

# THE DEVIL AND HOLLYWOOD

By  
Joseph More

If the devil had a world headquarters, it could very well be in Los Angeles - the unofficial capital of the entertainment media. The devil must get an extra chuckle because "Los Angeles" means "City of Angels". (Of course, it doesn't say what kind.)

One of Satan's Strategy is to use everything in his means to cause us to lose our souls. Obviously, he uses the entertainment media to further his cause. Of course, he first has to have a hold on the people in the industry before he has a hold on the industry itself.

Let's look at the movie industry first. Before one can understand the present power and influence it has - and what is done with it - it is necessary to examine the following four things: Who is in control?

Why do they do what they do?

How do they accomplish it?

What is the result?

It is a fact of human nature that people like to be entertained. Before this last century, it was limited mostly to live plays and shows, and individual singers and dancers. Movies were invented about the same time as more people were moving from the farms to the cities. Movies were not only the newest popular wonder - it was cheap entertainment. The public couldn't get enough, and movie makers poured out feature after feature to an eagerly awaiting public.

For some, it was just a way to make a living. For others, it was the road to fame and fortune. The very first movie makers were not too concerned with quality because the public would watch anything on the screen. The generally high morals and standards of the time was reflected in the movies that were made.

In the 30's after "talkies" came out, there was a change in the industry. Movies were starting to become risque and this was objectionable to most people. Even Congress (yes - the Congress of the United States) was about to step in. To avoid Congressional censorship, the movie industry decided to censor itself. In 1934, the "Hays Code" was set up (named after Congressman Will Hays, a Catholic). It was a detailed list of what was officially called the Production Code. It stated what could or could not be shown in movies.

The particulars, and they were very specific, were drawn up by Fr. Daniel Lord, a Jesuit Priest. The Hays office, which oversaw the Code, was directed by Joseph Breen, a Catholic, who was hired by Hays. He said, "It is better to have no nation pictures at all than to

permit what is objectionable to creep into our films.” While Catholics had no greater a percentage of the population then, the Catholic Church justifiably used its influence (power for “good,” if you will) to protect the morals of all people from an increasingly potential negative influence on society. That it worked is evidenced in watching the movies made when the Production Code was in effect. The Code is a source of ridicule and laughter today by those who don’t want any high standards - but it worked.

If the movie was to suggest sex between a couple, it would show them kissing, and then the camera would pan to a fireplace or waves crashing. The audience could think what they wanted. But nothing was shown and children watching the movies in those days were still innocent enough not even to know what was insinuated.

The 30's was also the time in which the major studios controlled the industry. They were in competition with each other, and one of the byproducts of this competition was increased quality in movies. Since they didn’t have to compete to see who could sneak in the worst elements, they could concentrate on trying to outdo each other in producing good movies. Making money was certainly a driving force; but it was not the only one. There were many to whom creativity, accomplishment, and self-satisfaction were very important. They made movies which were uplifting to the human spirit. When movies were made about crime, the Production Code saw to it that the end result of a movie was that crime never paid.

While there were A movies (big budget, big stars) and B movies (small budget - upcoming actors and actresses), you could see any of them without being offended or dismayed. Most of the studios were owned by Jews, but there certainly were no general anti-Christian movies, and absolutely no specific anti-Catholic ones. In fact, it was just the opposite. Many movies from the 30's, 40's, and 50's, while not being a religious movie, had reverential scenes of people visiting churches and praying there. Most of the time it was a Catholic Church.

In 1953, Alfred Hitchcock directed a movie called “I Confess.” In it, a priest hears a confession from a man who had committed a murder. Another man was accused of the crime, and the priest spent the whole movie trying to help him without revealing the confession of the guilty man. It definitely was a movie respecting the priesthood and the sacredness of the seal of Confession.

Quite the opposite is true in Hollywood today. While there is much evidence that the people making the movies in the early days of the Code may not have had the highest morals, at least their lifestyle was not showcased on the movie screen.

What was the devil doing all this time? It is important here to reiterate that the devil attempts to negatively influence everyone - at all times - in all areas. He was always working in the movie

industry behind the scenes (no pun intended) and was certainly accomplishing successes in individuals during this time. Specific successes (on a one-by-one basis) can lead to general successes (having many people in a certain area committing a certain sin). Then the general success of controlling most people in a certain area - by falling to a particular temptation - can lead other originally abstaining individuals to follow the crowd. It could be called a “Divide and Conquer” tactic followed by a “Unite and Control” tactic.

As an example scenario, let’s say that most Hollywood studio heads received the most satisfaction from making outstanding movies. Then one of those bosses was tempted by the devil to want to be the richest studio head of them all. He then started cutting production costs and started publicizing the enormous profits his studio was making, as well as his own personal profits.

Another studio head who did not fall to the original temptation of wanting to be the richest - did fall to the temptation of jealousy. Money was not as important as being “No. 1.” He not only started cutting production costs, but he started making more movies that appealed to a lower aspect of our human nature. (Does sex and violence ring a bell?) Then his movies started getting the most publicity. Another studio head, who didn’t want to lose his big stars to the other studios, joined the bandwagon. Soon, the concept of making the highest quality movies - both in content and production values - went by the wayside.

So while the devil was temporarily losing the war in the movies industry at the time of the Production Code, you can bet he was still winning a few battles as well as setting up his next major campaign. There were also other small battles being won by having individuals, privately and then publicly, denounce the Code. This worked on the minds of those working in Hollywood as well as the general public. Remember, the devil has patience. You don’t change public opinion, much less public morality, in an instant. It’s only accomplished slowly and methodically - at a rate that is not discernable to the general public. This principle can best be explained by the well-known story of how to boil a frog in water. If it is put in boiling water, it jumps out. If, however, it is put in lukewarm water and the temperature is increased one degree at a time, the frog just sits there until he boils to death.

In the 30's the word “censorship” was a good concept. By the 70's it was a hated concept. The devil had won the war in that area. It came, however, after skillful manipulation of public opinion of which the devil is the absolute master.

So if it could be said that the Catholic Church influenced the Production Code and “kept the devil in check” during the years of the Code, it could also be said that the lack of Catholic leadership in the ensuing years is a good bit responsible for the deplorable condition

the movie industry is in today.

Does that mean the devil was also winning battles inside the Catholic Church during those ensuing years? Read on.

At the same time the Production Code was in effect, the Catholic Church had the Legion of Decency. It evaluated movies and rated them. A-I, Family; A-II, Adults and Adolescents; A-III, Adults; A-IV, Mature Moviegoers; B, Objectionable in part; C, Condemned. In addition, every Easter Sunday all Catholics would make a pledge to follow these ratings. No one was supposed to go to Objectionable or Condemned movies. All good Catholics followed these ratings and Hollywood knew it.

In one such published list from the early 60's, there were 75-A-1, 67-A-2, 43-A3, 12-A4, 61-B, and 6-C. 67 movies out of 264 (25%) were off-limits. As one example of the high standards, even the suggest of fornication or adultery was enough to cause the movie to be rated B. And no C movies were shown in the local theater, at least not in small cities and towns. Hollywood didn't want to lose over 20% of their potential audience, so they were conscious of this rating system. (In other words, Catholics wielded a strong and positive influence on the industry.) In 1965, the Legion of Decency was reorganized as the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures.

In a list from the early 70's, there were 20-AI, 19-A-II, 65-A-III, 14 A-IV, 18-B, and 37C. Now 55 out of 173 movies (32%) were off-limits. Or were they?

Catholics no longer pledged at Mass every year to avoid B and C movies. Is that why even some C movies started showing up at the local theater?

