the snake was nonetheless a living creature, so why did Jesus kill?

The seeming infinite amount of blood: Jesus bled so much that IMO he would have either contracted hypothermia from exposure, or simply bled to death. Remember that the guards did beat him after his "chastising". Moreso, even on the walk with the cross; with all the open bleeding wounds, how can his physical body endure so much without failing?

The raven pecking Gebble's (sp) eyes out: While I know that one of the men crucified with Jesus went to Heaven, the other went to hell, I don't remember a raven appearing and torturing him.

The destruction of the Temple and the shattering of the Tabernacle: Again, I don't recall (at least from my Catholic upbringing and exposer) that after Jesus' death, the Temple split OR the Tabernacle shattered. And if this DID happen, wouldn't the Jewish people have reformed?

Just some questions, perhaps someone can enlighten me.

I am new to this forum but I can answer your questions from my stand point!

Jesus smashing the head of the serpent is symbolism for a passage in Genesis...

Quote:"...and I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed:You shall strike at his heel and he shall stomp on your head..."

It is true that Jesus did lose a lot of blood!! Doesnt that show you his divinity?? I mean how many people could lose that amount of blood and still have the strength to go on!

The Raven pecking out the man's eyes are showing us, again through symbolism the horrors and grossness of sin!

The temple splitting was a little over done of course, but it was over done to show you the severity of what grievous sin the people committed and actually if you have learned a little of the Jewish faith you would know that When they are condemning the Lord they say the following...

Quote:"We have no king but Caesar!!!"

In the normal Jewish faith that is the ultimate blasphemy!! You are saying that a simple man is king over God which is completely untrue!!! Thus you see how sin can start off one thing but then spiral into worse and worse things!! In scripture all they say was that the temple veil was split in 2. This veil was ment to section off a holy area that only the high priest could enter on Yom Kippur. It is where God is supposed to be in the temple and if it is ripped in 2 then anyone can see in and it shows that God is not there! Thus God is showing them the grievous sin they committed again!! Also the Jews would not have reformed because they though one what they were doing was right by the way the Sanhedrin convinced them! And two they were in the state of mortal sin which blinds people!

Also for the few of you who may be wondering my religion teacher explained to us what the devil holding that ugly baby meant. It is just a way of the Devil mocking Jesus and Mary's relationship

Also yes we asks Saints and Mary to pray for us, they are closer to God then we are and here on Earth we need all the Prayers we can get!!! So no talking to Bill Clinton wont get u jack squat one he is here on Earth and two. ewww ewww ewww! !!!!

Anyway by now if you are wondering I am Catholic and I believe that the movie was very touching!! It brought me to a more understanding of what Christ endured for our sins. He didnt have to come down as a lowly human but did so to show us how much he loves us. I also think that in no way did it ever come near to being anti-semitic. It was based off the Bible. In the Bible the Jews condemned him. They messed up but o well. We cant hold it against the present Jews. Anyway that was my view on The Passion! Hope I learned you all a thing or two!!! Sorry for the occasional spelling error and of course if oyu wish to look up bible passages <http://www.bible.com> is one of the best places!!!!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:02:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Romans 8:34, like it was posted either. Jesus is the only mediator. No one can help you with being saved, they can lead you into the right direction, but no matter if you pray to them or not, it's all on u to decide.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:11:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok for one Jesus was a model for his Apostles and told them to do what he did! Priest have special grace from God!! Also when you confess to a priest you are getting your sins off your chest! One it is humbling you because you are telling them very personal stuff sometimes and two it is good to talk about things!! I find Confession is very rewarding and uplifting!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:12:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But you don't need to go through a priest. you have DIRECT access to God. That's why the temple tore in half. The temple was where the priests came to confess the sins of others. Since he tore the temple in half, he gave direct access to us.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [hareman](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:17:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GET OUT OF MY THREAD

THIS IS MINE

GO AWAY

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:19:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

da_shizBut you don't need to go through a priest. you have DIRECT access to God. That's why the temple tore in half. The temple was where the priests came to confess the sins of others. Since he tore the temple in half, he gave direct access to us.

One he didnt tear the temple in half he tore the the Teample veil and it was done to show us that he wasnt present! And like I said you dont have to but it is a very humbling experience. If you have never done it before then you dont understand where I am coming from! I recommend to you this. Go to a catholic church and just talk to a priest. You may be very surprised on how knowledgable they are! I am just talking about what I have learned so far. I dont claim to know everything about the subject or where you are comming from. I am telling through MY personal experiences. Maybe you could sit through a Mass. But I would suggest to you to just go talk to a priest. Try it! Are you scared? You should be they will bite your head off!!! I know thats what your scared of!!!! Kidding! Seriously though, just go talk with him!! Ask him those questions that you are asking me!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:19:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Go divert your energy to getting Alkaline banned.

BTW, Hareman...

....

....

....

THIS IS MY THREAD....OUT YOU GO!!!!!!!!!!!!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:21:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, I have confessed to a priest before. I "was" Catholic. I went to a Catholic church and that's where i think i originally was saved. It's not as comforting as being able to go to God whenever and wherever I feel like.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:21:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alk has always been cool to me and I consider him a friend!

YOUR SCARED HAHHAHAHAHA!!!! :rolleyes:

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [hareman](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:22:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SO ... if you keep the company of a retard

hmmmm

birds of a feather

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:24:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Call him call me what you wish i dont give a shyt! Dont bother me none! I know he is a cool guy!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:24:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also, my sins are between ME and GOD, ALONE. No one else needs to know about them at all. I don't feel like I should have to go to someone to feel relieved. If you feel comfortable telling others, than that's fine, but there is no use to have established people that are to listen to your sins.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:26:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Go, with an unbiased opinion, and read his posts. You will see that everything he says is uncalled for and results in him getting justly flamed.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:27:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SAY WHAT YOU WANT!!! YOUR JUST SCARED TO EVEN GO NEAR A PRIEST AREN'T YOU!!! THAT IS SAD!!!!!! I SAY JUST GO TALK TO A PRIEST YOU DONT HAVE TO CONFESS YOUR SINS JUST TALK TO THEM ABOUT YOUR VIEWS!!!! STOP BEING A PUSSY AND JUST GO VISIT THEM!!!!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:28:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm sorry, maybe you don't understand me. I WAS CATHOLIC UNTIL SIXTH GRADE!

