The Jesus Film: Between Global Christianization and World Christianity

Colin H. Yuckman

ABSTRACT

Though the impact of translated written material in the spread of Christianity has been analyzed at length, less consideration has been given to the more recent turn to evangelistic non-literate media. Evangelistic films, for instance, have become common missionary tools, especially in places which lack technological infrastructure. Their success depends on effective translation so that indigenous communities, in the spirit of Pentecost, might hear the good news in their native tongue. A prominent test case for the vernacular principle is the JESUS film (Sykes/Krish, 1979), which has been translated into over 1300 languages and has reportedly led to more conversions than any other evangelistic tool in history. Its statistical success, however, tends to deflect questions of worth as a medium of vernacular translation. Based on a critical analysis of its content and ambiguous examples of its use internationally, this paper argues that in spite of its success and the ongoing translation of its script into local languages, the film's untranslated visual dynamics—sustained by competing tendencies to universalize and particularize—may potentially perpetuate a Christendom ethos. The paper concludes by drawing attention to an indigenous Indian Jesus film (Karunamayudu, 1978), suggesting a path for the future of visual media in the vernacular spread of world Christianity.

The long shadow of colonialism hangs over the last several centuries of Christian mission. We can point to all sorts of examples of compromise and complicity in this history--ways in which the universalizing tendencies of colonial agendas ran roughshod over local peoples and cultures and languages. At the same time, if Christian missionary enterprise had been so intertwined with imperial power it would have surely died out in the colonial form, and would not be flourishing today. It can no longer be denied, even by the staunchest critics of mission, that mission did in fact largely depart from colonial agendas, and the many unfortunate exceptions only serve to prove the rule. Nevertheless, the long shadow cast by colonial history has in fact led to great shifts in the theology and practice of mission.[1]

Perhaps the principal point of departure of mission from the colonial narrative has to do with translation. As Lamin Sanneh[2] and Andrew Walls[3] have shown, Christian mission often defied the linguistic uniformity characteristic of colonial rule. By their commitment to translating the Scriptures into the vernacular, missionaries effectively elevated local languages and aided indigenous peoples in recovering or preserving their cultural identity, which may have been suppressed during colonial rule. Whereas colonialism took its direction from the Tower of Babel effort to bring all peoples under linguistic and cultural uniformity, Christian mission at its best developed in light of the Pentecost pattern of translatability under the power of the Spirit. For this reason Sanneh calls translation "the church's birthmark as well as its missionary benchmark."[4] Evangelistic efforts are necessarily always wedded to a particular context, bridging the gospel and the culture through vernacular expression. The "vernacular principle" therefore turns out to be the defining difference between "global Christianization" and "world

---

1   One can think of the relocation of mission from being primarily rooted in soteriology or ecclesiology to its foundation in trinitarian theology, *missio Dei*, etc. See the standard textbook of David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991).

2   Lamin O. Sanneh, *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2009).

3   Andrew F. Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis; T & T Clark, 1996).

4   Sanneh, *Whose Religion is Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003): 97.

Christianity." For Sanneh, global Christianization or Christendom is the establishment of a primarily western religion, replicating western culture and sensibilities and often suppressing local religious expression. By contrast, world Christianity is the movement of indigenous forms of Christianity, expressed through a variety of local idioms.[5]

Much work has been done on the way translation of *written* material has characterized the spread of Christianity outside the West (particularly the Bible). Less consideration has been given to the more recent turn to evangelistic non-literate (visual, aural, and oral) media.[6] Many people groups have developed mixed media cultures, rather than purely literate-based ones, and the missionary tools of satellite broadcasting, internet-based evangelism, and evangelistic films have become increasingly effective and popular. Yet even with non-literary modes of evangelism--like an evangelistic film--their impact depends on effective translation. Instead of thinking of translation merely in literary terms we must consider the aesthetic angle as well. Where do missionary films fit on the spectrum between global Christianization and world Christianity in light of their translatability?

The most prominent test case for the vernacular principle on this score is the JESUS film (1979), which has been seen by more people and reportedly led to more conversions than any other evangelistic tool in history. Its statistical success, however, has tended to deflect questions of worth as a medium of vernacular translation. Triumphalist accounts may offer an incomplete picture of its place in the history of evangelical missions.