There was another name change in 1970, to the U.S. Bishop's Office of Film and Broadcasting, which lowered the standards. Now, suggestions of fornication and adultery no longer earned a B rating by itself. Let's examine some old movies reviewed by this organization.  
**A Perfect World** - "Internal menace to a child, graphic violence, sexual references and coarse language."

**The Three Musketeers** - "Much stylized violence, sexual references and joking treatment of religion."

**Leviathan** - "Moderate grisly gore, some profanity, laced with sexual vulgarity."

**Object of Beauty** - "Acceptance of extramarital relations and insurance fraud, a flash of nudity and minimal rough language." (Minimal? - Compared to what?)

**Mortal Thoughts** - "Some gory violence, abuse of women and much rough language."

**Monty Python and the Holy Grail** - "Another thing is irreverence, finding laughable the notion that anything might be sacred. The appeal of such humor is above all a question of individual taste." (So if you like sacrilegious humor, it's okay?)

**Moses** - “The script founds in most spectacular fashion, however, on the question of God.”

**The Suicide Club** - “Implications of incest and a lack of conscience on the part of the suicide club members.”

**Love and Death** - “Many of the jokes could be taken as blasphemous.”

**Ryan’s Daughter** - “Well acted melodramatic romance.” (Actually, it was about an adulterous affair.)

Now what do all of these movies have in common? Why, they all were rated A-3 (morally unobjectionable for adults) by the same U.S. Bishop’s Office of Film and Broadcasting. (Nothing in them could ever negatively affect an adult - right?)

And there’s more:

**Shark’s Treasure** - “An overt homosexual element comes into play, which becomes offensive and jarring because the feeble dramatic framework of the film is unable to sustain it. (Ah, evidently it would no longer be “offensive” if it is in a strong dramatic framework.) It was classified A-3.)

**Lucky Numbers** - This movie contained the following elements: “Sexual encounter, brief violence, casual law breaking, much rough language, recreational drug use, profanity.” It was rated A-4, “Unobjectionable for Adults, with Reservations.” (Isn’t it nice that they think that almost no adult Catholic could be harmed by the promotion of all the negative and immoral material in today’s movies?)

**The Black Bird** - “The humor moreover is often offensive (with more than a hint of religious parody at times), and the language is frequently blasphemous, aspects that cannot be condoned in a light comedy.” (This movie was classified B, so evidently those aspects could be condoned in a heavy comedy which would probably then be rated A-3.) Evidently these reviewers do not read (or ignore) the Vatican City daily newspaper, L’Osservatore Romano, which said that “Because of laxity in censorship and misplaced enthusiasm for alleged “artistic values” in obscene films, things are now getting out of hand. It added, “Art and obscenity have nothing in common” and that “evil must be combated.” It added, “Usually honest Catholics sometimes defend obscene films, seeing “art” in them,” L’Osservatore said. “This is wrong. Such temptations must be resisted. We are dealing with true and real corruption, a calculated demolition of consciences.”

But is that as low as the standards went? The next organization to review and rate movies was Catholic News Service - now known as OSV News from Out Sunday Visitor.

Samples of their present low standard: **Emilia** is "L" - limited adult audience, according to them. This classification suggests that the film "may contain problematic content that some adults would find troubling." (Some adults? It celebrates everything LGBTQ - which is a list of sexual sins condemned by God - if not by OSV News.)

Then the film **Conclave**, which it admits makes Church leadership look like power-hungry crazies, and nothing about Faith, still gives it an A-II rating which means they approve of it for adults and adolescents. (Could this movie possibly cause adults and adolescents lose respect for the Church that Christ founded? Really?)

In the meantime, what was happening in Hollywood? In 1968, Hollywood dropped the Production Code and instituted their own rating system - the one we have today consisting of G, PG, PG-13, R, and X. At first glance, this would seem to correspond very closely to the general ratings of the Legion of Decency. Unfortunately, what Hollywood considered suitable for adolescents - or even adults - was not the same as the Catholic Church.

Then, as succeeding years passed, movies that were X became R, R became PG-13, and so on. In the beginning, even one "f" word or the slightest glimpse of nudity garnered an R rating. Now these are PG-13, or even PG.

In 1969, The first X-Rated movie to win the Academy as the "Best Picture of the Year," was **Midnight Cowboy**. It has now been rated R. The same for formerly X-rated **Last Tango in Paris**. Many others have also had their rating changed to a less-objectionable one. These are just two of the well-known ones. If Hollywood re-rated the old Condemned movies by the Legion of Decency, almost all of them would be given a PG-13 or even PG today.

If you're ever read a film review or seen a television film review from a critic, you know all they talk about is "artistic merit" - never the moral, or religious elements in a film. (Actually that should read "immoral or anti-religious elements of a film.") For them, anything goes - and nothing is too trashy or filthy to get made.

We know Hollywood no longer has any standards at all.

Example:

**The Cook, the Thief, His Wife and her Lover** - In this 1990 movie, the opening scene involves a group of thugs who tear the clothes off a struggling, terrified victim in order to smear his naked body with excrement. They force filth into his mouth and eyes, then pin him to the ground while the leader proceeds to urinate all over him. Then it got worse. We see sex in a toilet stall, deep kisses given to a bloody and mutilated cadaver, and a shrieking and weeping nine-year-old boy whose navel is hideously carved from his body. The grand finale of

the film shows the main character slicing off - and swallowing a piece of human corpse in the most graphic scene of cannibalism ever portrayed in motion pictures. The critics raved about it, including Siskel and Ebert, the two most famous ones at the time who had their own television show. They gave it two "thumbs-up." The only nationally-known critics with the morals (and guts) to criticize it were Michael Medved and Jeffery Lyons. In his highly recommended book, "Hollywood vs. America," Medved called it "unrelieved ugliness, horror, and depravity at every turn." (Medved also had a show on PBS, "Hollywood vs. the Catholic Church." It contains much specific information on their incessant attacks on our beliefs and practices.)

And this was 35 years ago. It is even worse today.

So how did the movie industry get to the low level it is today? The Devil's No. 1 Strategy is to tempt a person to be filled with Pride - from any reason. Then it is easy to get another person to follow his lead. In other words, if the devil tempts someone to want to be famous, then he doesn't even have to tempt this person every step of the way downward. Their own ambition towards their one goal takes over, and one sin leads to another in the attaining of that goal.

To use a movie industry analogy, let's say there's a young woman who goes to Hollywood with the ambition of being a star. (As soon as one has the desire of being famous - versus simply making a living using their talent in some way - there is already an element of sinful Pride evident.) Let's say this woman is beautiful and talented. So are thousands and thousands of other women. Now she can hope she is lucky and just happens to be at the right place at the right time. It happens - but very rarely. But this woman finds out quickly, that in Hollywood, it's who you know with influence that counts - not just looks or talent. She also finds out that committing fornication or adultery (no euphemisms like "sleeping together" will be used here), she can definitely improve, if not guarantee, her chance of getting her "big break."

Now she may have gone to Hollywood by falling to a temptation of wanting to be famous and maybe even commits fornication the first time on a particular temptation from the devil. But if she starts getting acting roles, and more fornication or adultery leads to more roles, the devil can sit back and just watch the fruits of his labors. From then on, the sin perpetuates itself. The devil started the ball rolling, but the "world" and the "flesh" kept it going.

