

The Poisoned Passion Fruit of Mel Gibson Joseph Herrin (3-3-2004)

Dear Saints,

I have not wanted to send out another writing on Mel Gibson's movie "The Passion of the Christ", but daily I am receiving more and more e-mails from people who have viewed this movie, and from those who have read the article I sent out titled "The Passion of Mel Gibson". Many of these e-mails have been very harsh in their tone, condemning me for finding fault with this film and its producer. Yet I am hearing of the bad fruit coming forth from this movie on a continuing basis.

In the first writing I sent out on this movie, I shared a couple of Scriptures that the Spirit of God had impressed upon me as applicable to discerning the value of this film.

James 3:11-12

Does a fountain send out from the same opening both fresh and bitter water? Can a fig tree, my brethren, produce olives, or a vine produce figs? Nor can salt water produce fresh.

Luke 6:43-45

"For there is no good tree which produces bad fruit, nor, on the other hand, a bad tree which produces good fruit. For each tree is known by its own fruit. For men do not gather figs from thorns, nor do they pick grapes from a briar bush. The good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth what is good; and the evil man out of the evil treasure brings forth what is evil; for his mouth speaks from that which fills his heart."

In the previous writing I related the facts of Mel Gibson's career, and looked at the content of the movies he has starred in and directed. The movies were shown to be sexually debauched, filled with the coarsest profanity, and shockingly violent. Many of his films focus on themes of vengeance and vigilantism. In another place the following words of our Lord are recorded:

Matthew 7:15-17

Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. You shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree brings forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree brings forth evil fruit.

I asked the question in my previous writing, "How then is it that so many saints now

expect to pick the most delicious, wholesome, nourishing, and righteous fruit from a tree that has been bearing poisonous and destructive fruit for years?" As I read more and more about this movie, and the people who have viewed it, I am absolutely convinced that the fruit of this movie, though attractive on the surface, is filled with poison and corruption at it's core. Let me share with you some of this evidence.

The movie is so violently shocking that Peggy Scott, a viewer in New York, had a heart attack and died while watching it. Mel Gibson said that he wanted to make the movie as shocking as possible. He made it so gruesome in it's depictions of cruelty and violence that the rating board gave it an "R" rating. These secular people deemed it to be dangerous for children under the age of 17 to view it. A writer for Newsweek called it "The Gospel according to the Marquis de Sade", and his judgment was that no child should view it. Roger Ebert, the famous movie critic, said it is the most violent movie he has ever watched.

Is this extreme graphic violence necessary? Is it in keeping with the accounts of the gospels? Do the Gospels linger over every gory detail of Christ's suffering? No! As one reviewer wrote, the Gospels are as minimalistic as can possibly be in speaking of Christ's suffering. They are not written to shock people with gore and cruelty. Rather they focus upon the nobility of Christ who freely laid down His life for mankind. They focus more upon His attitude of forgiveness and grace and meekness than upon every lash of the whip, every drop and splatter of blood, every cruel abuse hurled His way. The gospels do not seek to excite the emotions, as does Mel Gibson's film, they seek to minister life by the Spirit of God.

As bad as the violence is in this movie, there is more poison that awaits the unsuspecting viewer. I know from listening to young people today (and many who are older) that the actors and actresses in movies are treated as idols, even among those in the church. Many people can rattle off every fact about a particular person's career. They know what movies they played in, who they starred alongside of, what famous quotes have come from the movies, and many other facts about the person's career. Beyond any doubt there will be a great number of viewers of this movie, which is already setting records for attendance, who will look further into the lives of the principle actors and actresses who portrayed characters in this movie. Some of what they will find is as follows (This material is quoted from an article by Dennis Palmu.)

MONICA BELLUCCI (MARY MAGDALENE)

1. It seems that one has had to star in a Dracula movie in order to qualify for casting as Mary or Mary Magdalene, since both Ms. Morgenstern and Ms. Bellucci were cast in Joe Chappelle's television special *Dark Prince: The True Story of Dracula* (2000) and the American remake of *Dracula* (1992) respectively!

2. Ms. Bellucci is not just a typical porn star, but perhaps the most vile in the history of mass-market movie-making. Consider this excerpt from Steve Rhodes' (www.InternetReviews.com) review. "*Irreversible* (co-starring Monica Bellucci) makes pure pornography look pretty appealing in comparison." Consider also these excerpts from a press release from the Society for the Promotion of Community Standards (www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/PO0303/S00182.htm).

"Premiered at last years Cannes Film Festival, 'Irreversible' proved so shocking that 250 people walked out, some needing medical attention" and (this movie is) "hard-core pornography."