Priests can be cool people, but why should I go to a priest when I can just go and talk to my pastor?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:31:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PASTORS AND PRIESTS ARE DIFFERENT!!!! You were catholic until 6th grade? Why what

happned? Are you following what your parents probably did? Are you uncomfortable around priests what? Just because you knew them until 6th grade means jack what matters is now u are old enough to go have a real heart to heart! Stop being hard hearted! What are you afraid of that they will change you views?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:33:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's VERY unlikely they would change my views BACK to what they were. No, infact, my family followed after me! I changed schools to go to a different, Chrisitan school. I am still at that school and I am continuing to learn things I would never have at a Catholic school. I am happy that I got out and there is nothing to turn me back.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:33:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I read his posts! Some of them start off completly diferent with like starting a server! Said nuthing offensive then people start criticizing him and he has to go defensive immediately@

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:35:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah, SOME. MOST, however, are blatent attacks to people. For instance, the first time he flamed me. I was just saying that he can get a FDS for free and he goes off on me. That's what started my belief that he is a nusiance. I had believed it before, but not as strongly until then.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:37:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uh huh! Well I have said my peace. Your views are your views and I have no right trying to change em so, Good Luck in whoever life may take you!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:42:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Confession itself is a blasphamy.

To prove this: I remind you that Jesus (IN THE BIBLE) is told to be the ONLY mediator between humanity and God. Since sins are a violation of God's law, it is humanity's job to amend with God. However, because Jesus is the ONLY mediator, not priests, pastors, bishops, or even Popes, you have 2 choices: Confess your sins to God, or confess your sins to Jesus.

Remember that God and Jesus are one in the same, being both part of the Trinity, so it doesn't matter who you talk to.

Now, if you rely on a mere human to mediate between you and God, then you elavate that human to a position equal to that of Jesus. Last time I checked, it's blasphemous to try and equalize any mere human with Jesus.

You can go and tell your priest all your problems and sins if you want to, but don't expect for that priest to magically make it all go away with some pennance, because that just isn't so. Your sins are your own, and God's business, and no one else's. It's just that simple.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 03:44:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree, I just wish I would have thought of that.

I did say Romans 8:34, but NOOOOOOOOOOO, no one ever listens

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 22:04:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey umm bud Romans 8 34 says this....

Quote:34 Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

No where does it say he is the only mediator!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 22:20:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GodofDeathHey umm bud Romans 8 34 says this....

Quote:34 Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is

even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

No where does it say he is the only mediator!

Umm... Perhaps you should look up the definition of "intercession".

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 22:55:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well the definition of intercession is...

Pronunciation: "in-t&r-'se-sh&n

Function: noun

Etymology: Middle English, from Middle French or Latin; Middle French, from Latin intercession-, intercessio, from intercedere

1 : the act of interceding

Pronunciation: "in-t&r-'sEd

Function: intransitive verb

Etymology: Latin intercedere, from inter- + cedere to go
: to intervene between parties with a view to reconciling

And the definition for interceding is...

Quote:

Pronunciation: "in-t&r-'sEd

Function: intransitive verb

Etymology: Latin intercedere, from inter- + cedere to go
: to intervene between parties with a view to reconciling

So there u have it!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 23:15:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Intercession:

n.

Entreaty in favor of another, especially a prayer or petition to God in behalf of another.

Mediation in a dispute.

Your own definition supports the idea that intercession means "To mediate". That quote from the Bible suggests that Jesus is the mediator.

Now, if Jesus is NOT the only mediator, then tell me, why exactly did he die?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 23:40:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jesus died because his body could no longer sustain life after his long torture.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 23:41:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thats not what I meant. Why did Jesus die "for our sins"?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 02:46:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because as it says in the Bible...

Quote:...For God so loved the World he gave his only Son...

Also God wanted us to have a share in eternity, thus he gave his only Son to bear the sin of all mankind!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 02:50:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mary didn't die for our sins neither did Peter or John or anyone else. If they weren't the Messiah, why should we act like they have a say in anything? He's the only mediator, the only one who can intercede.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 03:19:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did I say Mary, Peter and John Died for our sins? NO!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 03:48:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

that's what it seems like.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 19:23:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GodofDeathBecause as it says in the Bible...

Quote:...For God so loved the World he gave his only Son...

Also God wanted us to have a share in eternity, thus he gave his only Son to bear the sin of all mankind!

No, God has no reason to "want us to have a share in eternity". We are given that privledge when we die. It's called Heaven, and humanity has access to it long before Jesus came and died.

You still haven't supported a reason as to why Jesus died for OUR SINS. I know the reason, and I want to hear your definition.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sun, 11 Apr 2004 05:04:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430Mary didn't die for our sins neither did Peter or John or anyone else.....

Interesting point....

"But I urge and entreat you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in perfect harmony and full agreement in what you say, and that there be no dissensions or factions or divisions among you, but that you be perfectly united in your common understanding and in your opinions and judgments. For it has been made clear to me, my brethren, by those of Chloe's household, that there are contentions and wrangling and factions among you. What I mean is this, that each one of you [either] says, I belong to Paul, or I belong to Apollos, or I belong to Cephas (Peter), or I belong to Christ. Is Christ (the Messiah) divided into parts? Was Paul crucified on behalf of you? Or were you baptized into the name of Paul? I thank God that I did not baptize any

of you except Crispus and Gaius, Lest anyone should say that I baptized in my own name. [Yes] I did baptize the household of Stephanas also. More than these, I do not remember that I baptized anyone. For Christ (the Messiah) sent me out not to baptize but [to evangelize by] preaching the glad tidings (the Gospel), and that not with verbal eloquence, lest the cross of Christ should be deprived of force and emptied of its power and rendered vain (fruitless, void of value, and of no effect)." 1 Corinthians 1:10-17 Amplified Bible

<http://www.heaven.net.nz/answers/answer05.htm>

There is one Church, the Church of Christ. A building is not a Church, it is one body. We must not say things like, "My Church," or "Your Church." Someone actually once told me that Catholics were "the true Christians." That is something one shouldn't do. We should not separate ourselves, but be one in the Church of Christ.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 11 Apr 2004 05:08:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We ([Roman] Catholics) are the "original" Christians. Some people seem to get that messed up with the word true for some reason.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:39:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoWe ([Roman] Catholics) are the "original" Christians. Some people seem to get that messed up with the word true for some reason.