---

5   Sanneh, *Whose Religion?*, 22-25; see also Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002): ch. 1. Interestingly, in his "puff quote" on the back of Sanneh's 2003 book, Jenkins praises Sanneh for "his stirring analysis of the growth of *global Christianity*," either missing Sanneh's semantic turn or else refusing it!

6   Oral cultures have historically represented most of the world population; in their development they have not simply moved to literate culture (like the West) as if it were an evolutionary continuum (like many in the West might presume), but are moving to a non-literate mixed-media culture, where teaching from books may still be a distant second to audio and visual forms of communication, like movies (Rick Brown, "Communicating God's Message in an Oral Culture," *International Journal of Frontier Missions 21.3* (2004): 122–128.).

Understanding how mission and film came together gives us some background for assessing tools like the JESUS film today. Interestingly, John Mott--the architect of Edinburgh 1910--may have been the first to express the potential of cinematic media for world evangelization. His famous vision for "the evangelization of the world in this generation" was likely fueled by the prospect of mass media technologies like film. In the wake of Hollywood's early 20th century emergence on the international stage, mission groups took up Mott's call to action. Rather than tools of evangelism, however, missionary films quickly became occupied with exhibiting field work to churches and funding sources back home.[7] Mission during this period was by and large conceived as the reproduction of Western Christendom abroad, under the auspices of mission agencies. Not until the 1950s did missionary films begin to take shape as truly missionary in nature--i.e. as more than field reports (Tom Hotchkiss, Films Afield). A decade later, International Films (Ken Anderson, 1963) took up the task of making the gospel available to global audiences through indigenously produced films, using local writers and camera operators.[8] Remarkably, very few movies about Jesus were produced for missionary work, even though Jesus films abounded in the US market during this period (*King of Kings* [1961], *The Greatest Story Ever Told* [1965], *Godspell* [1973], *Gospel Road* [1973], *The Passover Plot* [1976], *Jesus of Nazareth* [1977], *The Nativity* [1978], and *The Life of Brian*[9] [1979]).

At the same time we must remember that Christianity in the 20th century also took shape under the shadow of the Fundamentalist controversy. One response to the predominance of the historical-critical approach to biblical interpretation (and liberalism generally) was the so-called "Biblical Theology" movement, which attempted to ground theological dogma in historical certainty. The post-Enlightenment division between "fact" and "value" had effectively relegated religion to the private realm of opinion, no longer self-evident in a scientific world. Reflecting their Enlightenment

---

7   Terry Lindvall and Andrew Quicke. *Celluloid Sermons: The Emergence of the Christian Film Industry, 1930-1986* [e-book] (New York: New York University Press, 2011): 192-3.

8   Ibid., 189-92.

9   The very appearance of a "spoof" movie like Monty Python's attests the popularity of the genre during this period.

heritage, evangelicals sought to convince modern minds that "biblical" denoted "historical." Critical tools were helpful to the degree that they confirmed this.[10] Inherent in the way many depicted Jesus were the competing impulses to affirm Jesus' particularity in historical fact and to commend the universality of the gospel to the non-Christian world.

Against this backdrop, Bill Bright, who founded Campus Crusade for Christ (CCC) in 1951,[11] joined with the Jewish-turned-Christian Hollywood producer, John Heyman, to produce a movie called "The Public Life of Jesus" (directed by Peter Sykes and John Krish, 1979). Based on the gospel of Luke (Today's English Version)[12], the film was touted as the most authentic rendering of the gospel to date. Excepting language, strict attention was given to historical similitude—it was filmed on location in Israel, all actors (except Jesus, played by the Englishman Brian Deacon) were of Yemeni descent, and costumes were limited to materials and dyes available in the first century. Around 450 "leaders and scholars" were reported to consult on the film to ensure its historical accuracy and faithfulness to the text.[13]

Originally a "Hollywood" film (Warner Bros.), the movie had a lackluster run in American public cinema[14], recouping only two of the six million dollars spent to make it. However, as early as the spring of 1980, having obtained the international rights to the film, CCC began dubbing

---

10   This accords with what George Lindbeck called the "preliberal" or "cognitive-propositionalist" approach.

11   For more information, see http://www.cru.org/about-us/index.htm

12   Except the Lord's Prayer and Beatitudes which were taken from the KJV. http://www.jesusfilm.org/questions-answers/making-the-film/version-bible

