
Subject: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 14 May 2006 03:17:27 GMT

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

Who's eager to see this movie? I didn't really care much for the book, really, but I love this kind of thing so I'm into it. I liked the book "Holy Blood, Holy Grail" and that's what really kicked off the recent popularity of the Jesus and Mary Magdalene idea. What's most interesting to me really, are the Nag Hammadi texts concerning Mary. That's the real deal. But the (DaVinci Code book and the) movie expounds on the same thread, so I gotta see it. Besides, Ron Howard directed it, and Tom Hanks and Audrey Tautou (Amélie) are in it so it has to be good.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 14 May 2006 18:09:34 GMT

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

I tried reading the book; but it seemed so mysterious I had to put it down.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Shane Martin](#) on Tue, 16 May 2006 12:56:37 GMT

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

I'll go see it. I think this will be the biggest hit of the summer.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 02:21:11 GMT

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

Here are a few links related to the "Da Vinci Code" book and movie. This helps separate the wheat from the chaff. Gnostic texts: Nag-Hammadi.com (See Gospel of Philip, Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Mary Magdalene) Rennes-le-Château:Renneslechateau.com Rosslyn Chapel:Rosslyn Chapel Council of Nicaea:Wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Council_of_Nicaea Tertullian.org/rpearse/nicaea.html Cathars:Wikipedia.org/wiki/Cathar Merovingians:Wikipedia.org/wiki/Merovingian Priory of Sion:Priory-of-Sion.com

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 11:20:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How do these relate to the movie?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 11:43:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, people like "secrets", and deep inside don't like authorities (religion)...interestingly, many which don't believe in Christianity and The Bible have no problem to believe in the obscure texts, cults and blasphemous - propaganda... But, I didn't read the book and won't see the movie. Those "secrets" are known from various cults and freemasonry, and this book/film is their "swan`s song", IMO. Boring.
<http://entertainment.tv.yahoo.com/entnews/va/20060517/114787380600.html>

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 13:38:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The book makes a story of weaving these elements together, with a fair bit of artistic license thrown in.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 13:46:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I understand how you feel, no offense intended on my part. I always thought the Priory of Sion thing was really low, stupid actually. Likewise, I think it foolish to include that part in any story, fictionalized or not. Throw in the Templars, make a story about Illuminati or something but don't use a group that is known to be a facade. But the Nag Hammadi texts are very interesting to me, as are the texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls. What do you think of those? And what's with that church in France at Rennes-le-Château?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 17:58:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey, I didn't think about you or anyone who is interested in these things, it can be very interesting. I thought about people who spit on Christian religion and make money that way. We talked about those texts before - I'm no expert in (Church) history, these texts are (officially) abandoned for some reasons, but many parts of them are very interesting, for example "Gospel of Thomas". The history of Templars, their rise and fall (and reasons) are very fascinating. I didn't mention, but this "Wall of Fortress Town" I've sent a picture of is probably made by them, plus a "St Martin" church in near town. There's a Templars heraldic in the church from 13th century...

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 18:25:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, you're right. It isn't the looking and questioning and searching that is offensive, it's the spitting that's offensive. I agree with you.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 19:40:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Personally, I found some modern books about Christian religion even more interesting, for example, J. Ratzinger: "God and The World/Believing and living in our time", and Hans Kung: "Does God Exist?" This later book gives the summary of modern philosophy vs. religion, from Descartes, Hegel... to Nietzsche.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 21:38:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well; so where does the movie stand in all this? Is it of some worth or what? I got confused.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 23:53:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So you are saying the movie is constructed from these narratives? Like the author read all this and then wrote a novel about it?

Subject: Amelie rocked
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 00:58:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great movie. I'm trying to remember: there is something special about the way it was filmed. Maybe the first all digitally recorded movie, or something like that. What ever, the movie is just damn good.....Colin

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 04:07:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, it is like Revelation (with Terence Stamp). It weaves the theory of the bloodline of Christ using the Nag Hammadi texts and things like the architecture and carvings of the Rosslyn Chapel as a basis. The basic story is that Jesus and Mary Magdalene had children and that their offspring are secreted and protected by a secret society, that this bloodline is the real "Holy Grail". The Cathars and the Knights Templar are part of the learned, and they protect and pass down the secret knowledge.