"Ms. Bellucci insists that her father, who was at the premiere, enjoyed it. 'It was hard for him to watch, but he loved it', she said."

This praise by Bellucci's father is staggering when one considers he witnessed her being raped and sodomized in this film for a full ten minutes without interruption!

Now consider this [bio](#) of Monica Bellucci.

"Film critics are quick to compare Monica Bellucci to previous Italian beauties, but she is her own brand of sultry icon. With roles as a topless vampire in Bram Stoker's Dracula, a taciturn war widow in *Malena* (2000), a charmed courtesan in *Le Pacte des Loups* (Brotherhood of the Wolf) (2002), and a sci-fi vixen in the Matrix sequels (2003), Bellucci has proved to be a bold blend of earthy and ethereal, actress and star...Bellucci went on to star as the seductive Queen of the Nile in the comic book adaptation *Asterix & Obelisk: Mission Cleopatra*..."

Let's briefly look at four of Bellucci's previous movie roles. As already noted above, she played Dracula's (topless) bride in Bram Stoker's Dracula (1992). In [Malena](#), Bellucci plays a voluptuous bride, whose husband has left for the war, and who becomes an object of lust by the village boys and men alike. "As Malena's fortunes, and those of Italy, fall, she dyes her hair blond and whores herself to Nazi officers." In *Brotherhood of the Wolf*, she plays a supporting role with her actor/husband Vincent Cassel in a movie about "a mysterious werewolf terrorizing rural France".

In [Irreversible](#) (2002), she stars with her husband in a movie "with two of the most horrific scenes in cinematic history", according to film critic Steve Rhodes. Rhodes, among other things, says that "Irreversible makes pure pornography look pretty appealing in comparison" and "nothing in this sleazy film is worthwhile". See www.InternetReviews.com. In the movie's "big" scene, Bellucci's character is raped and sodomized with a knife at her throat with almost no editing or camera movement for between five and ten minutes, depending on which reviewer is being cited.

Excerpt from "Sexual violence depiction causes audience collapse"

Friday, 21 March 2003, 8:20 am

Press Release: Society for the Promotion of Community Standards

"Premiered at last years Cannes Film Festival, "Irreversible" proved so shocking that 250

people walked out, some needing medical attention... "Irreversible, directed by Franco-Argentinian director Gaspar Noe, describes a woman's rape and her boyfriend's bloody quest for revenge. Examining a drug-crazed man's violent pursuit of revenge against a twisted pimp he believes is responsible for raping and disfiguring his girlfriend, the film is undeniably shocking and disturbing. The script consists almost entirely of expletives directed against homosexuals and women, and a scene in which Italian actress Monica Bellucci is raped lasts a horrifying 10 minutes. Shown anti-chronologically -- the violent conclusion first followed by sequences taking the viewer back through events -- the film delivers a stomach-churning opening punch set in 'Rectum,' a sado-masochist gay club.

"Fire wardens had to administer oxygen to 20 people (at the Cannes Festival) who fainted during the film - which includes a 10-minute depiction of sodomy and also contains graphic scenes of rape and murder...

Italian actress Monica Bellucci, whose character is raped and beaten in the film, said it was good to let people feel a range of emotions. "This is a film that people love or they hate, but it's good to have these kind of extremes," she said.

"Critics had walked out of Thursday's screening of Irreversible, describing it as 'sick' and 'gratuitous.' Fire brigade spokesman Lieutenant Gerard Courtel said: 'In 25 years in my job I've never seen this at the Cannes festival. The scenes in this film are unbearable, even for us professionals.' Even Monica Bellucci admits she cannot watch some of the scenes without looking away.

"Ms Bellucci insists that her father, who was at the premiere, enjoyed it. 'It was hard for him to watch, but he loved it,' she said. The film has also gained praise from critics impressed with its artistry, clever camera work and unrelenting examination of the pure anger that drives revenge." (end quote)

MAIA MORGENSTERN (MARY, MOTHER OF JESUS)

Let's briefly consider Ms. Morgenstern's words as quoted in the trailer on the official movie website, those being that "she did her best film work prior to the *Passion of the Christ* in...*The Oak Tree* (1992) and *Witman fiuk* (*Witman Brothers*) (1997)". According to a [press release](#) from the International Film Festival at Rotterdam, *Witman fiuk* is "a kind of Freudian case-study in the land of Dracula". "Their (the two brothers') cold mother (played by Maia Morgenstern) is hardly affected by the death of her husband and she soon has a lover. The boys are meanwhile obsessed by the death. They pay nocturnal visits to their father's grave and start to dissect animals. At school, their rather strange behaviour leads to reprisals by other pupils. When the elder brother Janos meets the pretty young prostitute Iren, she becomes the new object of obsession." Is this the "best film work" that groomed Morgenstern for her role as the mother of Jesus Christ? One cringes at the thought!