I beg to differ.

Where was the Pope at the last supper?

The church hierarchy is clearly laid out in the bible.

It consists of elders, deacons, and everyone else. Find the word Pope, Cardinal, or Bishop in the bible for me. Find "Vatican council" or rosary beads for me. Find where it says "Read this in Latin" for me.

All those things are constructs of man, and extra garbage to get in between God and you.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:55:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxGodofDeathBecause as it says in the Bible...

Quote:...For God so loved the World he gave his only Son...

Also God wanted us to have a share in eternity, thus he gave his only Son to bear the sin of all mankind!

No, God has no reason to "want us to have a share in eternity". We are given that privledge when we die. It's called Heaven, and humanity has access to it long before Jesus came and died.

You still haven't supported a reason as to why Jesus died for OUR SINS. I know the reason, and I want to hear your definition.

<http://www.wcg.org/lit/jesus/whydie.htm?PHPSESSID=f541911c820993802755ea3599f7fd7e>

It's all right there. Basically: Sin equals death, and seperation from God. So how do you receive entrance to HEAVEN considering everyone has sinned? God solved that. The only perfect sacrifice was something not of this corrupt earth, yet still of it. If you believe in him, and what he did, repent and are baptised, you will appear spotless before God on judgement day. Your debt has been paid by the only one who could forgive it.

No gimmicks, no rosaries, no Mary, no Pope, nothing but you and God.

As it was in the beginning, and as it was always meant to be.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 19:50:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kirby, I HIGHLY suggest you read this:
<http://www.geocities.com/varsityblue50/LegalBasis.html>

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Wed, 14 Apr 2004 20:44:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To your response that Jesus is the only mediator which is true! But he is God and what ever he says is LAW!!! So I asked my priest over Easter about your topic that telling our sins is blasphemy and he said that Jesus made priests with the power to forgive sins!! Have you ever read John 20: 23

Quote:

22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: 23 Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye

retain, they are retained.

He says right there to his disciples who's ever sins u forgive they are forgiven and who evers sin u do not forgive are not forgiven! SO there you see a it! A priest is acting through a law that Jesus made!! Thus it is perfect and infallible! So there you have it! A PRIEST HAS THE ABILITY TO FORGIVE SINS!!!!

Also I did answer why Jesus died for our sins!!! He did it because he loved all of humanity and wanted us to have a share in eternal life with him!! It says so in the BIBLE!!!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 14 Apr 2004 21:31:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He let the disciples have that power until the Holy Spirit came.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Wed, 14 Apr 2004 23:13:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DID U NOT READ MY POST???!!! It says he breathed the Holy Spirit upon them and then told them that they had the power to forgive sins!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 14 Apr 2004 23:21:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fine, i really wasn't paying attention. still didn't mean that his disciples were priests. his disciples were very close to him, of course they're gonna have that ability. AND THEY'RE NOT SAINTS!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 00:18:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What do you mean they weren't saints?? AND ALSO JESUS SAID TO GO OUT SPREAD HIS WORD AND TEACH HIS WAYS!!! DONT U THINK THAT MEANS TO PASS ON THE ABILITY TO FORGIVE SINS!!! Dont post stupid comments!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 00:34:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fine, if his disciples can forgive your sins then so can i. that's what you're saying.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [GodofDeath](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 03:18:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did I say that? NO I said that those followers of Christ and follow the disciples way i.e. priests. Because Peter was the first Pope and made the Priest thing! So only priest would be able to do it you see! Please stop I get tired of this stupidity! People jump in when they take their a small portion of a text that would support thier idea! I am stopping posting here because I dont care! It is a free country you are entitled to your opinion and lets not see a witty try-to-be comeback! I'm done I will no loger read anything under this post good day all! I have shared my belief's with you I care no more now!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 03:32:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GodofDeathTo your response that Jesus is the only mediator which is true! But he is God and what ever he says is LAW!!! So I asked my priest over Easter about your topic that telling our sins is blasphemy and he said that Jesus made priests with the power to forgive sins!! Have you ever read John 20: 23

Quote:

22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: 23 Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.

He says right there to his disciples who's ever sins u forgive they are forgiven and who evers sin u do not forgive are not forgiven! SO there you see a it! A priest is acting through a law that Jesus made!! Thus it is perfect and infallible! So there you have it! A PRIEST HAS THE ABILITY TO FORGIVE SINS!!!!

Also I did answer why Jesus died for our sins!!! He did it because he loved all of humanity and wanted us to have a share in eternal life with him!! It says so in the BIBLE!!!

Ok, I'm going to break this down for you, because you seem to be a bit confused on the issue:

Quote:To your response that Jesus is the only mediator which is true! But he is God and what ever he says is LAW!!!

Thats right, anything that Jesus said is to be considered God's law, HOWEVER:

Quote:So I asked my priest over Easter about your topic that telling our sins is blasphemy and he said that Jesus made priests with the power to forgive sins!! Have you ever read John 20: 23

Now, you need to understand this otherwise it's a waste of time to try and comprehend what I'm telling you: There is a DIFFERENCE between a human forgiving a human, and God forgiving a human. For example: If you steal a baseball card from a friend, but return it the next day, your friend may forgive you. This amends the relationship between you and your friend, but you haven't amended with God for breaking the commandment "thou shalt not steal". This can be extrapolated to priests aswell, however more indirectly. If you "confess" to a priest, he can say "Well sonny, you're forgiven for stealing your buddy's baseball card" but that is merely a human reconciling to a human. In short, you're not confessing to God, you're confessing to someone who is not qualified to atone your sins. It doesn't matter if Jesus gave them the gift of the Holy Spirit BECAUSE priests are still human; They are not God. The very most they can do is give you guidance on how to speak to God about your transgressions.