Subject: Re: Amélie rocked
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 04:31:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It was an interesting film, I agree. The colors were so vivid, the story, pleasantly curious...

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 05:11:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I posted about two, IMO, valuable books about Christian religion. Of course, "public" like damaged and obscured texts from pots, instant-mystique, conspiracies and gossips. No problem, but the problem is that those phantasies are abusive for believers...and based on the first critics, the \$125 m. movie is abusive more `cos of its "quality"... "That`s one small step for a man, one giant leap for manikin."

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 11:44:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I see. Has anyone seen this movie yet?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 13:50:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it hits the theaters tomorrow in most cities.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 22:13:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One thing I don't get. If the scholars are not even sure of who wrote the books in the Bible; how do they know what is true and what is false?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 23:11:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So; D-Man, you are saying the movie is just not well made? I am not a huge Tom Hanks fan so maybe you are right. I think he overacts. Although he wasn't bad in the terminal. But back to the subject; why would anyone care. I mean if they are true believers then nothing anyone else says should mean anything to them; right? And if people are convinced to believe something is true by a

book of fiction; then they aren't too high wattage anyway so who would worry about what they think?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 23:39:44 GMT

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

That's a whole other issue, in my opinion, John. Probably a discussion better suited for the Tower, but we're here, so why not kick it around a bit. Fits the movie, so I'm game.

To me, there's a difference between having a legitimate source for a text and having a text with legitiate information. The first is a little less ambiguous. As an example, the texts found in Qumran can be pretty well dated and found to be early versions of the texts in the Bible. That makes them arguably the most accurate copies, all others being handed down by them.

As to the contents and whether or not they're accurate, that's a matter for philosophers to decide. It's religion. It's like politics. Or science. The ideas tend to fluctuate and evolve. What's right and wrong? What's accurate? My bet is on systems that work. If the idea describes something accurately, it's a good model.

So religion then is a model of behaviors, those that are successful and those that aren't. It's a model of the universe too, to some degree. Science is too. And so is politics.

To answer what is true and what is false is at the heart of the matter. Is the Earth the center of the solar system, or is the Sun? Should man kill or should he not? What if the resources are limited? Should he share, or should it be survival of the fittest? What is gravity? How much does all this matter?

I think Douglas Adams was right. He answered it precisely: 42.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 04:38:59 GMT

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

Interestingly, based on some research (read in the newspapers, must be on the net somewhere), 2/3 of people who read this book think that is for real... Applause for the people who are the enemy of my religion, they spit on it and make money that way? No way...

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 11:44:22 GMT

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

No No; I understand the whole philosophy angle. I just meant how one can judge accuracy or correctness based upon subjective evidence. I do not claim to know anything about this whole biblical thing but I know the foundations of thought involved have always been contentious even within the churches. So how to judge the accuracy of any opinion anyone might have regarding the events in question. Therefor how the heck can people be so divisive regarding what is demonstrably just a novel or story; like the Bible.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 12:19:08 GMT

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

As a religous person why do you talk of enemies? You should have compassion for those who suffer under a deluded state of being far from the grace of God; right? Thomas Aquinas.Anyone who thinks this crappy book is real is to lame to pay attention to. I could not get past the first chapter it was so bad.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 13:57:10 GMT

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

I added in the end of the message as a sign that it isn`t too serious, but little funny and ironic. I found (in my messages before) this book/film trash, and everything about it light-minded.But, enemies - yeah, the masks are down and many showed theirselves.I can have a compassion, but enemies are enemies...