CLAUDIA GERINI (WIFE OF PONTIUS PILATE)

Claudia Gerini, until her minor role in *Under The Tuscan Sun* (2003), was virtually unknown to North American audiences, appearing mostly in movie and television productions in Italy. Gerini, who plays Pilate's wife in *The Passion of the Christ*, fits in well alongside fellow

caste members Monica Bellucci (Mary Magdalene) and Maia Morgenstern (Jesus' mother Mary). Why? Because, like Bellucci, she is a big favourite on pornographic web sites! As a matter of fact, many of the pictures in these photo galleries are more graphic than Bellucci's, and leave nothing to the imagination. Clicking through the list of websites that come up through a search engine, one is transfixed by the array of pornographic pop-ups that appear faster than ducks in a shooting gallery. We are told in a [mini bio](#) that "her parents, young employees, had liberal ideas." Judging by their daughter's graphic photo galleries, these ideas affected (and infected) Claudia profoundly.

ROSITA CELENTANO (SATAN)

Rosita Celentano seems to be bisexual, appearing in two films with shaved head and eyebrows, and some of her pornographic poses are lesbian trash. Bisexuality would be appropriate for Celentano's role as Satan in "The Passion of the Christ" according to Mel Gibson. On Primetime, Gibson said of this character: "It's attractive, yet it's intimidating. Masculine yet feminine..."

Like Monica Bellucci (Mary Magdalene) and Claudia Gerini (Pilate's wife), Rosita Celentano's nude photos are plastered all over the Internet.

End Quote

Let us consider the following Scripture once more:

Luke 6:43-45

"For there is no good tree which produces bad fruit, nor, on the other hand, a bad tree which produces good fruit. For each tree is known by its own fruit. For men do not gather figs from thorns, nor do they pick grapes from a briar bush. The good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth what is good; and the evil man out of the evil treasure brings forth what is evil; for his mouth speaks from that which fills his heart."

Satan knows what he is doing in guiding the various individuals who have produced this film. Mel Gibson said that he attended Catholic mass every day of the production of this film, for he felt that he had to be "squeaky clean" to produce it. Why then did he surround himself with Internet porn stars, and choose women who have starred in sexually debauched movies, to fill the leading roles of this film? There is no doubt that multitudes of young men and women will search out the careers of these characters, and by simply typing their names into an Internet search engine they will be led to websites filled with images of sexual perversion and uncleanness. These websites are already seeing an increase in traffic.

In the year 2000 Focus on the Family did a study on the problem of Christians viewing Internet pornography. In their study 18% of those interviewed admitted to having viewed pornography during the past year. How many more viewed it, but did

not admit it, is unknown. I suspect the percentages could be double the number actually cited, and the problem is growing. In an article published only five months ago titled "The Mainstreaming of Porn", Charles Colson spoke of the trend in Hollywood for porn stars to cross over into mainstream entertainment.

It must be considered one of the greatest coups of Satan's long struggle against mankind that he has now managed to fill a movie that focuses on a portion of the life of Christ with porn stars. This movie is being attended by Christians in massive numbers, some churches even renting entire theaters, and what will they see, but some of the world's most immoral and godless people "acting" out the lives of Jesus, Mary the mother of Christ, Mary Magdalene and others. More than a few will go home and look up these actors and actresses on the Internet and be led into the bondage of pornography. Consider the thoughts that Satan will present to those who are led down this path. He will say, "These pictures are not so bad. After all, this person played in a movie about Christ. Surely God would not choose someone evil to do such a good thing. What they are doing here is not so bad. Don't be judgmental. Just enjoy your sexual freedom in Christ."

The rottenness and poison of this passion fruit does not end here, however. Besides shocking and desensitizing many with the most violent movie ever made, and leading countless others into the bondage of sexual addictions and immorality, the film is filled with doctrinal heresies. These heresies arise from Mel Gibson's own Catholic beliefs, and those of his Jesuit advisors, as well as from the writings of Anne Emmerich. Ms. Emmerich was a Catholic, stigmatist (one who experienced the sufferings of Christ in her body) nun who claimed to have had mystical experiences where she saw the sufferings of Christ. She wrote of these demonically inspired dreams, which have the effect of portraying the characters in a light that is both false and deceptive. Her writings magnified the women around Christ, showing Mary Magdalene to be flawless, and Mary the mother of Christ to be a co-redemptor with her Son, while depicting all of the apostles as flawed individuals, and even making Christ appear weak and in need of drawing strength from His mother to endure His trials.

