

Can the World afford Religious Hypocrites today?

by budgie Monday, Oct 22 2007, 11:44am

international / theology / commentary

The genus of religious leader carries with it nasty character traits and virulent psychological disease regardless of the particular religion the leader represents. Last week saw the appalling hypocrisy of the Dalai Lama - in total denial -- willingly accept honours from the Holocaust President, G W Bush. It was refreshing to witness this much-venerated FRAUD finally display his true form to the world. However, just prior to the Dalai Lama's self-exposure, a historically consistent hypocrite [the Pope] was engaged in the usual sordid politics of religion - an excellent expose' from FPIF follows this introduction.



Ratzinger

But prior to undertaking that very good read we refer to a news bulletin in Sydney Australia concerning a group fast becoming the religious boffins of the world - the conservative, navel-gazing, Oz Anglicans. No prizes for guessing the issue relates to religionist's morbid fear of free expression and pleasure -- especially sexual pleasure! The consequences of repressing (God given) natural urges is of course the aberrant expression of those urges in the form of perverted practices such as paedophilia, bestiality, sodomy, chronic masturbation and a host other odd sexual behaviours - whereas FUCKING is a perfectly natural process. Anyone who has had any contact with the poisonous influence of religion knows the foremost religious fear is the pleasure derived from SEX.

A brief analysis of Genesis is warranted, as the worst offenders regarding sexuality are the Abrahamic religions. According to the text humans were made in the IMAGE of their GOD - have we all got that? That includes the anatomical features of cocks, cunts and arseholes or penises, vaginas and anuses if you prefer!

I have read the text extensively and do not recall God having a problem with any part of his/her perfect body - including his/her genitalia! Adam and Eve after indulging in the forbidden fruit however, became acutely aware of their bodies (for some unknown reason) especially the fact they were "naked." The 'small matter' of the non-existence of clothing or other body covering upon which the word "naked" is predicated tugs at the rational mind, however, for the moment we must assume

the role of mindless religious morons to further expose the idiocy and hypocrisy of religion!

God was roaming in his garden as a voice, noise, cloud, mist, fart or whatever – this ‘all knowing God’ was unable to locate Adam or Eve so he started screaming the Oz tourism slogan, ‘where the fuck are ya?’ Until Adam responded, ‘we’re hiding cos we’re naked!’ I must emphasise that no reference to any particular anatomical feature had been made. God as a voice retorts, ‘who told you were naked?’ The snake/cat is out of the bag and the couple is now doomed to earn a living by TOILING in the fields or working in the office blocks of Mammon.

The text does not refer to genitalia or any other body part! We can confidently assume the religious fear of SEX, pleasure and the genitals is not of ‘God’ but has been introduced into the text at a later period by aberrant sickos (Paul) masquerading as God’s representatives – nothing has changed in that regard!

I’ve always had a problem with God’s "TOILING" curse, he seems to have forgotten the idyllic lives of Pacific Islanders prior to the polluting influence of white men; basic needs were provided by the tropical forests and the sea – no toiling here, God! His son, Jesus, also states that the “poor” will be with you always – misapprehension obviously runs in the family -- traditional societies, Australian, Eskimo, Amazonian, etc, knew no poverty and existed without any notion of private property or money – but God knew that (didn’t he?)

What a total MORONIC FARCE religion is – is it any wonder the world’s most despicable murderers, sexual offenders, hypocrites, violent criminals and sociopaths are religionists and religious leaders?

The latest absurdity from the Oz Anglicans follows; first they create sexual problems then they try and manage them – some would label this process job creation!

“CLERGY and church workers who cheat on their spouses will be included with sex abusers on a new Anglican register of suspected offenders.

Many dioceses — including morally conservative Sydney and possibly Melbourne — will include complaints of adultery on the register along with complaints of child abuse and sexually inappropriate conduct against adults.”

Link:

<http://www.theage.com.au/>

The piece from FPIF follows:

Heather Wokusch -- October 4, 2007

Editor: John Feffer

Pope Versus President

The Vatican’s recent snub of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice is only the latest salvo in the battle between Pope Benedict XVI and President George W. Bush. This tug of war has profound implications for both U.S. foreign policy and the critical Catholic vote in 2008's presidential race.

On issues ranging from the war in Iraq to global warming, the Vatican and Washington have not seen eye to eye. With the popularity of U.S. foreign policy at record lows around the world, however,

the Vatican's diplomatic approach is more consistent with global public opinion.

Overlapping Agendas

Things haven't always been tense between Bush and Benedict. They share similar views regarding abortion, gay marriage, and other hot-button conservative issues. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (as Benedict was known before becoming Pope in April 2005) even helped Bush secure the White House for a second term.