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 14:39:18 GMT

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

Onward Christian soldiers. I don't know if you have ever read The Magic Mountain? Thomas Mann.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 14:41:16 GMT

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

Again, there are two things that can be judged for legitimacy. One is the legitimacy of a document itself, i.e. whether it is a forgery, whether it is actually ancient or more recent. Another is the legitimacy of the contents. You are bringing into question the legitimacy of the contents, which is essentially a philosophical debate. There is merit in that discussion for sure. But before we even get that far, I think it is important to look at the legitimacy of the document, itself. For example, the documents of the Priory of Sion are completely bogus. No point in even discussing them. But the documents found at Qumran and Nag Hammadi are significant.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 16:34:15 GMT

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

Well, would you like me to post a picture of St. Mary church ruin from my area? Gothic, one of the most interesting monuments in this part of the Europe. Burned in 17th century (Turks), heavily damaged in WW2, restored 1973. and totally destroyed (explosive) in 1991. by the enemy of Christian religion (and my people) - they killed 45 civilians in this village, besides the church.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 17:18:12 GMT

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

Yes absolutely there can be no argument there. I just wonder how they can argue a case where all of the evidence that would support those documents is purely subjective since there is no way of validating the absolute authenticity of the information contained within the documents. I guess the way I see it is they are arguing the merit of a point that has never been authenticated.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 17:19:22 GMT

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

That sounds more political than spiritual.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 18:16:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's all connected. Nation is language, culture, history, monuments,... and religion as an important part of identity. On the historic east-west and north-south borders of the worlds...from the 7th century till today.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 18:53:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You know this better than most. I cringe at what it must be like to live in the hotspots like the "Holy Lands", Yugoslavia, Kashmir and the like.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 19:14:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not sure I follow you. Have you read any of the texts of Qumran or Nag Hammadi? Do you know the story of their discovery? Nag Hammadi Library Qumran Texts - Open Scrolls Project

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 22:26:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Religion; since it is based on opinion or "Belief" is really political in nature and operates within a political paradigm. At least that is my understanding of the subject. Science is non-political in nature. It may be used for political reasons but in its pure form is not a political entity. As an impartial observer it appears to me that if you fight a war in the name of Christ you have basically negated all of his teachings that I am aware of. Hence the political part. That I think is what confuses me about this subject. And why I can't understand the hulla-balloo surrounding this book and movie. I still wonder why if a person really is a true believer he would care a wit about anything anyone else says. The whole thing smacks of a power play by forces manipulating groups of people.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 22:45:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No. I really know nothing of this in terms of history or anthropology. But from reading a post on this forum some time ago I gathered there was the Niciaeen Creed in the early years of Christianity that dictated the core beliefs that would establish fixed rules of worship. The stumbling block lies in which translation of the early scriptures one wishes to consider; the Greek translation or the Latin. That will tell what you feel is true in this story. Thats the extent of what I know. I'm not arguing here I have no ability to argue this point. I just wonder why people will get up-in-arms over something they should be absolutely contemptuous of if they really believe what they believe. Like water off a ducks back. Thats how I would feel. But I also understand how it would be of interest to a person. Like politics is for me! So I would enjoy to learn of some of the underlying issues revolving around this; but it seems it might be a sore subject to some. I did read a very good article concerning the Gospel Of Thomas in Harpers last year.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Sat, 20 May 2006 04:54:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Religion isn't based just on "opinion", but on words of God. Science is a very political in nature. No-one fights a war "in the name of Christ", but the Christian religion is important part of (our) national identity. Through the ages, many (other nations with different religions; and political systems - comunism) wanted to destroy it (religion and identity) - but failed. "I still wonder why if a person really is a true believer he would care a wit about anything anyone else says." Because - theory and words precede to the practice, and the practice was destroyed churches and political/economy terror. And believer isn't some monk in the trance-state, but citizen in the real world.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 20 May 2006 12:29:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not bad D. Good explanation. But by definition a belief is a persons opinion of what is right in the world. Thats the definition of Belief. If it was a fact it would be called a fact. So for whatever reason people go to war; it is still; whether religion or ethnic or language a political descision. If they could not justify war on religous grounds they would do it on ethnic grounds or as we did in Iraq for resource. There will always be a reason for war; religion is just a convenient name for the provocation. Right? In other words even if there were no religions there would still be war.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Sat, 20 May 2006 19:00:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huh, we`re going to far from ordinary movie discussion...I talk too much If you can find some time, try to locate (library?) these two books I mentioned...
http://www.lyricskeeper.com/frank_zappa-lyrics/150765-bow_tie_daddy-lyrics.htm

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 20 May 2006 19:55:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No problem; but it's nice to have something to offer more substantial than the usual movie-like it or don't like it talk.I'm still reading Thomas Mann; it deals with much of what we are discussing only from both sides as a novel. I have wanted to read this for many years along with Remembrance of Things Past/Proust. Now I have the time and the experience to appreciate these monuments of literature.