Quote:Also I did answer why Jesus died for our sins!!! He did it because he loved all of humanity and wanted us to have a share in eternal life with him!!

You're looking at it from a terribly broad perspective. God wanted us to share eternal life with him always, not just when he decided to sent Jesus to combat Satan (because THAT was what Jesus' mission was).

It's one thing to say "Jesus died for our sins" and it's another to actually understand what that means. If you want a simple, HUMAN answer, read that link I posted a few posts up.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 03:35:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GodofDeathDid I say that? NO I said that those followers of Christ and follow the disciples way i.e. priests. Because Peter was the first Pope and made the Priest thing! So only priest would be able to do it you see! Please stop I get tired of this stupidity! People jump in when they take their a small portion of a text that would support thier idea! I am stopping posting here because I dont care! It is a free country you are entitled to your opinion and lets not see a witty try-to-be comeback! I'm done I will no loger read anything under this post good day all! I have shared my belief's with you I care no more now!

I'm just going to point this out: You said it yourself; Peter was the first Pope, and made the "priest thing". So you ARE saying that priesthood is a human establishment, and therefore is not divine because it is fallible. Peter was not God, nor Jesus, nor the Holy Spirit, he was human -- and so were all his actions.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 13:21:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hope the Catholic arguement is based on more than one misinterpreted line in one passage that was taken out of context.

:rolleyes:

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Thu, 15 Apr 2004 21:10:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

this....forum...is...off.....TOOOPPPICCC

STOP
STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP
STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP
STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP
STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP
STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP STOP

NOOOOOOOOOOOOOWWWWWWWW!!!!!!

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 16 Apr 2004 13:50:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Λ

The reason Catholicism is so popular.

Nobody wants to think about the weightier matters. It requires more than the two brain cells normally used to decide what beer they want to drink, and what girl they want to abuse. Someone else can tell me what it all means. :rolleyes:

Of all the important matters in the world to ponder, these are the greatest. They are the only ones that really matter when you get hit by a bus on the way to the bar to drink your favorite beer and try to trick some poor girl into coming home with you.

There is much more to life than this, and our time here is very short. Prepare for the rest of eternity, not this fleeting moment of time.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 16 Apr 2004 19:49:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually, I'd say that Catholicism is popular because (and this is a guesstimate) 8 out of 10 people accept the religion because it is so mainstream. It's basically the same reason the Gentiles chose Christianity over Judaism: It's just easier. Everyone has done all the work to "decipher" what the messages in the Bible were, and they blindly accept that as truth.

For the person who wants solid proof, Catholicism doesn't make much sense. If you analyse some very important issues, even rituals and sacraments, alot of them are conflicting with other teachings. If the Catholic Bible is truth, then why (and this is just an example) did Jesus die for our sins if priests could forgive them anyway? Both aspects are "assumedly" in the Catholic Bible, and they conflict... But since they conflict, does that mean that the Bible is fallible? Which one is actually the truth?

When that happens, you start questioning lots of things you can find in the Bible, and when you break it down, the foundation of the Catholic religion is flawed -- all the way down through the people in the institution. I wouldn't want my kid going to Church if the people who we are supposed to trust full heartedly are under investigation for child molestation.

Screw organized religion -- you're only going to make it harder on yourself.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [U927](#) on Sat, 17 Apr 2004 02:26:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Screw everything and join the Atheist Church Of God.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 17 Apr 2004 03:20:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Atheism is a hypocritical crock.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Sat, 17 Apr 2004 03:54:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's why I'm 100% neutral.

Avoid all the damn confusion. If I go to hell, I'll know I had a damn good time here.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 17 Apr 2004 04:15:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I see your logic, but if you are in an eternity of death, you won't be thinking of your life, you'll be busy being scared shitless.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Sat, 17 Apr 2004 04:18:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, but, I generally like being scared shitless (rollercoaster pwns!) so it shouldn't be a problem. I'll probably get used to dieing all the time anyway.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [U927](#) on Sat, 17 Apr 2004 06:25:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxAtheism is a hypocritical crock.

Thank God I'm an atheist.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Sun, 18 Apr 2004 17:47:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxAtheism is a hypocritical crock.

What's really funny is the American Atheist Association.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [jd422032101](#) on Mon, 19 Apr 2004 02:09:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

this is is a long topic it like constant battle over good evil and nothing

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 19 Apr 2004 02:44:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...what?

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 19 Apr 2004 15:45:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Javaxcx...what?

This whole debate equates to explaining Boolean theory to a third grader. Of course they don't get it, and resort to all encompassing gobbledee gook.

Subject: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 19 Apr 2004 17:55:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The ONLY truth I see IS THAT YOU RETARDS ARE IN MY FUCKING TOPIC

GET OUT

NOW

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Sun, 24 Jul 2005 22:57:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^
||
||

lol

people who find conflicts with catholicism are just overthinking the issues. I have explained the answers to questions like yours far too many times to even care to do it now. Go talk to a priest if you want those answers.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 24 Jul 2005 23:48:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One could therefore, validly, claim the same argument regarding the simplicity of Catholic teachings.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Mon, 25 Jul 2005 02:18:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fifteen months from now, I may respond to your post...

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 25 Jul 2005 02:25:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Sun, 24 July 2005 17:57people who find conflicts with catholicism are just overthinking the issues.
Don't make me laugh.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 05:28:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You don't have to laugh if you don't want to. I find it a little odd that you're claiming the church teaching s are 'simplistic' now, when you earlier said that they were so convoluted that they contradicted themselves. They don't - I'm a self taught student of Catholic Catechism (and i have the books to rprove it) and I see absolutely no contradiction in Church Teachings. You, on the other hand, have likely never opened a book about catechism and therefore are not yet ready to debate me on the issue.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 05:30:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I could use some spellchecker lessons though.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 01:55:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've read much of the Catechism, and it works fine with the wrongly interpreted doctrine it stems from.