Let's return to the specific topic of the movies themselves. When the studio system ended and stars were no longer under contract, the control of the industry changed. During this change, the people in power changed. Now since prideful people, not humble people, look for power (a basic principle of fallen human nature), it is not difficult to guess who, over time, took over the important jobs

in the industry. You could say that the liberals replaced conservatives. And one of the bylaws of being a liberal is to seek change of any kind, regardless of existing customs, morals, or even laws. Another one of the bylaws of the liberals is to promote their philosophy and lifestyle. This certainly is true in Hollywood. We'll return to that a little later. Before that, however, let's look at how standards are lowered little by little. (Another one of Satan's main strategies.)

The first example will be filthy language. In 1939, at the end of "Gone with the Wind," Clark Gable said, "Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn." Audiences were shocked. The word "damn" had never been said in a movie before. The director had even shot two endings. The other one: "Frankly, my dear, I just don't care." The producer had to plead with Will Hays to use the word "damn," which was barred by the Production Code. Hays finally consented, and made the producer pay a \$5,000 fine for violating the Code. It was a small price to pay for the desired effect it caused. The word "damn" was not used again for some 18 years! This was not just because the Code still didn't allow it, but because the audience wouldn't have accepted it.

Producers and directors in power - because of pride again - evidently wanted to make movies that "pushed the envelope." They wanted to be the first to incorporate some previously forbidden item into a movie. This was certainly true of filthy language. Slow, but surely, all the curse words cropped up in films. The first time the "f" word was used, it was in an X-rated film. In fact, the use of that word automatically got a movie an X-rating. Then it was said once in a movie in a half-whisper and the movie got an R rating. Then the presence of that word automatically got any movie an R rating. Then it crept into PG-13 movies. It only a matter of time until it appears in PG movies, where the "s" word now appears.

In fact, there is no more X rating. NC-17 stands for "No One 17 and Under Admitted." It's the highest rating, indicating that the film contains content deemed clearly "adult." Evidently, the motion picture industry considers everyone 18 to 118 an "adult." And it doesn't consider *any movie* as "unsuitable" for *anyone*. In other words, anything goes - no matter what.

Why do the standards continue to go down? The MPAA continues to be funded by the major studios. Expecting the ratings board to go against the wishes of the studios that finance it is like asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

Of course, when the word said once no longer shocks - or gets any effect - then it is said more often. Movies are now made with the "f" word said as many as 200 to 300 times. (Nowadays, writers don't have to be able to write characters with any depth, and actors no longer have to be able to play a character of any depth. Just throw the



“f” word in every sentence and the people who go to those movies supposedly won’t know the difference.)

The same principle was used in introducing nudity and gory violence. One of the phony excuses that Hollywood producers and directors try to use to justify the filth in their movies, is to claim that they are just “giving the public what they want.” Actually, they are just giving the public what it will accept. And, of course, as public standards and morality continually go further down - aided and abetted by these same movies - the public is willing to accept more filthy language, nudity, and gory violence.

There were a multitude of war movies made in the 40's and 50's. No one saw them and claimed that they weren't realistic because there wasn't any filthy language in them. The play, “Mr. Roberts” had cursing in it, but it was all censored out of the movie. It is doubtful anyone came out of that movie disappointed - even if they had seen and accepted the play the way it was written. An actor, John Quaid, passed up a part in a movie because of profanity, saying “I don’t need profanity to portray an evil character.” He was heard by other actors in the hallway waiting to audition who applauded - but one of them gave up his standards to get the part.

A syndicated columnist at the time, Mike Royko, in talking about the movie industry, wrote “I don’t believe in censorship. Actually, I do, but being part of the news business, I can’t admit it. So pretend that you didn’t read this.” He had been around long enough to make fun of political correctness about censorship. He then proceeded to suggest that all those involved in marking movies which contained the “f” and, “s” words, or mother in any form other than the mother being someone’s mom, be assessed a percentage of their income. He added that there should be an extra 10% national sale tax on those who rent the movies, because they are also part of the problem. Of course, it would be better for everyone if these words weren’t allowed in the movies in the first place.

The same slow, but sure, introduction was also done with sex scenes. In the old movies - as in the “old days,” romance was portrayed. It showed “courting,” or couples getting to know each other. While it may have too often suggested a negative psychological factor - that romance and attraction are all that need be required for a couple to get married and live “happily ever after” - at least it didn’t suggest that a good sexual relationship, especially outside marriage, was all that mattered.

Once the Production Code no longer existed, it was a matter of nothing being forbidden. Just label it for whom we think should be able to see it. And we have seen, that standard gets lower and lower at the same speed as society allows it.

One highly popular movie, **Pretty Woman** had reduced “romance” to a handsome rich, corporate raider hiring a prostitute to

be his show piece (and you can take that both ways) for a week to help him put over a big deal. A week later, they were “in love” and drove off together into the sunset. The move grossed over \$100,000,000 and not all of it from repeated viewings by optimistic prostitutes.

One of the “subtle” ways nudity was introduced into mainstream movies was to put a little - just a little - into so-called “highly respectable movies.” This was done in 1971's “Romeo and Juliet.” Since this was a play from Shakespeare, (everyone pause - bow your head - and look up in awe with your mouth open), you can get away with things that wouldn't ordinarily be allowed. At the end of the movie, there is a shot of Juliet sitting in bed with breasts exposed. It was rated PG because it was Shakespeare. (Everyone pause - bow your head - and now look up in awe with your mouth open). The same reason supposedly made it acceptable for high school and junior high school students to be taken in classes by their teachers to theaters to see it. As a result, 99% of the boys got their first motion picture experience of an exposing of female breasts. And that's all 100% of the boys who saw the movie talked about afterwards.

The administrators and teachers who gave “Romeo and Juliet” their total approval because it was Shakespeare. (Repeat the worship drill. By this third time, your eyes should be glazed over also.)

Obviously the film could have been made by the director, without those few seconds of nudity. So why put them in? (A side note: A succeeding film by this director, **Brother Sun and Sister Moon**, portrayed St. Francis of Assisi as a secular saint and a social heretic, and completely avoided the supernatural - his prayer life. Coincidence?)

Comic Jackie Mason once said, concerning the argument that sex scenes are justified because people have sex in real life said, “People eat soup in real life, but not every movie has to have a soup scene.”

When people do not object to pornography, it is because they want the “freedom” or “right” to see it if they so choose. The actresses doing nude scenes (and now, actors, too) try to justify it by saying, “The part called for it,” like there was an absolute requirement written in the sands of time to force the part to be written that way. No writer, for instance, has to write a movie about a prostitute. If he does, he's not required to write a scene with nudity. To state that the scene is “dramatically necessary” is simply an excuse. Even if it is justifiable to suggest something immoral is going on, it is never necessary to show it.

Now why do actresses, who because of the natural sense of shame do not feel comfortable being filmed in the nude, agree to do it? The simple answer is that it helps their “career.” Sharon Stone

became a major star after a movie she made, with the camera filming up her skirt without her wearing panties. She claimed that it was accidental. Evidently, even after she read the script and it said that the camera will film up her skirt, she “accidentally” left her panties off that day. Anyone who believes that is also open to buying ocean-front property in Kansas. But it did get her a great amount of publicity, which made her a “star,” and that was her exact intentions.

Whenever someone tries to justify something they know is wrong, they use a statement that goes against reason and common sense. At least it shows that their conscience still exists, or they wouldn’t have to try to justify what they do to anyone else who’s differing belief is based on that same reason and common sense.

Movies are a favorite tool of the devil because they are made with the intention of entertaining an audience and a movie is considered entertaining if it has an emotional effect on the audience. This negative effect can be laughter, sadness, adventure, or fear.