13   Paul A. Eshleman, "The 'Jesus' Film: A Contribution to World Evangelism," in *Speaking About What We Have Seen and Heard* (ed. by J. Bonk et alia; New Haven: OMSC Publications, 2007): 147-8; reprinted from *IBMR* 26, no. 2 (April 2002): pp 58-74. See also http://www.jesusfilm.org/questions-answers/making-the-film/historical-accuracy

14   See the reviews of the unimpressed Richard Christiansen ("'Jesus' film: Human, Faithful, and Flawed," *Chicago Tribune*, April 2, 1980, A2) and Judith Martin ("'Jesus' Film: One of the Least of Them," *The Washington Post,* March 28, 1980, p. 17).

the film's soundtrack into other languages for ministry abroad. It was first telecast in Hindi to 21 million viewers in India. By the end of 1980, the emerging Jesus film ministry had produced 31 language version soundtracks. Paul Eshleman was brought in[15] to head the new division of CCC called the Jesus Film Project (JFP), headquartered in Orlando, Florida. Since then the JFP has renamed the film simply "JESUS," suggesting its definitive status. Not long afterwards Eshleman claimed that CCC's Jesus film "evangelizes, edifies, teaches and makes disciples," an allusion to 2 Ti 3:16, essentially equating the film with Scripture.[16]

Despite its lukewarm reception among American audiences, the JESUS film had an immediate impact on international audiences with less exposure[17] to cinematography. Used predominantly, according to Eshleman, by conservative groups like the Nazarenes, Southern Baptists, Wycliffe Bible Translators, and the Roman Catholic Church[18], it has also been employed for outreach by Canadian Mennonites[19] and the Salvation Army.[20] Today the JFP both supplies these groups (among 1,000 mission agencies and denominations) with JESUS film materials and also operates its own five-point strategic ministry outreach.[21] Though the estimated viewership of the

15   Eshleman, 147-9. In "The Making of 'Jesus'," *The Christian Century*, June 6-13, 2001: 26-31, John Dart (p. 26) says Eshleman's association with the project began in 1985, not 1981 as Eshleman claims.

16   Dwight H. Friesen, "An Analysis of the Production, Content, Distribution, and Reception of *Karunamayudu* (1978), an Indian Jesus Film," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2009: p. 173; Eshleman, 179.

17   Freek Bakker, "The Image of Jesus Christ in the Jesus Films Used in Missionary Work," *Exchange* 33.4 (2004): 328.

18   Eshleman, 154.

19   Ryan Miller, "Death Fails to Stop Woman's Witness," *Canadian Mennonite* 10.22 (Nov 13, 2006): 20-21.

20   Dart, 28.

21   Included in that global strategy is (1) Mission 865, the JFP's subsidiary working to translate the JESUS film into all languages spoken by 50,000 or more people who do not have it available in their native language—approximately 323 million people—by 2025 (mission865.org); (2) Jesus Film Media, which attempts to maximize The JESUS Film Project's tools and resources through digital media like the free Jesus Film Media app that can stream the JESUS film in any of its translated

film to date is "billions," Eshleman's 2004 estimate[22] put that number around five billion, equivalent to more than 80% of the world's population.[23] The concerted effort to translate and dub the film's audio into every language has resulted in more than 1300 "translations" of the film's script, with roughly 700 more left to be done. The JFP uses two processes: in the case of a written language, they work with natives to carefully render an equivalent script which is then dubbed; in the case of no written language, they use an audio/visual strategy called VAST, which translates by audio recording rather than writing, taking less than five weeks in some cases.[24]

Issues of perception, however, complicate the question of vernacular translation in visual media. An audience may recognize the language of the JESUS film as their own, but they more than likely will experience relational distance from the light-skinned Jesus and flat narrative action. The decision to limit vernacular translation to the audio script of the movie, rather than rework the whole movie, presumes that the visual aspect is subordinate to the language, a characteristic of Protestant logocentrism.

---

languages (JesusFilmMedia.org); (3) Short-term mission trips to take JESUS to the unreached people groups of the world are also organized by the JFP with the support of Campus Crusade international staff members (jfmt.org); (4) the Global Short Film Network, which has hosted short film trainings in ten countries, equipping 350 people from 27 countries to share the stories that resonate within their cultures (GlobalShortFilmNetwork.com); and (5) The Peoples Connection, a network for assisting American Christians to share their faith with their international friends and neighbors (ReachingTheNationsAmongUs.org). These last two exhibit a tension between enculturation and globalization.