Subject: Re: Amelie rocked
Posted by [lon](#) on Sat, 20 May 2006 20:20:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The latest pairing of Jean Pierre Jeunet and Audrey Tautoucalled A Very Long Engagement has a deceptively simple titlefor a masterful storytelling. Recommended.Haven't seen Da Vinci Code and may never cuz I'mnot into all that.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 05:23:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This must be the earlier post you are referring to:
"Priory of Sion"

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 08:32:48 GMT

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

Last year, I mentioned that I read again (after 25 years) "Swann`s Way", and a friend of mine said:"One of the writers, whose sensitivity and inspiration disclosed in the end like pure homosexuality"...he started to count, and if I remember correctly he mentioned T. Mann, too...
<http://www.plyrics.com/lyrics/sexpistols/myway.html>

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 11:10:09 GMT

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

I'm not sure because in this thread nothing is mentioned about the Niceen Creed and I know I read that in here. Looks like almost the same thread we have going now. I; as I said read a good article in Harpers written by a Biblical Scholar that explained the differences between the Thomas books and how the approach shifted when the church discarded that book in favor of others. I wish I had it because he describes in detail exactly what those differences were and why he thinks they were chosen. Something to do with interpretation of some of the teachings. I do remember that according to that book Jesus was more of a real man and not so much a diety. And women were not relegated to second class status as they are in the current texts. Thats one part of this whole thing I have trouble with; why women in the Bible are either whores or virgins but never just people. What is this whole anti-women thing in the three big faiths? Reading that post I realise I miss Dave; a voice of reason. Ever hear from him?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 11:19:58 GMT

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

I wouldn't doubt it. It is probably true that many of the writers from those times were of that ilk. But I never look at the artist; I only look at the art. If you study who makes art; music/painting/sculpture/literature/ you would probably be unable to ever read or watch anything ever again. I mean after the sex scandals in the Catholic church you could never be Catholic again if you worried about that. I just look at the message not the messenger. Lots of folks say Hemmingway was Gay; so go figure. I still love "The Sun Also Rises." And "A Farewell To Arms." And look at Picasso; what a creep; but I like his art.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 11:56:03 GMT

Art = Gay? About Hemmingway - all that macho BS + drinking problem, etc. - like he really tried to prove he`s a "real" man... And those "priests" and "teachers"...some says that opportunity makes a thief?! (Never in the case of moral and normal man - IMO). But probably those "patients" choose professions in "harmony" with their aspirations?!

<http://www.plyrics.com/lyrics/sexpistols/nooneisinnocentthebiggestblow.html>

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 13:52:41 GMT

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

I can go on about Hemmingway. The reason people disrespect his art is due to the posturing he engaged in. But who of us can say they are any better? At least he accomplished things in life and took chances. And while some of his writing is weak; a lot of it is bordering on true genius. One of the few. Anyway I see a lot of posturing going on all over; even in audio forums."Opportunity makes the thief??" I hope you don't mean those little kids the priests molested brought it on themselves?As far as artists being gay; yes there are gay artists; and many of the writers from that era were. So?The work is still good and insightfull.You know I don't really care what someone is; I only care what they think. Long as you have your mind right; then all is well.But I still wouldn't let my son join the Boy Scouts.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 15:53:23 GMT

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

That's the point of the controversy. I think it's interesting to contemplate what really happened. One thing I've always thought is that the truth is an expression of God, so to mistake the truth is to misunderstand the will of God. So in other words, when the Vatican punished Galileo, they saw God less clearly than he.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 16:19:16 GMT

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

Let me finish this wonderful theme with the artists I really like... It`s a song (that follow a little cartoon) in the end of "The Great r`n`r Swindle" movie...