Using one of these emotional states, it is easy to get someone to accept something that they would not ordinarily accept. This is another of Satan’s successful strategies: to use the weakness of human emotions to put across his errors in truth, and to lower the standards of decency and morality. Let’s look at the emotions of laughter and fear. Everyone likes to laugh. There are not only mental benefits, but actual physical benefits caused by laughter. One of the devil’s first and still successful tactics in the area is dirty jokes. Sex is sacred. It was created by God for His specific purposes. A dirty joke - any dirty joke involving the topic of sex - degrades it from its rightful place in God’s Plan. However, since they are the easiest jokes to get a laugh, people without high standards listen to them and repeat them all the time. Most of the present-day “famous” comics are the ones with the filthiest mouths.

Now dirty jokes have been told for a long time, just as filthy language has been used for a long time. Even 60 years ago, however, it was just between men. Men used to treat women with respect, and not only would not use filthy language or tell dirty jokes to them, but would not allow other men to do so. The point here, is as the content of movies started going down, females as well as males lost their sensitivity and standards in this area. (The frog boiling strategy again.)

One of the successful ways to accomplish this was to say that movies containing filthy language were for “mature audiences.” And remember, every person in this country who is 16 or older claims that they are “mature.” (Find one who doesn’t and you win a Kewpee Doll.) Another subtle trick was to refer to filthy language as “adult language.” Every teenager wants to be an adult, so listening (and using) that kind of language is a showcase for every teenager who is dissatisfied with being a teenager and wanting to think they’re an

adult. The devil always wants youth to think they're "mature" as early as possible. And since it is supposed to be "adult language," adults shouldn't object to it, right? Therefore, both teenagers and adults accept it, both operating under an aspect of pride.

Let's return to the strategy of having unacceptable principles accepted under the guise of being "funny." Anything can be presented as acceptable as long as it is presented with humor. There have even been movies which portray killing people as "funny." In a 70's movie, **Death Race 2000**, it was done with cars. In a 90's movie, **Pulp Fiction**, it was done with guns.

Then, of course, there are which make fun of God, the Catholic Church, priests, nuns, and anything religious?

Some attempted to be subtle. Examples:

**Looking for Mr. Goodbar** - About a Catholic woman who goes from one disastrous sex encounter to another. A Notre Dame jacket is worn by her father to further the point.

**Same Time, Next Year** - About two married people who conduct an annual adultery ritual for over 20 years. When it takes place in the movie, the woman, a Catholic, is on her way to a religious retreat.

Others are even more blatant.

**Oh, God** - Which reduces Almighty God to the level of a stand-up comic.

**Nasty Habits** - About an abbess who wins reelection over a sexy young nun.

**Michael** - About a crotch-grabbing, beer-guzzling, skirt-chasing angel (St. Michael the Archangel drove Satan and his underlings into Hell. Ever see a movie about that? ) And is it a coincidence that the blasphemous portrayal of an angel in this movie is about one named Michael?

**Lovers and other Strangers** - Features humorous confessions.

**We're No Angels** - One character says, "It's not supposed to make sense! It's religion." People, including supposed "good Catholics" will call these and others "good movies," because it made them laugh.

Now let's look at the emotion of fear. People have always enjoyed scary movies because they evoke that emotion in a safe setting. In the old movies, however, the fear was caused by something that doesn't really exist, like Frankenstein, Dracula, the Werewolf, or Mummies. Then they went to mutant animals - always caused, of course, by atomic testing. There were giant grasshoppers, ants, rabbits, and a hundred other existing animals. These "monsters" were a little more familiar.

Then there was a change to monsters being human. It was the "nice" man who lived next door in all the woman-in-jeopardy movies.

To scare teenagers, there are the slasher films, where teenagers get sliced and diced by some maniac. The success of these films are evident by the 10 or 15 sequels which followed.

To frighten children, nothing is off-limits, including killers dressed as clowns or even Santa Claus. In a movie about the later, **And All Through the Night**, a homicidal maniac dons a Santa suit before going on a Christmas Eve killing spree. Not exactly the feel-good movie as "It's A Wonderful Life," is it?

While people couldn't be paranoid about fictitious monsters or giant animals, they could certainly be made paranoid about the man next door.

Letting children view horror movies is probably more of a case of child-abuse than a case of beating them with a coat hanger. The body heals faster than the mind, and the mind heals faster than the spirit.

People, however, leave the theater after watching a bloody, gory movie, and call it a "good movie" because it caused an emotional response one of fear. Of course, they never seem to consider how a diet of these movies (or even one), will affect them psychologically for the rest of their life.

During the change to new monsters, a new evil was introduced into movies - the devil. This would not seem to fall under a strategy of the devil, until one realizes that a partial truth is still a lie. **The Exorcist** was the first blockbuster movie (recently re-released), about the devil. It was taken from a true case of possession of a young boy. In actuality, the exorcisms worked. The boy was released from the possession, and the entire family became Catholic.

Enter Hollywood. The boy was changed to a girl, because it is more shocking to hear a little girl using filthy language and see her throw up. According to the film, the devil, during an exorcism, enters one of the priests and causes his death. In the movie, the devil evidently wins.

He did win in real life in one way, as evidenced by the terrifying nightmares of thousands of people who read the book or saw the movie - including children.

The Motion Picture Association of America rated it R when it should have received an X. The National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures gave it an A-4 - "Unobjectionable for Adults with reservations." Of course, they did not explain how this movie could not even be considered "Objectionable in Part," much less "Condemned." One priest reviewer wrote, "Because of the obscene language and gestures, poor theology, and the danger of spiritual and psychological harm, no one in good conscience could recommend this film to children or to the adolescent."

Isn't it nice, again, to know you're an "adult," and therefore

nothing can affect you negatively, either theologically or psychologically. Another priest has even written, "If you are not harmed by viewing a *Condemned* movie, you do not sin." Now that's really intelligent thinking. You either have to know the harmful ramifications of a movie *before you see it*, or you see it and just wait to find out any bad effects afterwards (that you recognize) before it can be called a sin.

There were at least 200 documented cases where persons after reading the book or seeing "The Exorcist," either believed they were possessed or had become possessed by the devil. Evidently they hadn't been able to discern ahead of time whether they would be harmed or not. The "success" of "The Exorcist" started a parade of movies about the devil:

**The Omen** - Included an Anti-Christ theme, misrepresented scripture, and portrayed priests as other fanatics in fear of Satan or empty-eyed monks worshipping huge crucifixes.

**Rosemary's Baby** - One of many movies in which the devil impregnates a woman. (Now that's a film that can really make pregnant women feel good about motherhood.) According to movies, the only thing you have to fear from the devil is the rare case of possession, or the non-existent case of impregnation. (The devil's No. 1 Strategy is to try to hide from people the way in which he is the most successful to get them into sins of Pride. If they think that they are not being deceived by the devil because they are not "possessed," he is home free.)

The desensitization of the public to violence is so obvious, that it does not bear much going into specifics. It'll suffice to say that "Jaws" which included many scenes of gore and blood, of arms and legs are seen floating in the water, where a dead girl is seen covered by crabs on a beach, and is climaxed with a man vomiting blood as a giant shark chews him up. Rating? It was a PG, which means Hollywood thought it was suitable for adolescents.

This movie also definitely caused a paranoia about sharks, and was responsible for millions of people no longer swimming in the ocean or resort areas. Need we mention that half of this number were adults. Yes, so movies certainly don't affect adults psychologically? Really?

Much worse than the psychological fear of sharks, however, is the psychological approval of any immoral conduct or values. The Production Code required that lawbreakers were caught and punished. Good always had to triumph over evil. After the Code ended, movies started to be made that glorified criminals and their crimes. One of the best early examples of this was 1969's highly entertaining **Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid**. Since Paul Newman and Robert Redford played the leads, it was easy to turn these outlaws into likeable heroes. They didn't kill anyone until the end of the movie,

which was lost in the emotion of their losing their lives - while making jokes at the end.