22   Eshleman, 155. Clearly, even if that number were accurate a significant number are repeated viewings. In his interview with the *New York Times*, Eshleman revised the estimate down to 3 billion people, less than 50 percent of the global population.

23   Other evangelical leaders have challenged the JFP's numbers. For example, Vinay Samuel, Executive Director of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Mission Theologians, insisted that "these numbers are, to say the least, not gathered in a social-scientific way. They have no way of knowing this." (Franklin Foer, "Baptism by Celluloid," *New York Times* (Feb. 8, 2004).)

24   http://www.mission865.org/about-us/. Note the quick effort to translate the film rather than the Bible. Defenders of this procedure claim that the JESUS film effectively *is* the Bible since it comes directly from the Bible.

Given what we know, for example, about West African audiences,[25] this limits the film's effectiveness. When it comes to the inference of meaning, visual symbolism can have a greater impact than a vernacular script. When they see the JESUS film, non-Western audiences come to the story of Jesus through a western construal of the biblical Jesus story, making them in effect "tertiary audiences."[26] The indigenizing of Christianity is not well served by evangelistic tools that increase rather than decrease distance from the founding text of the tradition. The film's un-enculturated visuals may undo whatever gains the film makes with its translated audio.

In Guinea,[27] for example, audiences mistook Jesus for a priest with fetishes based on his appearance. Because the film draws selectively from Luke's gospel, information necessary for contextualizing Jesus' words and deeds is missing. Some have noted that using the Old Testament would more likely open dialogue with Muslims.[28] Furthermore, perceptions of the film's Western origin, compounded by its untranslated visuals, have given rise to Muslim (and Hindu) backlash.[29]

As we weigh the film's merits as a translatable medium for evangelism, we encounter an inescapable tension between universalizing mission and particular history. On the one hand, the film presents itself as a *universal* message of salvation—reflected in the use of John 3:16 and Matthew 28:16-

---

25 Karin Barber, "Preliminary Notes on Audiences in Africa," *Africa* 67.3 (1997): 347–362; and Asonzeh F.-K Ukah, "Advertising God: Nigerian Christian Video-films and the Power of Consumer Culture." *Journal of Religion in Africa* 33.2 (2003): 203–231; see also Johannes Merz, "Translation and the Visual Predicament of the "JESUS" Film in West Africa," *Missiology* 38.2 (April 2010): 115.

26 Merz, 112, 118-22.

27 Hannes Wiher, "Der Jesus-Film: Sein Gebrauch in der animistischen und islamischen Bevoelkerung Westafrikas unter Beuecksichtigung von Erfahrungen in der Waldregion Guineas," *Evangelikale Missiologie* 13.3 (1997): 66-74.

28 Wiher, 67. See also Eshleman's list of translation problems, "The 'Jesus' Film," 155-56.

29 "Jesus Film Ire: Two Christians Murdered Apparently For Showing The Movie," *Christianity Today* 49.10 (2005): 28-29; and David W. Hendon, Kevin Holton, "Notes on Church-State Affairs," *Journal of Church and State*. 45.3 (Summer 2003): 619.

20 as its bookends as well as in the "Jesus prayer" that follows the film. On the other hand, it claims to capture the *particularity* of the Jesus story by depicting it[30] in its "authentic historical setting." While the first impulse affirms the endless translatability of the gospel, the second undercuts it, and using the film in cross-cultural settings only highlights the tension.

For instance, the film adds[31] the word "absolute" to an otherwise word-for-word rendering of Luke's preface (1:1-4): "it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may have *absolute* certainty concerning the things you have been taught." It was apparently inserted to indicate the *complete* historical reliability of the story and, no doubt, to reject any postmodern relativism (a primarily Western concern). Equally illustrative is the decision to add the word "documentary" to the movie's opening credits, as if the film were simply a clean transposition from text to screen. Fixing the film's (visual) form in a "biblical setting" but then emphasizing its translatability communicates a contradictory message. If an indigenous Christianity is the film's putative goal, that aim would be better served by translating the *whole* film, visuals included. Converting only the audio to the vernacular implies that the Western JESUS film is not itself a kind of vernacular translation; rather its implicit claim is to be the *original* version. As Sanneh[32] reminds us, "The mental habits of Christendom predispose us to look for one essence of the faith." Translation, in the case of the JESUS film, appears to serve a globalizing rather than indigenizing purpose.