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 17:45:07 GMT

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

Do you mean what really happened at the conference of Niceea? That truth? Did I spell Niceea correctly? I'm not sure I follow exactly what you are saying. Do you mean truth in the absolute sense or truth regarding what body of people and who made the decisions too toss some of the gospels while keeping others? That's what the disagreement is all about on the Code movie; right?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 17:52:54 GMT

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

Geez; I can't read that much stuff about male members. I get queasy. Don't let my words fool you; I said I don't care what people are; but that don't mean I plan on trying it out. One man one woman; that's the rule. No two of the same belong together in my book. But I don't hate anybody, live and let live. You don't bother me; I don't bother you. But that song is a little too much for me. I would poke a hole in my own eardrum if I had to listen to that.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 18:21:15 GMT

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

It was about '83. or so, large party and a new hit plays "Do you really want to hurt me". One friend of mine drank a little and said: "What, Boy George and a Culture Club? What culture? Just the homo-junkies, as I can see it...and this song is probably about his butt...and his black drummer friend and his..." "Wow- you can guess the reactions, everyone hates him 'cos of these words...you know, this is nice love song, and you are cynical, etc. Years passed, and I read the interview with this Boy George...after another drug/police scandal. He talked about this song...and said that it's dedicated to his drummer lover, they went through very wild things then, rough sex + drugs..."
<http://www.lyricsbox.com/stranglers-lyrics-school-mam-1vprfx3.html>

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 18:55:02 GMT

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

I never did like that song. Even drunk. But what I don't get about this post is; how did your friend know so much about Boy George?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 19:12:34 GMT

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

Common sense - he is a very bright/lucid (although "crazy"), "fox"-style; + life experience, street/job. His nickname is "Rat"...used to play a Gibson LP back then...

<http://www.lyricsbox.com/stranglers-lyrics-no-more-heroes-7rm2nhm.html>

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 19:51:58 GMT

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

When I say "it's interesting to contemplate what really happened", I mean in all things. In this case, I'm thinking about the nature of the relationship of Jesus and Mary. It's interesting to ponder whether or not they might have been close, even married, and whether or not they may even have had children. Whatever the truth is, I'd like to know, just for curiosity's sake. To know the truth will help one to better understand things. But it's not limited to that. Like I said, another one was the issue of Galileo confirming that the Sun is the center of our Solar System. That was fact, and knowing it helped a person to better understand the movements of the bodies in the heavens. This is a part of God, in my opinion, so to understand it better is to better know God. It's a shame for the Catholic Church to have tried to silence that for so long. After all, they were seeking the same thing: The Truth.

The Galileo Project

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 20:38:51 GMT

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

Hmm..I see what you are saying; however I am not so sure the Catholic Church is seeking the truth. Now I am not Catholic; but from what I see they are seeking to perpetuate a society subject to their rules and philosophy. I believe they are more about politics in the broad sense of defining

rules and structures of life than any kind of genuine spiritual quest. That's why they feel so threatened at this kind of thing. I am sure there are real truth seekers amongst their ranks but I don't believe they are strictly about the spiritual dedication; truth is I think they believe they have a lock on the truth already; so to suggest they are somehow actively seeking this truth amounts to blasphemy in their eyes. But again this is from someone who is not educated or knowledgeable concerning these things. However it is interesting to follow the story that informs the great religions. The real conundrum for me is the whole anti-woman thing. I can't get past that. How can you be a spiritual seeker of truth and have such a deviant set of notions. That goes for the Buddhist/Hindu/Christian/Moslem etc etc. What is that all about? Even Buddha; the most compassionate of the great seers negated the female in mankind. Very strange if you ask me. It sort of divides anything of any value they offer into something less than perfect or even good. And that is what seems to me to be at the crux of this whole controversy. Why would it be such a terrible thing if Jesus had a wife anyway? I'm baffled by all of this. But I do see the enjoyment at the thought of realising what happened; it is the greatest of mysteries. And I know many of the finest minds of our culture have wrangled over these issues ceaselessly; minds far more capable than mine. My primitive understanding of the meaning behind these things is obvious. And as my son tells me, the mystery is not for us to know but to believe. He's a pretty devout Catholic; who woulda thunk it!