So where does the movie industry stand today? Is this a conspiracy? Yes, even if not overt. Each producer and director is out for the same thing - to be the richest in the industry, and to push their own agenda. Because most are not Christians, much less Catholics, they are all working from Pride (respected by their peers who have the same agenda), and greed (the desire to be No. 1). They work from the philosophy of appealing to the lowest instincts of human nature to attain their goals, and to the furthering of their hedonistic agenda, which is generally anti-Christian and specifically anti-Catholic.

This appeal to natural weaknesses is why they make movies on empowerment for children like **Home Alone**. It was a brilliant tapping into modern fears - suggesting to latchkey kids that they have power, and to ease the guilt of mothers who are at work when their children get home from school. Did it work? It grossed over \$200,000,000 and spawned two direct sequels. (Indirect sequels are others inspired by the money this movie made.)

The appeal to teens are movies about rebellion against authority are like the popular **Ferris Buellar's Day Off**. In it, the adults, parents and teachers, are all idiots, the children are all geniuses and no matter what the teens do wrong, it all turns out fine in the end. There are no negative consequences or penalties.

The appeal to adults (and of course, all teens who consider themselves "adult") is through sex and violence. This includes every movie which portrays violence as a way of handling any dispute or problem. Besides the general desensitizing to violence that these movies accomplish, there is also specific instances of their effect. In just one example of a copy-cat crime, there's the real-life case of an accused serial killer of six women who gave a graphically gruesome description of how he slashed one of his female victims. He said that he copied that killing from the violent science-fiction movie "Robocop" which he had earlier viewed. "I did exactly what I seen in the movie" he said.

In one newspaper cartoon, about an awards ceremony, it summed up Hollywood's attitude about violence. The M.C. in the cartoon says, "For the film most likely to inspire senseless acts of violence, the nominees are...."

Both "adult and "teen" movies suggest that the main road to happiness is paved with fornication or adultery. No use naming numerous ones - that fact includes maybe 90% of all movies made today.

One movie could be spotlighted because it was about a male angel who comes back to earth after dying as a human (bad theology), falls in love (worse theology) and says, "I'd give up an eternity in Heaven to spend a lifetime with this woman." Just one more example

of how sex on Earth is supposed to be better than Heaven with God. (Come to think of it, aren't human beings actually making that bad trade very day?)

Hollywood is also not just interested in selling sex and violence to teens as well as adults. A slight flak occurred when it was discovered that they were test-marketing R-rated movies to 10-year-olds. (Of course they all stop for a while, the flak will die down, and as the water gets 10 degrees hotter, they'll go back to it.)

It should also be mentioned that the violence in videos is even worse than what is in movie theaters. That's because studios sometimes take ultra-violent scenes that were cut from theatrical release and reinsert them into films before they are available for video rental. Does the rating change then? Of course not.

The only reason Hollywood continues to make movies with filthy language, violence, and sex scenes is because *they make money*. As long as the public pays up to \$9.50 for two hours of trash masquerading as entertainment, those kind of movies will continue to be made. (For instance, as long as parents let their teens go to slasher movies, they will make a hundred sequels.)

It must be kept in mind that the vast majority of people who are seeing them are people who call themselves "Christian" or "Catholic." One of G.K. Chesterton's best lines is, "Sitting in a church on Sunday doesn't make you a Christian any more than sitting in a garage makes you a car." He was making the point that you must live up to your religious beliefs all through the week, not just for one hour on one day. So, are people who call themselves "Christian" or "Catholic" and patronize trashy movies (all R and many PG-13 ones) being hypocrites? And you can double the hypocrite evaluation for anyone who patronizes X-rated films. (Obviously, this includes using any service that offers them, as well as seeing them on the big screen.)

Trashy movies, however, don't actually make the most money. Of the 29,791 films reviewed by the movie ratings board since its inception in 1968, the vast majority - 17,202 have been assigned an R. The next biggest grouping are titles rated PG (5,578), followed by PG-13 (4,913) and G-rated releases (1,574). In today's times, R-rated pics as a class generate less revenue overall than PG or PG-13 offerings. It is evident that there's another reason for these kinds of movies to be made to foster immoral philosophy and (lack of) values onto others.

Movies have always reflected, at least to an extent, some of the philosophies of producers, and directors. Because of so much alcohol abuse in Hollywood, drunks have long been portrayed in a humorous or "to be pitied" light. This is also why more Academy Awards for "Best Actor" have been given to roles involving drunks than anything else. One year, in fact, all five nominations for "Best



Actor” involved roles about drunks. (Hollywood would call them “alcoholics,” but as one writer observed, an alcoholic is just a drunk who goes to meetings.)

Is that why there are so many movies today advertising and/or promoting recreational drug use? Before the late 60's movie characters who used drugs were portrayed as “junkies and losers. “ Then the upsurge of drug usage in society that accompanied the turbulent events of the late 1960s and 1970s was mirrored in the entertainment media. Today, drug usage is presented in many movies as a normal and enjoyable part of life.

This is the same reason that movies always endorse fornication and adultery as normal in any relationship between a man and a woman, including on the first date. The latest in this ongoing portrayal of immoral behavior as normal, is the present positive portrayal of homosexuality as a normal lifestyle.

One of the psychological reasons film-makers make movies to influence people to join in their degraded lifestyle, is to attempt to lessen the chance that anyone else, either by word or example, can bother their conscience (You can't criticize someone else who has the same weakness or commits the same sins as you do. This could be called Human Nature Principle B.)

All political movies are blatantly pro-liberal. Occasionally one makes money, depending on the size of the budget, the name-value of the stars, the amount of publicity, and how subtle the liberal agenda is presented. One which was not successful because it wasn't subtle enough was **Reds**, a movie glorifying John Reed, an American Communist (which should be an oxy-moron) who was active in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. This movie was not successful, despite the name of the producer and star, Warren Beatty, because it was obviously pro-Communist. This movie came on in 1981, only years after Hollywood was purged of producers, writers, and stars who at one time were Communist leaning. Did the Communists after that time make a big point of infiltrating Hollywood to attain positions of power? Or is it just a coincidence that Hollywood no longer makes any anti-Communist movies, but rather movies like “Reds”? And is that why you often see news shows and movies criticizing those who wanted to purge the Communists out of Hollywood, in the 1950's, and the glorification of those who were either card-carrying Communists or sympathetic to it's philosophy? (The media has since turned the blacklisted writers and actors from the days of the House Committee on Un-American Activities - which no longer exists - into Hollywood “saints.”)

It should be kept in mind that the further left a liberal gets, the closer they get to Communism in their philosophy. And the basic tenet of Communism is anti-God and anti-religion. It is, therefore, no surprise to understand the anti-religious movies being made once you

know that 96% of the Hollywood elite do not go to church. (Notice that it is not suggested that none of the 96% call themselves “Christian.” If they do, they place themselves at the highest level of the hypocrite category.) Could being non-Christian (or even an atheist) have a direct effect on their beliefs and philosophy and values expressed in their movies? Does 2 + 2 still equal 4?

So we have a liberal agenda, pushed by the majority in Hollywood who are liberals. There still is a big difference, however, between people who are simply not religious, and those who are actively anti-religious. A few examples of anti-religious movies:

**The Passover Plot** - Based on a book portrayed Christ as only a man and not God. In the book’s introduction, the author stated: “Far too many Christians do not know God in any other way than through Jesus. Take away the deity of Jesus and their faith in God is imperilled or destroyed.” (Evidently that was the purpose of the book and a good bit of the marketing for this movie, as it was for showings at colleges.)