In the most extensive critical essay written to date, Johannes Merz[33] further illustrates the tension in the film's portrayal of Jesus.

---

30   Quicke and Lindvall, 193.

31   For a detailed list of the additions/variations see Richard Walsh, "Ch. 12: The Jesus Film" in *Jesus, the Gospels, and Cinematic Imagination* (ed. by J. Staley and R. Walsh; Louisville: WJKP, 2007): 90-100.

32   Sanneh, *Whose Religion?*, 35.

33   "Translation and the Visual Predicament of the "JESUS" Film in West Africa." *Missiology* 38.2 (2010): 111-126.

Jesus is depicted as exemplary and immaculate, merging the conventions of Hollywood with the evangelical pietistic tradition. The makers seem to have tried to remain as neutral, and for that reason inexpressive, as they can, creating an image of human distance...With its evangelistic purpose "JESUS" thus invites its audiences to a private, internalized faith.[34]

The concern for "neutrality" is a false pretension of modern rationality derived from the Enlightenment. Ironically, the objectivity implied here is more characteristic of the 19th and 20th century liberal-historical tradition which modern evangelicalism rejects. The more the Jesus of history is fixed in his original context, the wider the gulf between past and present, and the greater the resistance to translation. At the same time, decisions made by the directors/producer show that they were not at all interested in simply visualizing the gospel narrative. For example, the role of female disciples figures much more heavily in the movie than in any of the gospel accounts, while the place of social justice and poverty is noticeably missing, though Luke's account is saturated with it.[35] Both alterations point to a larger narrative to which modern evangelicalism is beholden. The most obvious critique of the film is in its casting of Jesus. While every other actor is of Yemeni descent, for historical similitude, Jesus is a light-skinned Englishman. A perceptibly white Jesus portrays Christianity as a Western religion in spite of efforts to translate the audio track. Even some evangelical critiques[36] of the film only offer "missiological prerequisites" to consider before showing the film, the critique ultimately being one of strategy not content. The mindset that views the expansion of Christianity as merely a question of strategy rather than principle betrays its captivity to the thought-world of Western Christendom.

As a tool of cross-cultural evangelism the JESUS film, while purporting to be translatable, is very much a Western film with sensibilities

---

34   Merz, 113.

35   Bakker, 330; Walsh, 173.

36   Tom Steffen, "Don't Show the "Jesus" Film: To Maximize the Potential of this Powerful Evangelistic Tool, We Need to Do Our Homework First," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 29.3 (July 1993): 272-5.

peculiar to the late 20th century evangelical tradition. On the question of indigenization it is more accurate to think of the film as speaking out of a North American context[37] than to an international one. Granted, a number of films have been released to supplement[38] the JESUS film—movie shorts like "Walking With Jesus in Africa" and "Following Jesus: Follow-Up Film for India" which use indigenous casts to demonstrate discipleship in action. However, their very existence seems to admit of the deficiencies of the JESUS film itself. And it is worth considering examples of alternative evangelistic films that may avoid some of the JESUS film's pitfalls.

Virtually unknown outside of India is the 1978 full-length film *Karunamayudu*[39] ("Man of Compassion," directed by Vinay Chander). Though the JESUS film has had great success across the Indian subcontinent since 1979, *Karunamayudu* has arguably been the more effective evangelistic film,[40] even if it was not entirely conceived as one. With a Telugu script that has been translated into numerous, mostly Indian languages (except, notably, English), the film has had broad appeal to those who have rejected the JFP's "Western Jesus." The film's Jesus has distinctly Asiatic features and clothing, ministering in a recognizably Indian village. The Christian evangelistic organization Dayspring International picked the film up for national distribution in 1985 and by 2009, with the use of ministry teams (not unlike JFP), had shown the film in 190,000 villages. In ten years, they

---

37   Merz, 114; Mike Wilder, "Group Wants to Send 'Jesus' Film Throughout County," *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News* (Washington, Dec 5, 2005): 1; Teresa Neumann, "Outreach Plan Uses 'Jesus' Kiosk at Mall," *Recorder* (Indianapolis, Dec 3, 2010): B2.

38   "Producer Settles Suit over Jesus Film." *Christian Century* 120.20 (2003): 14.