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 20:47:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hmm..so he was able to use his intellect to decide that Boy George was gay? What does Fox style; you mean crazy like a fox?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 22:01:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did you notice that this conversation has less and less sense?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code
Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 22:16:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, that's it - all that blablah with "texts from pots", all that speculations from various sects, collected in one book and one movie have the one main reason - the attack on Catholic church.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 22:51:57 GMT

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

I always figured he just wanted to make a buck. Because of the huge numbers of religious people he knows he has a built in audience of millions. Garraunteed income.Why else would he write a book and then someone else make a movie? For a good payday.BTW the opening gross for this weekend looks like 80 million dollars or better. Pretty good incentive to make a movie; that kind of money.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 21 May 2006 23:26:23 GMT

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

How do you mean that?

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 05:28:17 GMT

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

I think that the Church, whatever denomination, seeks the truth. That's the purpose of a church. Its members seek the truth; It's there to help them find it. Now then, all churches are human organizations so they make mistakes. Some I think are pretty bad. But by definition, they are seekers of the truth. Just like scientists. Both are groups of seekers, both have believers and zealots. Both groups have some level headed people too.

Subject: Re: Da Vinci Code

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 10:40:17 GMT

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

I ran the truth seeking proposition by my sister's freind who runs the lay ministries for catholic charities here in town. His answer was that the Catholic church is the living embodiment of the word of God; they are the truth.The flock tries to live by the word and as such reap the rewards of being good christians. Thats why they call the Holy Trinity the Spirit of Truth.To suggest the Catholic Church must seek truth is blasphemy; it says that they are not of the truth and must somehow look for it. They say they have it.Thats the way I heard it.

Subject: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Damir](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 11:40:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Please, read this two book I posted. Then you`ll have a more understanding about all of this. Blablah like this is on the discussion level of some electronic forums, where arguments are "that`s a way I heard it", "It`s like this or that, I heard it from my sister friend".Nobody knows anything, have no real experience, nor they want to read some books - no, no way. But, they have strong opinions. About things they really don`t understand, nor they are the part of it.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 11:52:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If he is wrong why not say why you think that? I just assume that someone who teach's in the Catholic Church might know something about the faith. You keep telling everyone how much they don't know but you never say what YOU know.Why do two books you recommend have the whole truth and no one else does? Thats what started this thread; a discussion about the movie that thinks it tells the truth.At least I admitt I don't know and so I ask someone who does. But you keep denying things but don't offer any of your own opinions. You just insult all of the opinions you disagree with.I am just discussing something about this with Wayne who is interested in the whole concept and as such I ask what he thinks. I would ask what you think but you never say. And I think you are too emotionally involved with this to have an impartial view and discuss it with out becoming angry. Remmember I am not of the Faith; so getting angry with me is pointless because my only interest is one of curiosity.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Damir](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 12:20:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is the discussion level, for example - "yeah, those evil Jews, they want to control the World, I heard it from my friend`s brother in Law" - and it`s very insultingly if somebody here actually is a Jew.I still don`t know do you can`t understand this, or you`re doing this on purpose?!Hans Kung and Joseph Ratzinger are (probably) two world`s largest theologians, first from Protestants side, second is the today`s Pope Benedict XVI - formerly Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. I remember one large tubes theoretical discussion, where I posted the literature, and the pages (it was Barkhausen Law). Even described it in my own words. But, to no avail - later it was clear that person who had various "opinions" actually provoked.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 12:53:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well I would respect that except for the fact that I never said anything about the Jewish People; second those remarks that might have looked wrong to you are only my experience with the Church and I say it is only my experience. I can't pretend these things don't happen; because they did. You must understand I have my kid in the Catholic System; I see from what happens there and thats my experience. Thats how I form an opinion. When you use an analogy like the one about the Jewish People; someone reading that might think I actually said something so stupid. What I heard from the teacher I spoke of I heard in person and his job is to teach the Catholic Liturgy and he is respected here and in the church so why would I not believe what he says? I have read some of Ratzingers writings; they publish them in the Catholic Digest that comes to my home. I think he is a very bright guy. But my point takes issue with how you oversimplify and deny what I actually say. My real question is why are they so anti-female. Thats a fact. Thats why the Davinci Code has stirred up the waters. So why not offer some perspective on my question? If you are a true defender of the faith then take time to explain that to me. The rest is enjoyable to think and speak about; the lost Gospels and why the early members of the church chose the gospels they did to represent thier faith; instead of the ones they refuted. Thats interesting because it says something about human nature. That was the discussion with Wayne; those issues. I can participate there because I can follow cultural anthropolgy a little. As far as faith; I leave the discussion of that to the faithfull; because i know nothing about it.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 18:14:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whether or not an organization or entity "has" the truth, individuals still have to learn and apply it to their lives. I don't think any Christian church disagrees on the concept that "all men have sinned..." The idea is that all of us are flawed and all must learn and grow in one way or another. Sure, the Catholics and other Christians believe that Christ is the messiah and that he takes their sins upon himself, but the believer must still take certain actions. Not to get to much into any philosophy or implementation but I think it is safe to say Church goers are "seeking truths".