I'm not quite sure where you're going with these backdoor shenanigans and ad hominem.

A blantant contradiction of the Catholic Church is the priesthood and Pope. Why do these exist if Jesus died for our sins? Reconsiliation is an unnecessary farce as per the basic logic that the

Bible sets forth. That isn't even touching upon the very existence of the Pope, which by the way, rests entirely on ONE single line in the entire Bible. Oh, did I mention that line is quite misinterpreted from the ancient texts.

I suggest you look it up and read.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 14:18:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Thu, 28 July 2005 00:28 You, on the other hand, have likely never opened a book about catechism and therefore are not yet ready to debate me on the issue. You're right, I never have, BUT I went to a Catholic school up until the end of 6th grade, and then I had a class or two on Catholicism in my Protestant school. I know the contradictions. I know the stupidity of the church. Hell, my family is a prime example of how messed up the Catholic church is.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Sat, 30 Jul 2005 01:12:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no offense, but i don't accept your family as evidence that the 'catholic church' is messed up. I accept it as evidence that your family is messed up (you said it, not me). My family is catholic, as is the family of a number of my friends, and we're doing just fine. Sorry.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Sat, 30 Jul 2005 01:20:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 29 July 2005 10:18 amid_tha_rubble wrote on Thu, 28 July 2005 00:28 You, on the other hand, have likely never opened a book about catechism and therefore are not yet ready to debate me on the issue. You're right, I never have, BUT I went to a Catholic school up until the end of 6th grade, and then I had a class or two on Catholicism in my Protestant school. I know the contradictions. I know the stupidity of the church. Hell, my family is a prime example of how messed up the Catholic church is.

there's your problem. You go sola scriptura from the bible, which is the real farce. The bible is the Official Canon of the Roman Catholic Church. It was never meant to supplant church teaching, but to supplement it. The real authority on Jesus' teachings IS the church. It always was. The bible is a supplement to those teachings.

The thing that i find funny is that you take the bible to be the be-all-end-all. If you accept the bible

as the absolute authority on all things related to Jesus, then don't you have to accept the absolute authority of the Church which uses it as it's official canon?

There is no hypocrisy or contradiction in church teaching. Now that doesn't mean i don't agree with everything the church says (i.e. 'no women priests') but at the same time, core church doctrines are fine, with absolutely no contradictions. And I'm sorry if you thought I was going ad hominem, i assure you that was not my intent. But as I've said, i'm really not in the mood to keep arguing this. Neither of us is going to change each other's opinions, so i suggest that we respectfully agree to disagree.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 30 Jul 2005 01:44:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Fri, 29 July 2005 21:20

The thing that i find funny is that you take the bible to be the be-all-end-all. If you accept the bible as the absolute authority on all things related to Jesus, then don't you have to accept the absolute authority of the Church which uses it as it's official canon?

No, you don't. The "absolute authority" of the catholic Church lies entirely on one single misinterpreted line in the entire logos. ONE! On top of that, lol, is that such line never establishes an absolute authority! It doesn't establish anything at all! The Papacy and the cardinals did that themselves, and like much of the world, they played you all really good. REALLY good.

The worst part is that the Church, (more specifically, Constantine) opted that Jesus must have implied that a hierarchal construct is to be created as a result of him using a metaphor on Peter. What's even funnier though, is the way that organization is run. I mean, it is really a ridiculous thing! Conclave?! Where is conclave inferred from in the Bible? Where is this self proclaimed immutable correctness of a man elected through the redundant democracy of a bunch of old men who vote amongst themselves in the Bible? How exactly is nepotism something that you, me, or anyone else alive today have the authority to call truth when God never said--OR IMPLIED-- anything even REMOTELY like that.

The problem with your interpretation of scripture is that your Church has created their own doctrine, called it dogma, and somehow calls it infallible-- kind of like what Stalin and Kim Jong Il did in their respective nations.

The Catholic Church consistently uses inverted Aristotilian logic to validate themselves. A highly generalized but accurate example is as follows: "God exists, therefore Jesus exists, therefore the Church exists, therefore the legitimacy of the Papacy exists, therefore whatever the Papacy says is capital T Truth....because God exists." And it is a flat out idiotic thing that, has only existed this long because of the very popular and powerful influence of faith based on the one good man who lived and died. It seems to be one of the very few things that Catholicism has gotten right-- the existence and nature of Jesus.

I ask you to prove to me, using the ancient texts, that Peter was given absolute authority in such a fashion (and this is important, because I know exactly what you're going to say) that it unarguably

implies that Peter's nepotistic decendants are to inherent this authority and that these descendants are also to be elected by old men ordained by God and God alone. Because you know as well as I that no one has the power to embue the power of God into man but God Himself.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 30 Jul 2005 03:41:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Fri, 29 July 2005 20:12no offense, but i don't accept your family as evidence that the 'catholic church' is messed up. I accept it as evidence that your family is messed up (you said it, not me). My family is catholic, as is the family of a number of my friends, and we're doing just fine. Sorry.

That's because you're Catholic, you can't afford to look at it from a different perspective. I was a Catholic for some time, therefore, I have the ability to look from both perspectives.

Also, I'll let Java finish the fight, he actually likes to research his information and is damn good at it, too.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Sun, 31 Jul 2005 19:50:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ugh. Still thumping the bible again. I'm done with this argument, i'm am just sooo tired of explaining the same shit over and over again - and you completely missed the point of my post. I'm sorry you don't like catholics, really. Ttyl

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Sun, 31 Jul 2005 19:52:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 29 July 2005 23:41amid_tha_rubble wrote on Fri, 29 July 2005 20:12no offense, but i don't accept your family as evidence that the 'catholic church' is messed up. I accept it as evidence that your family is messed up (you said it, not me). My family is catholic, as is the family of a number of my friends, and we're doing just fine. Sorry.