39   Dwight H. Friesen, "Showing Compassion and Suggesting Peace in *Karunamayudu*, an Indian Jesus Film," *Studies In World Christianity* 14.2 (2008): 125-141; and Freek Bakker, *The Challenge of the Silver Screen: An Analysis of the Cinematic Portraits of Jesus, Rama, Buddha and Muhammad* (Leiden: Brill, 2003): 218-223.

40   According to Friesen ("Analysis," 176), Chander produced the film to inspire devotion to Jesus, but not necessarily conversion, which was the later objective of John Gilman and Dayspring International/Enterprises, who distributed it.

estimate, 120 million people have seen this film and 7 million have made public confessions of belief in Jesus.[41]

In contrast to the JESUS film teams who focused mostly on spreading God's Word on film, the Dayspring groups were interested in subversively transforming the political and social structures of Indian society, an agenda reflected in the film. *Karunamayudu*'s Jesus is primarily concerned with his community's "untouchables" and placing Jesus in the tradition of non-violence. Judas and Barabbas figure heavily in the film's plot as members of a violent and self-righteous movement of zealots against imperial Rome. Though it may exhibit some traces of the Western Jesus film genre[42], the film casts the story of Jesus in visual terms and traditions indigenous to modern India.[43] Furthermore, Dayspring has circulated different versions of the film out of sensitivity to regional differences.[44]

Dayspring has complemented their film evangelism with ministries of food, shelter, medical care, job training, education scholarships, grants, provisions of seed and farming equipment.[45] What an outside film ministry could likely not have achieved—namely, a more holistic and indigenous ministry—Dayspring has accomplished in part through the insistence on a visual vernacular principle. In the last several years it has become clear that the Western JESUS film is regarded by Hindus as a provocative Western import, distributed and funded by Westerners,[46] whereas its contemporary, *Karunamayudu,* appears to respect and encourage cultural tradition. Though reception among the Brahmin caste, for example, has, to my knowledge, not been documented, it may serve as the ultimate litmus for the film's vernacular power.

---

41   Lindvall and Quicke, 198-99.

42   Like resemblances to DeMille's *King of Kings*; Friesen, "Showing Compassion," 126.

43   For example, the use of some dance and sung soliloquys.

44   Friesen, "Analysis," 164.

45   Lindvall and Quicke, 200-201.

46   Ibid., 202.

The future of the evangelistic film outside the West may not be clear. What does seem clear, at least on the basis of this study, is that visual representation in evangelistic media matters. And the most effective uses of that media toward the indigenization of world Christianity will likely require more examples like *Karunamayudu*, which do not fall victim to the post-Enlightenment, postcolonial evangelical tensions between the universal and the particular. After all, India was once colonized by a "Christian" nation; the future of an indigenous Christianity in India, therefore, may be advanced by the use of a Jesus film that explicitly rejects the implicit colonial associations of tools like the JESUS film. And what appears to be the case for South India may very well hold true for the rest of the world.

THE JESUS FILM PROJECT

Helping provide media tools, training and strategies for abundant
follow-through evangelism in every needed language

Official Ministry Statistics — April 23, 2015

Language Production Progress

JESUS (classic version)	**1,311**
The Story of Jesus (audio)	**429**
The Story of Jesus for Children	**157**
Magdalena: Released From Shame	**131**
My Last Day	**122**
Following Jesus	**10**
Walking with Jesus	**8**
Rivka	**7**
Total number of languages available[1]	**1,332**

Cumulative Exposures/Decisions/Products Distributed Since 1979

Audience[2]	**billions**
Indicated decisions for Christ following a film showing	**more than 200 million**
All products, including film, video and audio[3]	**more than 60 million**

Ministry Strategies

Countries where JFP funded ministry activity in 2014[3]	**120**

Jesus Film Media

2014 Jesus Film Media platform views (all channels, excluding YouTube)	**8,386,267**
2014 Jesus Film Media app new installs (includes Android and iOS)	**163,356**
Video clips available	**78,623**

[1] Includes all versions. In some cases, an audio-only version is completed without the classic video to more effectively reach selected language groups.
[2] Includes all versions and multiple exposures per viewer. Based on estimated data.
[3] Based on allocations made.

The JESUS Film Project Field Information Services
100 Lake Hart Drive, Orlando, FL 32832
Telephone: (407) 826-2300 • FAX: (407) 826-2375 • Email: info@jesusfilm.org
Internet: www.jesusfilm.org