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 19:58:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with that. Why else would they be there if not to fill the spiritual needs in their lives. But it is explained to me that the Catholic Church brooks absolutely no dispute on this point; they are Gods representation of truth on earth as expressed in the Holy Trinity. To say they are somehow

not the sole and only keepers of the truth or that they must somehow find the truth is a big no-no in their Church. Just like the wafer is not a wafer; it is the body of Christ. It doesn't represent Christ or act as a substitute for Christ; that wafer is the body of Christ. I found that one out the hard way and took a nice crack in the shoulder from my wife as well as some rather sharp words from the Priest for forgetting that and pocketing the wafer. I thought the man was having a coronary the way he hissed at me in front of God and everybody. " Surrender the Host" he yelled. "Thats the Body of Christ." "You don't mis-interpret that twice."

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 06:30:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, the Orthodox Church believes that too. The process is called "transubstantiation" and it means that bread and wine have been actually transformed into the body of Christ and to his blood by prayer and faith. It is not merely symbolic but rather an actual transformation to the Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ. That's why you are to be careful with the materials given - do not drop them on the floor or misplace crumbs - because it is the body of the Savior that you handle. This is one of the differences between Orthodox and Catholic Churches and the Protestant denominations. I respect my Catholic and Orthodox friends and would not want to insult their beliefs. However, I think of this as something like witchcraft and will not take part in a communion in a church that believes in transubstantiation. I will take communion in a Protestant church though as long as they don't use wine. I am good friends with an Orthodox priest in Tulsa, and have enjoyed many long conversations with him. I like to find common ground rather than dwell on our differences. However, I find the idea of transubstantiation troublesome. For example, a person that is allergic to alcohol may have an adverse reaction to the communion, whether a priest has prayed for its "transubstantiation" or not. So while I wish to respect the Orthodox and Catholic beliefs, I find I must quietly turn down any communion in their churches.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 11:13:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thats interesting; I must plead ignorance here. So which church do you attend that takes communion without the belief in Transubstantiation? Actually; what is the point of communion without that?

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 13:49:14 GMT

All Protestant Christian churches I am aware of believe that the communion is a symbol of Christ's sacrifice, not actual changing of the substance. Transubstantiation is a uniquely Catholic and Orthodox thing, but I think the Episcopal church believes in transubstantiation too. All others that I am aware of do not.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 16:05:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I see; thats something from the Lutheran's? Or Baptist?

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 16:46:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don`t know about US, but here in Europe is a very impolite to make a negative opinions (especially in public) about other religions and their holy ceremonials. Interestingly, even during the war in ex-YU, through the all hate-talk against enemies and propaganda, I never heard negativeness in our media about Ortodox or Muslim religion and about their sacraments and sacred things. It`s too low, and isn`t right. IMO - sometimes it`s better to have a (negative) private opinion - private. If for nothing else, ... you can be, for example, in the Irish pub, after midnight...