That's because you're Catholic, you can't afford to look at it from a different perspective. I was a Catholic for some time, therefore, I have the ability to look from both perspectives.

Also, I'll let Java finish the fight, he actually likes to research his information and is damn good at it, too.

i have plenty of friends who aren't even christian, and i can look at my catholic friends families from a different perspective. Right now, I'm heading back to a family party for my second cousins

who were just baptized into the church. It's also a party for my aunt and uncle who are having their 40th wedding anniversary. We're having a great time.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 31 Jul 2005 20:00:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Sun, 31 July 2005 15:50Ugh. Still thumping the bible again. I'm done with this argument, i'm am just sooo tired of explaining the same shit over and over again - and you completely missed the point of my post. I'm sorry you don't like catholics, really. Ttyl

There is nothing wrong with "thumping" the Word of God. Your faith does it all the time. They just do it wrong--and has been proven. As for "your point": It doesn't exist. Your argument was trashed and you nodbuggered away from the whole thing and now are running around like a headless chicken forking out misinterpreted dogma.

It's a shame you're so devoted to a falsehood that you flat out refuse to consider alternatives.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 01 Aug 2005 01:54:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

People who think any form of Religion is absolutely flawless are about as blind as those who think God doesn't exist.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [amid_tha_rubble](#) on Mon, 01 Aug 2005 19:18:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ROTFL.

Serious quick argument time.

Quote:No, you don't. The "absolute authority" of the catholic Church lies entirely on one single misinterpreted line in the entire logos. ONE! On top of that, lol, is that such line never establishes an absolute authority! It doesn't establish anything at all! The Papacy and the cardinals did that themselves, and like much of the world, they played you all really good. REALLY good

Listen, you keep claiming that 'i'm wrong' but you never offer any proof. My point does exist: There is no contradiction in catechism. Only God can forgive sins? Then why the passage "He whose sins you forgive will be forgiven; he whose sins you retain shall be retained". As for your requirement that everything christian be founded in the bible, what about 'Now Jesus did many more things than are written down here but if written out, I suppose the whole world could not hold them'. There's that point.

For someone who claims to base things from the bible, you sure do ignore the hierarchies existant in Paul's letters, and in the Acts of the Apostles and in all the other letters to the Churches. Had

you read them carefully you can see that church leaders and hierarchies are already taking shape in the time of the Apostles; that is to say, The apostles are forming the Roman Catholic Christian Church!! Jesus Gave the apostles the authority to become 'fishers of men'. So they did, and following that they did so by growing Jesus' Church on earth. They had the Holy Spirit to guide them, as Jesus says, 'I will send the Helper'. So, if on Authority from Jesus, and in Union with the Holy Spirit, the Apostles started the Catholic Christian Church, it would seem that the Church does Indeed have complete apostolic authority; other man made churches simply do not. The bible clearly shows that the hierarchical church is taking shape in Peter, Paul and the rest of the apostles' time. Quote:Where is conclave inferred from in the Bible?

Say it with me, one more time: "The bible is the Canon of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not a stand alone document. It supplements Church teaching, it does not supplant it

I am sure that you will say the RC Church isn't the original Christian Church; to that i will simply say that surely no protestant Church is, so that kinda narrows it down, don't it?

I recall you saying that there was only one line in the bible that proves authority of the church 'I tell you you are petros...on this rock i will found my church' etc. Notwithstanding the fact that I've already proved that the bible is the Canon of the RC church and therefore not the be-all-end-all of God's Word, I'll humour you. You said 'it was only one line' - I'll humourously question you, how many lines does it take for God's Word to be true? One? Three? Five? Are we counting to determine importance? How many lines of Scripture that reveal Jesus' complete glory to the Israelites are jsut that - ONE LINE!

Part of your problem is that (here's the shocker) you lack faith in Christ; Faith that His apostles, led By The Holy Spirit (God Himself!) and directed by Jesus (Ditto) grew His Church into what it is today; Seriously, how on earth could you think that God would tell the apostles 'Grow my Church' and then dodder off for two thousand years? Do you think Jesus would give authority to His apostles (in His name) and then just go AFK?

It comes down to Faith.

I figured you would take my apathy for responding to yet another anti-catholic hack (now i am ad hominem, but so are you) as being 'defeated' in my argument. You can think what you like. I have spent FAR too long online arguing the Church's authority to apostates such as yourself and, as I have said, I am simply no longer willing to do it. Period. End of story. And I really wish you'd stop baiting me by continuing this pointless tit-for-tat BS because you will not take my eye off of Truth, nor will I lead you from your mistaken blindness. If you choose to respond to this forum, fine. But i'm taking off my e-mail alerts for this topic and i'm not coming back. It is a waste of my time.

Perhaps what is most amusing about your vitriolic anti-catholic attitude is that your church hasn't once come up; not once have I asked what denomination, if any, you belonged to. Not once have I made any attempt to attack your denomination, your beliefs about Christ, or your devotion to your faith. Not once have i questioned your dogma. Never. But you don't seem to have any problem launching a good-ol'-catholic bashing. If you aren't catholic, why should you care? Why'd you bring it up? Why so judgemental? Despite the truth that protestant churches are clearly in apostasy from God's One True Mother Church, I haven't made it an issue. Because I don't care. Because that's between you and God. I will never understand the protestant drive to slander the

roman Catholic Church's teachings, other than the fact that moral-relativist-nihilists can't stand to see someone take a stand on anything.

Anyways, that's it, i'm done, no more arguing, reminders are off, see you later. Enough rambling. Bye. Have a good life.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 01 Aug 2005 23:11:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not sure you're aware of your own self-validation throughout your flawed argument. You've gone out and crapped out more of that Aristotilian logic that simply doesn't work here.