**Jesus:** In this movie, Christ says: “I’m a liar, a hypocrite, I’m afraid of everything. I don’t ever tell the truth. I don’t have the courage . . . . You want to know who my God is? Fear! You look inside me and that’s all you’ll find. . . . Lucifer is inside me.”

**Monsignor** - It has a priest seducing a glamorous, idealistic nun and becomes involved in her death.

**Agnes of God** - The movie opens with the uplifting spectacle of disturbed young nun giving birth in a convent, murdering her baby, and then flushing the tiny, bloody corpse down the toilet.

**The Pope Must Die** - Need a further comment be made? (Anti-Catholicism is considered the last acceptable prejudice in the U.S.)

**The Last Temptation of Christ** - This was probably the most blasphemous movie ever made. Among other things, it insinuated that there was an affair between Christ and Mary Magdalene. This movie was made by Martin Scorsese, considered (by Hollywood, at least) to be one of the most respected directors. He also likes to call himself “Catholic.” .....(Excuse the pause. This writer was gagging.)

One Catholic priest who reviewed it said it was “a marvelous film, although it did have some debatable theology.” (That’s like saying that Jack the Ripper was a marvelous humanitarian, although he had a hang-up about women.)

It is a well-known fact that anti-Catholic and anti-Christians movies do not make money. The studios and independent producers can afford to have losses on these movies only because they make so much from the R and PG-13 movies that “Christians” and “Catholics” patronize. (You can’t be part of the solution when you’re part of the problem.) Besides losing money, why do they make movies that

offend a percentage of the population?

Evidently, they don't offend enough of the population. There are always a few good Catholics, as well as other Christians, who make objections to these movies, which Hollywood basically ignores. (Evidently, not enough objections are being made from Catholics or Catholic organizations, and especially national conferences of American Bishops. Evidently, the salvation of souls is not high on most people's priority list.)

Even George Lucas has said that film has supplanted religion as the shaper of values. Anti-religious movies not only make the least money, but bring criticism to the studios and the film-makers responsible. (You'd almost think it was payback to the devil for the power and position they now hold.) Nowhere does this seem more evident than at the Disney Studios. (In respect for its founder, it will not be called the Walt Disney Studios here.) After Walt Disney died in 1966, the control of his industry was turned over to his brother, Roy, who evidently had neither the creative nor business sense of Walt. They were still making family movies, but the vision of Walt was missing, and the corporation was not making the mega-bucks any more.

Enter Michael Eisner in 1984. There's no question about his executive ability. He took the Disney Studios from its lowest point to being possibly the most powerful organization in Hollywood. At the same time, Walt Disney's own personal standards had been lowered considerably. Using other names like "Hollywood Films" and "Miramax," films with other than a G-rating began to be made. Before long they were into making R movies. Eisner's agenda, however, evidently wasn't just to enter the sex arena to make more money from adults. They were still making G-rated animation movies, but even these were not the innocent movies of the past. Two things were different: 1) many promoted the feminist agenda, and 2) subtle elements of non G-rated materials started creeping in. Take a close look at the castle on an early videotape of **The Little Mermaid** and you will notice that the towers are phallic symbols. After there were objections to this, new video covers were printed which made it not so obvious. The movie **The Lion King** contains a scene in which a lion plops down on the ground, and dust rises in the air - spelling the word "SEX" before drifting away. Obviously with artists drawing one frame at a time, this is no accident. In the movie, **Aladdin**, there is a scene with the words, "Good teenagers, take off your clothes" whispered in the background.

None of these are accidents. Was Eisner including these things in movies for children to set them up for increasing his audience for the promotion of illicit sex in the teen and adult movies he was also making?

Another basic aspect of his Eisner's agenda was evidently to

push homosexuality. While it claims to be the world's largest family entertainment company," it has allowed homosexual celebrations in its theme park. It has even extended insurance benefits to live-in partners of homosexual employees. Estimates are that 40% of theme park employees are homosexual. It should also be added that these benefits are not available to unmarried partners of heterosexual employees. (In both situations, the couples are living in Mortal Sin. It just shows preferential treatment of homosexuals.)

Then the Disney Studios, now making money hand over fist, bought the ABC Television Network. Before long, of the 28 homosexual characters on prime-time television shows, 13 were on ABC. Coincidence?

Liberals are always consistent - they're wrong about everything. That's because if you're anti-God in one area, you'll be anti-God in all areas. If license is justified in one area, license can be justified in all areas. So is it a surprise that Eisner, under the Miramax name, made a movie called "Priest" in 1995? It is about five Catholic priests, all of whom are depicted as perverts. The movie blames their perversion on Church teachings. One priest is a homosexual; the second an adulterer; the third an alcoholic; the fourth demented; and the fifth is just plain mean and vicious. The American Family Association concludes that the film "is blatantly anti-Christian," let alone anti-Catholic.

Why make a movie which not only loses money but offends a large segment of the American population? If it's not payback to the devil, what is it?

It is important to remember that all pacts with the devil are not direct. While there are some who actually *do* make these, most of the time it is an indirect pact. A person simply has to place God outside of their life, aim solely for money, success, pleasure, fame, or power, and the devil is more than happy to do anything he can to help you get them. He knows that by attaining any or all of them, you will keep God out of your life, and you're his when you die. So if money, success, pleasure, fame, or power is your main goal in life, you've already made a pact with the devil. Whether it is direct or indirect is only a matter of accounting.

Regardless of Hollywood's reasons for making filthy, violent, and anti-religious movies, anytime anyone suggests that movie makers go too far, they start yelling "censorship", "freedom," and "rights." This is an appeal to emotion, not reason. People have been conditioned "to feel" as they hear those words. "The right" to make filthy movies is supposed to outweigh the true right of society to protect its own citizens from violence, sexual promiscuity, and homosexual perversion.

Michael Medved (who must really be hated in Hollywood), wrote an article entitled "Hollywood 3 Big Lies."

LIE NO. 1: “It’s only entertainment - it doesn’t influence anybody.” A representative of one of the three major studios claimed that a three-second scene of the main characters in “Lethal Weapon III” would save lives because it showed the main characters buckling their seat belts, and people would imitate that. At the same time, he wouldn’t admit that the rest of the movie’s ultra-violent 118 minutes would have any influence at all. If he couldn’t see the inherent contradiction in his own beliefs, is that a result of moral brain dysfunction, or the devil clouding his mind? (He can’t claim stupidity; nobody is that stupid.)

LIE NO. 2: “We just reflect reality. Don’t blame us; blame society.” Really? Where are the movies about: couples who practice abstinence before marriage; families who pray, and even go to church every week; adults who can actually participate in a discussion without arguing; children who show respect to their parents and elders; crooks who are actually guilty, get caught, and go to jail; athletes who really are good role models; businessmen who treat their employees and customers with courtesy; a stay-at-home wife and mother who feels completely fulfilled; someone (anyone) resolving a problem without violence; men getting upset without rattling off profanity or obscenities (actually, that now includes women); a dedicated, even holy, priest or nun; parents who teach their children about right and wrong. While the total number of people who fit into those categories are certainly less than the number who did in the 30’s, 40’s or 50’s, there are still many around. The movie and television industries seem to think they don’t exist. As Meved says, “The true power of mass media is the power to redefine normal.” Another point: who said it was necessary to always reflect what is wrong and sinful in society. This preoccupation with the negative becomes, over time, a self-fulfilling prophecy. (If the movies actually reflected reality, they would show more women holding babies rather than machine guns.)