In an Interview relating to this film, Mel Gibson stated that he was surprised that so many Protestant Christians were supporting this movie. His reason for surprise was that the movie is so "Marian" (his expression). Some of the unbiblical and heretical elements of the film are as follows.

This movie portrays Christ in such a way that He is viewed as weaker than His own mother. He is consistently drawing strength from Mary, and there are non-Gospel scenes where He is portrayed as very weak and frightened. There is a scene in Gethsemane where the three disciples see Christ in distress and one of them asks the other disciples what is wrong with Him. Peter replies, "He is frightened." The

disciples then ask Christ if He wants them to get the other disciples, and He replies, "No, I don't want them to see Me like this."

Such fictitious constructions are heretical, and they reduce Christ to an appearance of a mere man. I had a man write to me, and he simply effused over this movie. Why was he so delighted with it? He holds to the false doctrine that Christ was not God, but merely a man, and he said that this movie portrayed this "truth" better than any movie that has ever been made. I told him that this was reason enough to not go view the movie, for in diminishing Christ to the image of a mere man it would cause incalculable damage to the faith of many people.

There are many Catholic additions to the movie. When Christ is praying to the Father He says "If it be possible let this CHALICE pass from me." The chalice is a Catholic term full of false connotations. Then there is the addition of the stations of the cross, the myth of Veronica offering Christ a towel to wipe His bloody face and the cloth then receiving a perfect imprint of Christ's face. There is the presence of the Catholic scapular worn by the thief to whom Christ says "This day you will be with me in Paradise". (The scapular is a Catholic invention that did not exist prior to 1600, and it is said that Mary gave it to the church that whoever wears it might pass directly from death to heaven without having to go through the purging fires of purgatory. It was necessary then for Mel Gibson, and his Jesuit advisors, to portray the thief wearing a scapular to explain how he could be with Christ in Paradise that very day.) Mel Gibson also depicts Mary and the other women as dressed in the garb of Catholic nuns. Furthermore he portrays Peter coming to Mary for confession and absolution after he denied Christ.

The overall emphasis of this movie is that Christ was weaker than His own mother and had to continually draw strength from her. Mary is portrayed as suffering everything alongside her Son, and thus she is fulfilling the Catholic doctrine that she is co-redemptor, or co-mediator with the Son of God. The following are all unbiblical elements that Mel Gibson incorporated into his film.

- The stations of the cross are unbiblical.
- Jesus being thrown from a bridge is unbiblical.
- His repeated falls on the way to Golgotha are unbiblical.
- The story of Veronica is unbiblical.
- The exaltation and veneration of Mary as co-redemptor and co-mediator is unbiblical.
- The words already mentioned that Christ spoke to His disciples in Gethsemane are unbiblical.
- Satan being portrayed as a female, or an androgynous being is unbiblical (The Scriptures always refer to Satan with the pronouns "he" and "him").
- The many additions to this movie are unbiblical, such as Pilate's wife handing

Mary a towel to wipe up Jesus' blood, and Mary searching for the place right above where her Son is being tortured and then falling to her knees in agony.

- The thief wearing a scapular is unbiblical.
- Peter making confession to Mary is unbiblical.
- All of the disciples calling Mary “mother” is unbiblical.
- Mary, and the women with her, dressing as Catholic nuns is unbiblical.
- The cup of suffering being referred to as a Catholic chalice is unbiblical.
- The doctrine of transubstantiation depicted in the movie is unbiblical.

These are things I have gleaned from various reviews of the movie, and I am sure there are many more things that could be added. Are these things petty and meaningless criticisms of this movie? Is it a small thing to change the Gospel accounts by infusing them with Catholic dogma and the visions of a demonically deceived nun? Is it a small thing that Christ is shown as having to draw strength from a woman to continue His course? Is it a little thing that Mel Gibson deliberately sought to magnify the role of Mary, the mother of Christ, above that which is revealed in the Scriptures? Is it insignificant that Mary and the other women are dressed as nuns, and that such false doctrinal inventions as the scapular are portrayed in this movie?

II Corinthians 11:3-4

But I am afraid that, as the serpent deceived Eve by his craftiness, your minds will be led astray from the simplicity and purity of devotion to Christ. For if one comes and preaches another Jesus whom we have not preached, or you receive a different spirit which you have not received, or a different gospel which you have not accepted, you bear this beautifully.

How fitting are Paul's words for this hour! Another gospel is being preached, and another Christ is being depicted, and the church is bearing this beautifully, opening their hearts and arms and pocketbooks wide to embrace a man and his chosen associates who have filled the world with violence, profanity and sexual impurity. By the serpent's craftiness he is leading many away from devotion to the true Christ portrayed in the Gospels.

The Scriptures declare that the last days will be days of great deception. Surely the hour is late.