And I would very much like to clarify to you: I was baptized Anglican-- but I very much not Anglican in practice. I find your organized worship to be a hinderance and the sheeplike following to be a plague. Your Church, established on the name of God and in the acts of good has done some very evil things and continues to blaspheme God. What's worse, you do it in total ignorance of it. The protestants had the right idea by cleaning up the Catholic bastardization of the Bible but in their own right have messed up a fair bit. The confederation of altered faiths you could potentially categorize protestantism is, is in itself another blasphemy. As such, I want to make clear to you that your conception and blind tracking of such a flawed organization, be it catholic or protestant is a problem and you are quite wrong to categorize me into either of these.

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Mon, 01 August 2005 15:18

Listen, you keep claiming that 'i'm wrong' but you never offer any proof. My point does exist: There is no contradiction in catechism.

Actually, as I've already stated and you conveniently ignored: The Catechism already works fine... if you accept that which is in it as an extention of the Bible. The problem is though-- it's not. Much of what is in the Catechism, the blantly obvious rules which come from the Bible are accurate. Except for when it comes down to dealing with falsehoods such as the Papacy, the divinity or "specialness" of Mary, just about everything in the Vatican, it's dead wrong. THOSE are contradictions. They have no Biblical criterium or reinforcement. THERE IS NO TIGER CLAW. YOU'RE MAKING SHIT UP.

Now, since you're obviously getting worked up and have already stated you won't be replying again, I'll ask you to find some proof that actually reinforces the divinity of Mary, and the authority and justification of Papacy and the Cardinals. You know, from the Bible? Because you have yet to do it, and have already responded when you said you wouldn't. I'm calling your bluff and I have a feeling you'll cave like the crusades did.

Quote:Only God can forgive sins? Then why the passage "He whose sins you forgive will be forgiven; he whose sins you retain shall be retained".

You're not thinking again. Stop that.

There is a very clear and distinct difference between the forgiveness of sins between men and the

forgiveness of sins between men and God.

Matthew 6:15 But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

Wait a second here, but doesn't the Catholic doctrine say that men can forgive men? You're self-proclaimed, and you said that yourself. But uhh...

Wait a second! Mark 2:7 "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?"

Read the rest of Mark 2, it's a fair and fully valid context. Jesus completely reinforces this quotation Himself.

The fact of the matter is, men can forgive the transgressions of men. But that's as far as it goes. Since when was I allowed to harness the power of God and abolish a sin? Do you even know what a sin is? Sins are ALWAYS between man and God. Never between man and man. Man transgresses between other men, but the act of disobedience against the Word is always between man and God. So when did Judge Judy get the divine power to absolve such a transgression? I'm sorry, but your faith fails here.

Oh, and take a look at this chief:
Catechism falsehoods

Quote:As for your requirement that everything christian be founded in the bible, what about 'Now Jesus did many more things than are written down here but if written out, I suppose the whole world could not hold them'.

What are you trying to say here? That because the entire life and times of Jesus weren't documented in a book that somehow a bunch of old farts in red dresses can fill in the blanks 2000 years later, call it ice cream and condemn all those who disagree? Don't you find it slightly odd that God *wouldn't* pick and choose what to inspire into the writers of the Bible? It seems to me that God would have put in exactly what He wanted to and what was necessary. Obviously you disagree.

Quote:For someone who claims to base things from the bible, you sure do ignore the hierarchies existant in Paul's letters, and in the Acts of the Apostles and in all the other letters to the Churches. Had you read them carefully you can see that church leaders and hierarchies are already taking shape in the time of the Apostles; that is to say, The apostles are forming the Roman Catholic Christian Church!! Jesus Gave the apostles the authority to become 'fishers of men'. So they did, and following that they did so by growing Jesus' Church on earth. They had the Holy Spirit to guide them, as Jesus says, 'I will send the Helper'. So, if on Authority from Jesus, and in Union with the Holy Spirit, the Apostles started the Catholic Christian Church, it would seem that the Church does indeed have complete apostolic authority; other man made churches simply do not. The bible clearly shows that the hierarchical church is taking shape in Peter, Paul and the rest of the apostles' time.

There is a very key and very distinguished difference between the authority in the Acts and Letters

and the authority and hierarchy of the Catholic establishment.

Do you realize what the Catholic hierarchy entails? It says that a man, a MAN elected through democratic means ALONE (sometimes days, or weeks, or YEARS of voting) becomes a proclaimed mediator and High Priest between man and God. Aside from the fact that Jesus Christ is already the High Priest as defined in Hebrews (Read me!111111) and was and is to be considered the FINAL High Priest, your pontiff has erroneously called himself this name himself! How? Where is his Biblical authority to do this? Was Peter a High Priest? The democratic process leading to this falsehood is even more ridiculous. They claim the pontiff is elected through the will of God and always is someone chosen by God and was predestined to such a position. And when the vote fails for days, months, even years on occasion, the excuse is "well, I guess they weren't aware of the will of God yet." Every time I hear that explanation it makes me chuckle, because it's the foundation of faith for so many people that have no idea how it even came about.

In fact, the only mention of a real hierarchy or any means of administrative authority in the Church is established in 1 Timothy.

It's actually a humorous thing to talk about, because the very existence of your Priests is a farce. There is no mention of the necessity of Priests after the death of Christ. God intentionally did this; Jesus was the High Priest, sinless, and absolved us from bondage with Satan. Priests became redundant and unnecessary. Here's a little history lesson for you.

Before Christ, all mankind was in bondage. They were without a complete mediator between man and God and required the services of priests in order to perform the rituals that would otherwise COULD not be done. It was basically the old Jewish law. The old covenant. When Jesus came, as you know He took the sins of all mankind and upon his death created the eternal mediation between man and God. This nullified the usefulness of Priests. For them to do what they did after the death of Christ might as well be considered a blasphemy. It would be like saying to God: "Well, that's nice your kid died for us, but you know, I think I'm just gonna keep doing what I did before". It seems to me that would be an insult to God for priests to do what they did before Christ... AFTER Christ. As such, the very existence and arrogance of your pontiff has very dangerous and blasphemous roots. You might as well rename Catholicism to Hebrewism because you're not doing anything better. They ignore God and claim it His will. Bravo.