LIE NO. 3: “We give the public what it wants. If people don’t like it, they don’t have to watch it.”

This is actually two lies. The first is that when appealing to the lowest side of human nature, movie makers are guilty of creating the demand and then presenting the supply. Where are the petitions requesting the end of filthy language in movies? Where are the original surveys that point to teenagers asking for movies that show their peers getting chopped to pieces with blood flying everywhere? Where are the polls that indicate that the public requires all couples to engage in fornication or adultery? And where is the request for sacrilegious and blasphemous movies? The movie-going public never asked for these movies.

The second lie is the inference that if you don’t like what a movie is about, just avoid it, and it doesn’t do you any harm. It puts

the responsibility on the individual viewer. This is true for that person. However, what about other people who watch it? What about the teenagers who did not see a movie in which a student kills several of his peers, and who then gets killed by a teenager imitating what he saw on the screen? The parents who prevented their own children from watching that gore still have dead children. Of course, everybody with any level of responsibility would try to pass the buck. As an example, this is what happens when a gun is involved in a crime:

Gun Manufacturer - "We just made the automatic weapons; we don't sell them to the individual consumer."

Gun Show Dealer - "We just sold the weapons; we didn't even sell them the ammunition."

Weapons Store - "We just sold them the ammunition; we didn't tell them to shoot anybody."

(This was not written to go into the gun control question. It was to show how it is easy for everyone in any level of responsibility, even in an area of teens killing teens, to be able to point a finger at someone else in trying to absolve themselves of any liability or guilt. If it also makes the point that "The Right to Bear Arms" was never intended to include automatic or semi-automatic weapons, then that's a bonus.)

It is the same with movies. Now, it is time to start assigning some blame for trashy moves, and its negative effect on society. Included is their excuses.

Satan's Generals - People like Michael Eisner, Martin Scorsese, and others like them who are responsible for the movies to be made. This level also includes anyone who furnishes money for them; as well as the Distribution Company. *"Movies are expensive. We have to appeal to the masses."*

Satan's Colonels - Producers and Directors and major Technical personnel. *"We just made the movie. We don't control who watches it."*

Satan's Majors - Actors and actresses playing the lead roles. *"The script calls for it."*

Satan's Captains - Bit Actors and Actresses, minor Technicians. *"It's just a job for us."*

Satan's 1<sup>st</sup> Lieutenants - Motion Picture Association of America - *"We rated it R because it was not as bad as some X-rated films."*

Satan's 2<sup>nd</sup> Lieutenants - Critics who see nothing wrong with them and promote them. *"It's not our job to comment on the morality of movies."*

Satan's 1<sup>st</sup> Sergeants - Newspaper editors and others who accept advertising for these movies. *"We are just letting the public know*

*what is available."*

Satan's Staff Sergeants - Theater Owners. *"We just show what is available and what is popular. If they are 17, they are allowed to buy tickets for that movie."*

Satan's Drill Sergeants - Projectionists - *"I just set the reels up for viewing."*

Satan's Corporals - Parents, whose main job as parents is to dispense morals and values - not just money. *"We can't monitor our children 24 hours a day, to know what movies they see or what they spend their money on."*

Satan's Privates - You. *"I just like to go to movies."*

While trashy movies could be stopped on any of these levels, it is easiest to stop them at its source. Regardless of whoever else does not do their job, however, it still always comes down to YOU. Because when Judgement Day comes, it'll just be God and you. They'll be no finger pointing then.

An additional point needs to be made about people imitating what they see in movies. Hollywood producers claim that the only people who are guilty of copycat murders, copycat kidnaping, and copycat rape, are the people who have mental problems. When you know that half the people who are in hospitals in this country, are there for mental problems, that is not exactly a comforting thought.

Besides, it's not just the number of people who could possibly be affected. It's the number who actually are affected. And it only takes *one* to copycat a murder, kidnaping, or rape to make a whole movie lose any reason for existence.

Again, there are some good organizations and individuals that publicly object to trashy movies. Parents and individuals can obtain information from them. Anytime someone objects to a specific movie, the first thing they are asked by any liberal is, "Did you see the movie"? If not, you get roundly criticized as not knowing what you are talking about. This is a variation of the old ad hominem argument, "if you can't attack the point made, attack the person." As advice to anyone who has this happen to them, simply has to answer, "I don't have to jump off a 10 story building onto a concrete parking lot to know that damage to my body or death will occur as the outcome. Other people have learned from the experience the hard way and I have learned the lesson without personal participation. Likewise, I don't have to view hard-core pornography, snuff films, or newsreels of Nazi torture, before daring to criticize."

What is the devil's favorite movie? It's a difficult decision, (and only one man's opinion, of course) as to which movie receives the biggest applause from Satan.

It is probably not **The Last Temptation of Christ** because

it did little business. It was mostly seen by people who were already anti-God and anti-Christ in the first place, and would not likely turn Christians into atheists. It is probably not **The Exorcist**. Even though it was a lie, it still made people realize that the devil exists, and any publicity is bad publicity for him.

Runner-up may be **Titanic** in 1997 because it contained nudity and still received a PG rating. It introduced nudity into that rating, much like **Ryan's Daughter** introduced nudity into PG-13 in 1970. "Titanic" grossed a billion dollars worldwide, which means that its promotion of premarital sex was viewed by the most people ever for a movie on the big screen. And, of course, everyone thinks it's a "good movie" (even "great" movie) because it was successful at wrenching emotions - especially out of women. It had parts which were laughable to thinking adults, such as the scene where the heroine takes five minutes to find her "lover" from the top deck to some unknown place in the bottom of the ship - all the while rushing through 30-degree water. You have to be able to ignore the fact that in 45 seconds in 30-degree water, hypothermia would set in and she wouldn't be able to move.) Then with her eyes closed, she swings an axe and in one chop breaks the handcuffs holding him. There were other illogical, and other negative concepts in the movie - all which were lost by the people who were caught up in the emotion of the film.

Say the word "Titanic" to someone who liked the movie (they'll say, "I loved it") and they will get reflective and misty-eyed. Say the word "Titanic" to anyone in Hollywood, and their eyes will turn into dollar signs as they hear the sound of a cash register.

If you ask anyone who saw the movie, "What was the biggest tragedy that happened - according to the movie? You would get one of two answers. Either A) the "hero" drowned, or B) 1500 people drowned.

Actually, according to the movie, the real tragedy was that the hero, and many of the others who drowned - and later the heroine - evidently ended up burning in Hell for all eternity. This is because the hero drowned without any regrets for his premarital sex, the heroine died as an old lady without ever showing sorrow, and after she dies, you see her joining her hero and other members of the crew and passengers. The movie shows them back in full costume back in the main ballroom of the Titanic. If they were, in fact, all together, it would not have been in Heaven. (If you suggested this scenario to anyone who thought it was a "great movie," you would have watched their face turn into a horror mask. Again, emotion reigned above any other consideration. )

While there are many worse movies, "Titanic" may be the runner-up because of the scope of the advertisement of the Mortal Sin of premarital sex that it promoted.



This writer's vote, however, for the devil's favorite movie, was another disaster movie, whose premise was even more deadly than "Titanic." Coincidentally (or maybe not), it also involved a disaster on an ocean liner.

That movie was 1975's **The Poseidon Adventure**. In the beginning of that film, we see a young, intellectual, ultra-liberal priest tell a group of people that, "It is a waste of time to pray to God. Everything is up to you, so don't ever ask for God's help, because you won't get it."