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 18:17:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree, absolutely. I've found that one must be careful what one says on public messageboards, just as a matter of courtesy and gentlemanly discourse. If I've offended you or any other Catholic, I sincerely apologize. As I said in this thread, I have a lot of Catholic and Orthodox friends, was married to an Orthodox wife for several years and had many friendly and spirited conversations with the Orthodox Father. I have the highest respect for people of Orthodox and Catholic faiths.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 18:36:03 GMT

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

Protestants include Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Pentecostals and many others. I would loosely describe these as being slightly more gnostic and less ritualistic than Catholic and Orthodox traditions. Each of these groups is in general agreement on the main points, but several details are seen differently. One of the main things is that a Protestant does not find special authority given to the Roman Catholic Church, and instead, believes that a man may approach God directly, and find answers and salvation through his own relationship with God. A Protestant believes that he does not have to "go through" the Catholic Church to get to God, he can access God directly through his meditation, prayers and studies. Catholics believe that the Pope is Christ's representative here on Earth, sort of a stand-in for the almighty. This gives a hierarchal power structure and a sort of chain of command. The Catholic believer should approach his Church, who will then instruct him on the matters at hand. In early times, most people could not read or write, so Church scholars were really the only ones qualified to interpret scripture and so this structure made sense. Whether it does today is a matter of personal opinion.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 00:53:10 GMT

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

Thanks. I have a question and since you are so kind as to share this without the hype then I will take a chance and ask. Earlier you said you will not take communion with any sect that believes in transubstantiation. That suggests to me you don't believe that whole premise and that you believe in symbolic representation. How does one come to have such a set of belief's? I mean belief by definition is the acceptance of an idea as truth without proof. So how do you distinguish between what belief's you will entertain and which belief's you refute? What is the mechanism of deciding that provokes that certainty? The basis upon which you make a determination to accept one thing over another? I admitt that has always puzzled me. I understand intuition; but to me that has somepart that relates to your experience and subliminally expresses a thought not readily available on the surface of consciousness . It has a trigger. But belief's; whats the foundation that creates a protocal for one over another. I understand the concept of faith because that is really something intrinsic to the organism. But to hold belief's independant of any cause is strange to me. See; I haven't had any one who specifically stated his or hers objection to a religous concept like that. They either accept the whole bag or dispute the everyday matters of living like ethical or moral positions. Like the Catholic Church's refusal to ordain females. They don't take a personal position of character; they take a position on moral grounds. Does this make any sense? Because your position transcends any ethical or moral consideration and seems to deal with a more intangible and diffuse reasoning. It's that intangibility I am hunting at the meaning for. Thanks.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 01:48:25 GMT

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

I was raised Christian, and in the "Bible Belt" of America. I am very comfortable with both the Protestant and Catholic versions of the Christian faith, and I do not want to be rebellious, certainly not against God. Nor do I want to be against any man that I think is sincerely trying to find truths and live a spiritual life. Because of this, I feel more in common with Christians and Catholics than I feel apart from them. I suppose this could also be said of other faiths too, particularly Jews and probably Moslems too. I have some Zoroastrian friends, and their religious text, traditions and culture have always fascinated me. And I also have a lot of Hindu friends, and their rich traditions are interesting to me as well. But I am also somewhat of a scientific kind of person, maybe a critical thinker. That's how I'm built. So I had to reconcile those two things, faith and science. That drove me towards a belief system sort of like the gnostics, so when I discovered them, I immediately became interested. A long time ago, I realized that science is a belief system not unlike religion. There are uncertainties and assumptions, hypothesis and theories. It seems concrete to me, but it is not. Still, it is a way of thinking that I am comfortable with. It is basically to hold as matter of principle the idea that truth should be sought by rigorous testing. I thought to myself that a God would probably not be insecure, and so would probably not mind an inquisitive subject. God would not mind proving himself and could stand up to scrutiny. So I decided not to be afraid to put God to the test. To me, faith is built like trust - It is built by testing and seeing repeated results that are as expected. That builds faith and ultimately wisdom. I began to form a definition of God, one that is basically everything in the universe. Maybe the "I AM" of the Bible. The thing is, even an atheist scientist believes in the universe. So when one defines this way, they have no reservation that God exists. God's Will then, is the natural and physical laws of the universe. Some we understand, some we don't. My job is to understand things as well as possible, and to try and be part of the plan rather than trying to force it into something it isn't. Surely lots of other people have lots of other views and that's fine with me. This is just my take on things, or part of it. Probably not worth going into much more detail on an audio messageboard.

Subject: Re: My sister`s friend and other stories

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 11:04:19 GMT

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

Well; I appreciate the input. The interesting thing about all this for me is the thought process behind it; and you gave a good description. Thanks.