Quote: Say it with me, one more time: "The bible is the Canon of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not a stand alone document. It supplements Church teaching, it does not supplant it

The Word of God IS a standalone document. Why would God leave out important details? I'd like to point out, however, that those who you claim to have been imbued with the Holy Spirit to guide the Catholic church have this nasty habit of doing things which have no Biblical endorsement and are very much to be considered sinful. Remember indulgences? The pompous Popes? The crusades? THESE are the people you think God chose to run a Church? These are the "infallible" men to whom claim to know the thoughts and will of God?

Quote: I am sure that you will say the RC Church isn't the original Christian Church; to that I will simply say that surely no Protestant Church is, so that kinda narrows it down, don't it?

The only true Church is the one created by Jesus Christ. And it is definitely not the same as the Catholic one.

Quote:I recall you saying that there was only one line in the bible that proves authority of the church 'I tell you you are petros...on this rock i will found my church' etc. Notwithstanding the fact that I've already proved that the bible is the Canon of the RC church and therefore not the be-all-end-all of God's Word, I'll humour you. You said 'it was only one line' - I'll humourously question you, how many lines does it take for God's Word to be true? One? Three? Five? Are we counting to determine importance? How many lines of Scripture that reveal Jesus' complete glory to the Israelites are jsut that - ONE LINE!

You left out the misinterpretation of it which is the basis for you entire organization. You're right though, God only needs one line to get a point accross. It's certainly not HIS fault that the self-proclaimed leaders of the Church miscontrued it to suit their own needs. I'm not sure how versed you are on Church history, but I think you should know that the early Church was not all good and happy. It was a greedy foundation where men in power got into power playing on people's faith. It's where the Church has been led to this day, and it's quite obviously still racking in foolish sheep.

Quote:Part of your problem is that (here's the shocker) you lack faith in Christ; Faith that His apostles, led By The Holy Spirit (God Himself!) and directed by Jesus (Ditto) grew His Church into what it is today;

There is a Church today. It's not the Catholic denomination. The Church exists in every person who accepts Jesus as their savior. It doesn't rely on silly, pointless and redundant sacraments that give man the power of God. It certainly doesn't create a barrier between man and God through one man who could pull off a role in Star Wars. Most importantly, it doesn't play on people's fear of God's wrath to pass its often distorted agenda.

I suggest you sit down and think about just how the Kingdom of God and the Church are related. Do you even know what the Church is?

Quote:Seriously, how on earth could you think that God would tell the apostles 'Grow my Church' and then dodder off for two thousand years? Do you think Jesus would give authority to His apostles (in His name) and then just go AFK?

It comes down to Faith.

He did, and it does. The Church is growing. It isn't growing nearly as fast as the Catholic or Muslim faiths-- and that's a shame.

Quote:I figured you would take my apathy for responding to yet another anti-catholic hack (now i am ad hominem, but so are you) as being 'defeated' in my argument. You can think what you like. I have spent FAR too long online arguing the Chruch's authority to apostates such as yourself and, as I have said, I am simply no longer willing to do it. Period. End of story. And I really wish you'd stop baiting me by continuing this pointless tit-for-tat BS because you will not take my eye off of Truth, nor will I lead you from your mistaken blindness. If you choose to respond to this

forum, fine. But i'm taking off my e-mail alerts for this topic and i'm not coming back. It is a waste of my time.

You said this before, and you came back. I suspect you'll falter. It suits the denomination.

Quote:Perhaps what is most amusing about your vitriolic anti-catholic attitude is that your church hasn't once come up; not once have I asked what denomination, if any, you belonged to. Not once have I made any attempt to attack your denomination, your beliefs about Christ, or your devotion to your faith. Not once have i questioned your dogma. Never. But you don't seem to have any problem launching a good-ol'-catholic bashing. If you aren't catholic, why should you care? Why'd you bring it up? Why so judgemental? Despite the truth that protestant churches are clearly in apostasy from God's One True Mother Church, I haven't made it an issue. Because I don't care. Because that's between you and God. I will never understand the protestant drive to slander the roman Catholic Church's teachings, other than the fact that moral-relativist-nihlists can't stand to see someone take a stand on anything.

I don't belong to any denomination. I was baptized against my will when I was too young to think in the Anglican denomination and that is where it stopped.

I find it interesting how you assume I'm attacking your faith because it is different than mine. I'm not against Catholics: many of my good friends, even my "good" friends are Catholic. I'm against ignorance. You preach ignorance and call it capital T truth. Do the math. I would do the same thing to you, or anyone else if you were speaking on matters you clearly knew nothing about, be the war in Iraq, the morality or logistics of controversial topics, anything. You and your faith are not special, sorry.

Quote:Anyways, that's it, i'm done, no more arguing, reminders are off, see you later. Enough rambling. Bye. Have a good life.

Talk to you tomorrow.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 02 Aug 2005 00:39:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whether it's contradictory or not, the question that should be asked is, "Is it wrong?"

I don't think so. I can't speak for the priesthood, but I do think that the idea of "forgiveness on behalf of God" is something that is necessary, even if not entirely proper. The priesthood forgiving on behalf of God gives people an authenticity to the act, as well as prevents disillusioned people from thinking they have recieved forgiveness, even when there is no intent to repent, and self deluded enough to think that what they are doing is forgiven, simply because the individual thinks that it is for the proper reason.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Wed, 03 Aug 2005 11:27:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Holy shit java , its my first time on this forums...ure really do reasearch your shit and take the time and effort to put em in words. I respect you very much. And btw, i thought this was supposed to be about the movie, now we're argueing over pretty much the fact that amid is an idiot..I dont have a religion, never have never will however my mind is always open to new ideas. And i dont agree with him very much i think he is very narrow minded and doesnt see the true point to those phrases.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 21 Nov 2010 12:37:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shame i wasn't around for this thread, it's a perfect example of how religion can make obviously intelligent people say extremely stupid things, and make decent people say wicked things.

Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sun, 21 Nov 2010 21:33:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unneeded bump, Spoony.

We get it, you don't like religion. Go take it elsewhere.