The rest of the movie is simply using a disaster format in the attempt to prove the young priest right. After a giant tidal wave capsizes the ship, the young priest tells everyone that they have to climb up to the bottom (the ship is upside down) to get out. An elderly priest says that they should stay where they are, pray, and wait for help. They all drown, of course. The Captain says that they should stay where they are as the ship might right itself. He and everyone who trusts him drowns, of course. (The only ones who believe the priest and follow him, happen to be all the other big name stars of the movies.)

The movie follows an emotional roller coaster as they make their way "to the bottom" and are saved. The priest's heresy has been proven true. They needed one last emotional punch at the end, so the young priest gives his life to save the other non-believers. (Hmmm.... The "hero" also died in "Titanic.")

Let's backtrack a bit. Before a book or screenplay can be written, the writer has to come up with an idea. The basic two ways are to either come up with a plot, and then fill it with characters, or come up with one or more characters, and build a plot around them. It's a good bet that the latter was the case with the "Poseidon Adventure" and the former was the case with "Titanic."

The Titanic disaster actually happened, so the basic plot was already there. The writer simply decided who the main characters would be, and chose a fornicating couple. To make it at first a "romantic," and then a tragic setting, does not change the true nature of the characters. It only aids in their acceptance by the audience.

It seems unlikely, however, that the writer of "Poseidon Adventure" got an idea first for a disaster movie, and then out of all the thousands of possible leading characters, chooses a man who believes in the heresy that even if God had some kind of responsibility in the creation of the world and human beings, He has nothing to do with us anymore. And then he uses a priest, no less.

No, it's kind of naive to think anything else except the fact that the entire movie (and book it was from) seems to have been written for the express purpose of spreading that heresy.

(Anyone want to place a bet that the writers of these two movies fall into the 4% in Hollywood who attend church weekly?)

“Poseidon Adventure” was worse than “Titanic” (and it was almost as big a comparative hit in 1972), because a sin of heresy is worse than a sin of sex. The sin of heresy was promoted somewhat more subtly than the sin of sex. It, therefore, works more on the subconscious level, which is even more insidious than the conscious level. (If you’re old enough to have seen the movie in 1972, or since then, were you conscious of its premise? No one should feel too bad if you didn’t. Most people were in the same boat (excuse the pun). Always remember, the devil and his associates - those in Hell and on Earth - are very sly and subtle.)

Another thing that may place “Poseidon Adventure” as No. 1 on the devil’s favorite movie list, is that even millions more people have seen it in the 53 years since it was released. It’s heresy was also promoted to two whole new generations of viewers in that it has been remade twice. A 2005 television movie, also titled **The Poseidon Adventure**, and a 2006 theatrical release, titled **Poseidon** introduced this anti-God movie to new generations.

A final point: guess how “Poseidon Adventure” was rated by the Catholic Bishop’s Office of Film and Broadcasting? Why, A-3, of course. Nothing about that movie could be harmful to adults, right?

While the Bishops may not be seeing and rating the movies themselves, they are ultimately responsible for that office. They cannot absolve themselves of the responsibility that it has failed miserably in its supposed service to the Catholics in America and around the world for that matter, as American movies are shown worldwide.

What reason would there be for an office of the Catholic Bishops to lower standards over the years? Secularists use the excuse, “Times have changed,” but wouldn’t you assume that the Catholic Bishops know that Truth and Morality have not? (This is despite the fact that what many people *accept* as Truth and Morality has changed.)

Those in charge seem to have forgotten that with God, standards do not change. What was wrong 1000 years ago was also wrong 100 years ago, 10 years ago, last year - and today. (And it will never change.)

God doesn’t grade on the curve. Immorality doesn’t become morality because of popular practice. The people in charge of the Catholic Bishop’s Office of Film and Broadcasting must not believe that, because they continue to lower the standards the same as Hollywood. (And who are the actual people that are issuing the ratings? Could it possibly be that ultra-liberals have infiltrated that organization? What a shocking concept!)

In contrast to their lowering of standards, there is an internet service - [PreviewOnline.org](http://PreviewOnline.org) - with a database of over 4000 movies

which rates movies two ways - first, by its entertainment value, and second, by its moral (or lack of moral) value. The reviews give specifics on the presence or absence of nudity, sexual encounters, and homosexuality elements. It even counts the number of times language is crude, obscene, or profane. It is highly recommended for anyone with high standards - especially for parents in guiding their children.

And that's to whom the final responsibility always falls for themselves and their children. Parents need to hold the highest standards personally, and then see to it that those standards are followed by their children - even their teens who like to consider themselves "adults."

The bottom line is that each one of us will have to answer on Judgement Day for not only our sins of commission, but any sins of omission - not doing what was our responsibility. (And God still allows parents to actually forbid their children to go to filthy movies, watch immoral television shows, not allow raunchy music, not play trashy video games, avoid bad company, etc.)

Once children do become "adults" and are on their own, they then have the full final responsibility for their own actions. Until then, we all have a duty to help protect them from the people and things of this world which could cause them to lose their Soul for all Eternity.

And that's always "THE BOTTOM LINE."

Now movies or not the only area of the media that the devil has given major approval in another area, the devil's favorite play comes from the devil's favorite book. And that is To From Galilee. It is based on the heretical notion that the only thing the Blessed, Virgin, Mary and St. Joseph had on their mind the month before they got married, was sex. That is blasphemous and sacrilegious in a multitude of ways.

The first is a not-so-subtle denial of the Immaculate Conception. That dogma asserts that, from the first moment of her conception, the Blessed Virgin Mary was, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, and in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, our Savior, was kept free from all stain of Original Sin. Because she was to be the mother of Jesus Christ, she was never under the power or influence of the devil for even a second.

This book and play denies the fact that she was Blessed Mary ever Virgin - and that she and St. Joseph never had sex - and the "brothers" of Christ mentioned in the Bible were cousins.

It also denies the holiness of St. Joseph, chosen by God to be the foster father of Christ and the husband of Our Lady. Evidently the author of this book, and collaborators of the play, were sex-crazed moderns who think sex is the be-all of this world, and attempted to

put the Blessed Verging Mary and St. Joseph in that category. To know also why it's the devil's favorite book and play is because Blessed Verging Mary is, after Christ, the most humble person who ever lived. And next is St, Joseph. Satan, who is the Father of Pride, hates humility, which is why he hates Our Lady more than anyone who has ever lived - after Christ Himself.

If ever a book and play needed to have every copy burned on Earth, these are the ones. They will certainly burn in Hell, and it is hoped for the conversion of those responsible for the book and play - so they don't follow them.

Additional note: there was a time in Hollywood when actors and actresses there who were Catholic, had to circumstances they worked. The first was that they were known to be Catholics, the second one was that being Catholic did not prevent them from getting jobs there. At that time, and for a period of 20 years, there was a television program with uplifting stories entitled "Family Theater." It was started by Father Patrick Payton who coined the saying, "The Family That Prays Together Stays Together." That program featured many of the biggest stars in Hollywood. There was also a weekly national program featuring Bishop Fulton Sheen - who among many topics warned against atheistic Communism.

The situation today is exactly the opposite. One who is a practicing Catholic has to almost hide the fact to get work. If a job is to go to a practicing Catholic or a fallen- away Catholic, the latter will get the job every time. And the one sure way and aspiring comic will ensure success, is to make fun of the Catholic faith and its devotions, and especially make fun of nuns that taught in Catholic Schools they attended as children. (To be factual, the only requirement that is more needed to be a very successful comic today, is to use the "f" word as often as possible. And audiences who pay to see them are also part of the problem.