What does this video teach about how outsiders of the faith view Christians?

He video presents a sarcastic, comic yet realistic and very disturbing fact that the Christianity is being wrongly judged, and inaccurately viewed by outsiders and non-Christians because of the attitude, approach and misdirection of the Christian authorities. The video shows that the attitude of the church authorities according to which they focus more on their perception of ‘right’ rather than being ‘good’ or humble is making them appear more rigid and aggressive which is against the sentiments and teachings of Jesus.

For instance, Merchant highlighted in one section of the video (interviewing certain celebrities and street walking Americans) how seculars are more well versed about Christianity because of their neutral mindset. The main features of the film are the director's nonscientific tests: a "Culture Wars" amusement demonstrate that uncovers how secularists find out about Christians than a different way; "Confession Booth" that turns out to be shockingly prominent with the bystanders at a gay pride march.

Dan Merchant perceives that Christianity has a picture issue in America, and goes looking for the purposes behind this, and things the Church could do to transform it. Presently, any untouchable to the confidence or by and large reasonable individual would promptly bring up that there's a truly straightforward answer, something along the lines of "quit sentencing and endeavoring to control the conduct of others." truth be told, various individuals in the city whom he talks with state to such an extent. Yet, Merchant some way or another figures out how to confuse this issue, and he does it by declining to get out disdain as contempt. Amusingly for a motion picture that tries to persuade Christians to be less judgy, it could have utilized somewhat more judgment.

What does this video teach about the culture in which we are living?

The video specifically focuses on the cultural wars of the modern world including the ironical existence of gay Christians, secular political leaders, celebrities, etc. In describing the modern cultural conflict in the idea, the director is less egotistical and gains significantly more access through his nonthreatening habits and addressing. In this manner, we get agreeable, standing out meetings from liberal new Sen. Al Franken and preservationist ex-Sen. Rick Santorum, liberal evangelist Tony Campolo and moderate radio host Michael Reagan. In like manner, there are recorded video and sound clasps of the standard thing "culture war" suspects including Jerry Falwell, Rick Warren, Ann Coulter, Bono and, Maher.

Merchant likewise talks with people in the city in a few distinct urban communities.

Merchant is softly and quickly reproachful of a portion of the more intense, crasser famous people and savants as a major aspect of a push to unite ordinary individuals to have affable talk and look for accord. The last section of the film underscores this by appearing odd-couple pairings of George Clooney and Pat Robertson and George W. Shrubbery and Bono doing benevolent acts and saying pleasant things regarding one another.

By tagging the cultural identities of modern era as “bumper sticker” mentality, Merchant aims to describe how we have described and defined our identities in an egoistical manner which makes it difficult for us to observe their possible flaws or weaknesses; and improve ourselves for a better personality this leading to a cultural war.

Has the church completely lost its influence in culture?

From the point of view of the film, it can be stated that Merchant is of the idea that Church has not lost its authority. However, it has lost its infleunce, power and control. The authority of the Pope is still maintained across the Christian dominion. However, rigid attitude of church authorities no longer influence the people to be good, moral or simply the followers.

Dan briefly describes his moderate evangelical upbringing—which incorporated a ton of The 700 Club—and after that brings watchers up to the moment that he felt constrained to make this film. A trip to Africa demonstrated to him a side of the congregation that appeared to be extremely unique than the congregation he knew in America. In spite of the cruel conditions they lived in, the African adherents were loaded with generosity, satisfaction, and beauty—he heard none of the opposing rhetoric that regularly leaves the American church. On the off chance that our confidence is equivalent to theirs, Merchant ponders, "For what reason is the gospel of adoration dividing America?" He begins by indicating how the congregation is "dividing America"; he finishes with a few thoughts for settling that.

How did the church lose the ability to have a conversation with Homosexuals?

Merchant would gice feel that the issue isn't that vast swaths of Christians hold convictions that are intrinsically scornful. In this perspective, the appropriate response is simply to be pleasant about it. You know, that "adoration the miscreant, detest the transgression" thought, that is intended to be empathetic however which is rather hugely stooping. Resilience unravels close to nothing. Acknowledgment is the thing that prompts advance. The Church won't become just by stopping to be vocal about how homosexuality is "corrupt." The Church needs to make sense of that there's nothing amiss with it.

Obviously, that is only one issue the motion picture handles. Another terrific/terrible precedent is the take a gander at the "War on Christmas," which Merchant promptly excludes himself from realizing how to discuss by tolerating that it is really A Thing. It isn't. He finds a city where the Easter Bunny was removed from an open showcase and refers to that for instance of how, really, the culture is, here and there, mistreating Christianity. Over and over, Merchant sets up a false division where there are "nonconformists" and "moderates" and the two sides are by one way or another substantial, and the appropriate response is to compromise. No. When one side backers despise and corruption of human rights, there isn't any bargain that will encourage anybody.

Application/Conclusion:

The movie tries to change the discussion; however it comes up short since it approaches the discussion the incorrect way. It falls into the device that is now been set by the right-wing component of Christianity which is skilled at "winning" arguments by setting up fake premises as it is stated that "what the founders would have wanted argument," which sets the standard that it really matters at all what the founders would have wanted. In the event that you go into the discussion as though the two sides are acting in generosity, you will lose to the side that wants to make things the same as before on advancement.

From multiple points of view, this film helps me to remember God Bless America, Bobcat Goldthwait's enemy of ugliness screed which was itself very cowardly. It is arguing for affability in the "culture wars" yet is itself a rather uncivil film. Indeed, much like the majority of traditionalist Christianity today, it frames its incivility in an innocuous grin and delicate voice. However, everything necessary is a critical take a gander at what the film is really saying to understand that it's contributing nothing supportive to the discussion.
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