Specifically, after Bush visited the Vatican in June 2004, complaining that "not all the American bishops are with me," Ratzinger sent a letter to U.S. bishops, ordering them to refuse communion to "a Catholic politician ... consistently campaigning and voting for permissive abortion and euthanasia laws" - a thinly-veiled reference to John Kerry. Ratzinger added that any person even voting for this Catholic politician "would be guilty of formal cooperation in evil and so unworthy to present himself for Holy Communion." Probably no surprise, then, that Bush increased his margin among Catholics by 6% from 2000 to 2004.

In an interesting twist, Ratzinger also partnered with George W. Bush's brother Neil in a foundation "to promote ecumenical understanding and publish original religious texts" in 1999. Oddly enough, business credit reports listed the foundation as a "management trust for purposes other than education, religion, charity or research," leaving the true nature of the Neil Bush/Cardinal Ratzinger venture unclear.

In 2005, Ratzinger was named as a defendant in a U.S. lawsuit suit accusing him of conspiring to cover up the sexual abuse of minors. At the center of the controversy was a May 2001 confidential letter he had sent Catholic bishops across the world ordering them to keep evidence of the sexual abuse of minors by clergy secret until 10 years after the child had reached adult status.

Soon after becoming Pope, however, Ratzinger was dismissed from the case. A U.S. federal judge decided the lawsuit would be "incompatible with the United States' foreign policy interests."

Disagreements Multiply

On many contentious issues since then, Pope Benedict XVI has disagreed with the Bush administration's policies, but only politely and indirectly. For example, Benedict has spoken in favor of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is often at loggerheads with Bush administration foreign policy.

Similarly, Benedict's Vatican has taken a firm stance against global warming, even acquiring a carbon offset forest to make the Vatican the "first entirely carbon neutral sovereign state." The Pope has called for greater international co-operation to fight ozone depletion, yet not overtly criticized White House foot-dragging in that area.

The gloves came off, however, regarding the war in Iraq. In a May 2003 interview, Ratzinger said, "There was not sufficient reasons to unleash a war in Iraq. To say nothing of the fact that, given the new weapons that make possible destructions that go beyond the combatant groups, today we should be asking ourselves if it is still licit to admit the very existence of a 'just war.'"

The U.S. invasion of Iraq was similarly contentious for former Pope John Paul II, who sent a special envoy to the White House in March 2003 in an effort to prevent an attack. The papal envoy's pleas fell on deaf ears.

Vatican criticisms of the Bush administration's military intervention in Iraq have continued unabated. French Cardinal Jean-Louis Tauran, head of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, told an Italian magazine in August 2007, "The facts speak for themselves. Alienating the international community (with the U.S. push for war) was a mistake." Tauran, who has referred to the invasion and occupation as a "crime against peace," also said that Christians in Iraq "paradoxically, were more protected under the dictatorship" of Saddam Hussein.

Rice Rebuffed

As such, it is perhaps unsurprising that Benedict failed to honor Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's urgent request for a private meeting last month. The Italian periodical *Corriere della Sera* reported that Rice was hoping to capitalize on the Pope's moral authority by having a papal audience focused on the Middle East. Instead, Rice was told that Benedict was on holiday and had to settle for a telephone conversation with a lower Vatican official.

The ongoing tensions between Bush and Benedict over Iraq put America's over 75 million Roman Catholics in a tricky position for 2008. By supporting candidates hawkish on the Bush administration's Iraq policies, are they defying the Pope and the Catholic Church?

For its part, the powerful United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) has taken a firm stance against the U.S. presence in Iraq. A July 2007 letter to House Republican Leader John Boehner (R-OH), USCCB noted, "The current situation in Iraq is unacceptable and unsustainable, as is the policy and political stalemate among decision makers in Washington ... our nation must have the moral courage to change course in Iraq."

Dissent is swelling up from the grassroots as well. In August 2007, an alliance of religious groups calling itself Catholics for an End to War collected 10,000 signatures for an online petition "urging leaders to commit to a responsible withdrawal of U.S. troops." Sister Simone Campbell of the national Catholic social justice lobby NETWORK said, "Church leaders and individual Catholics have opposed U.S. policy in Iraq since before the war began," adding that the petition "lets thousands of Catholics unite to speak out even more strongly for an end to the violence and occupation."

In other words, being dovish on Iraq might help the next Democratic presidential contender win Roman Catholic votes. Whether the current front-runners qualify for that distinction, however, is another matter.

Heather Wokusch is a journalist, the author of The Progressives' Handbook, and a contributor to Foreign Policy In Focus (www.fpif.org). For more articles in the Religion and Foreign Policy strategic focus, visit <http://www.fpif.org/fpifinfo/4590>

Copyright applies to FPIF story.

Postscript:

Most of the social crises we face in the world today have been created and sustained by religionists. If we are to survive in a tenable world we can ill-afford the influence of fantacists, sickos and mindless nihilistic religious morons. It is time to jail all war criminals including the religious leaders involved in supporting, directly or indirectly the wars of our time.

The only just war today is the war on the destructive influence of religion on human society. Clear thinking, rational minds are required to address the problems we all face today.



Chummy -- Bush and Dalai Fraud

<http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/4610>

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-747.html>