

Good evening.

The President of the United States often gives a State of the Union Address. In a like manner, governors give States of the State Addresses. I have even seen The University Presidents and Chancellors give states of the University Address. The purpose of these addresses is to reflect and assess the current state of the organization or territory. Naturally, these are given from the perspective of a member usually the leader of the given territory or organization. Thus, I find it proper to give a State of the Church address, not from the perspective of a bishop from the pastor, but instead from an outsider, from himself.

Tonight we will see how the church is faring today. We will see in what areas it's doing okay, in what areas it needs to improve. We will find that in some areas the church is doing good while other areas poorly. We also see some aspects of the church are okay while other aspects are not. Adherence organized religion often contend their faith instills a sense of current. They often point to examples of martyrdom. They tell us religion instills nobility to the extent its followers are willing to sacrifice their life for faith. Indeed, this is noble. I may not agree with the sentiment behind it, but I do believe if

you're willing to sacrifice your life, not the involuntary lives of others for your cause, it is noble. Courage, of course, matters most in the most trying circumstances.

An important example to examine is Nazi Germany. Nazi Germany is generally considered one of the most evil regimes that existed. In fact, many writers, historians, consider the Holocaust to be the epitome of evil in Not only was the government doing a very evil act, but it did not tolerate dissent. Dissent was also punished severely with harsh and rigid repercussions. Thus, anyone who would dissent from this evil, who would speak out, would naturally be courageous. How did the Church fare?

During the Liberation Conference that we put on in 2001 to 2001, We had Jehovah's Witnesses who talked about how courageously the Witnesses acted in Nazi Germany. I've also read in other places these Witnesses would even refuse to give up their faith when they were offered the opportunity to do so to get out of concentration camps. I've even read "they were continuing to publish Watchtower magazine while in the concentration camps." Normally, Jehovah's Witnesses are considered by society to be nuts, coots, outsiders, long-bats. But apparently they are doing something right if they are able to resist

the evil of Nazi Germany. Other less deviant Christian faiths failed miserably.

Some Protestants either did not act during Hitler's evil, or they outright supported it. We've all heard the famous saying by one pastor about how "first it came for a time and if he didn't care he didn't speak out, then it came for him." "No one would ever speak out for him", as the saying goes. There is a photo I've seen reproduced in many places with the caption: "A Protestant rector blesses a Nazi flag." Sadly, the Catholic Church was perhaps worst of all. They signed a concordat with Hitler, stipulating Hitler would allow Catholicism in Germany just as long as Catholicism did not get in the way of the regime [multiple sources]. The two would peacefully coincide. If that is not making a deal with the devil, I don't know what is.

Although today we don't have Nazi Germany, we have an important moral dilemma nevertheless. An important moral dilemma It demonstrates courage, or lack thereof, by religious people. Interact more is a moral dilemma facing our contemporary world. It is not as important as most people make it out to be, but nevertheless it involves vital moral issues.

How do Christians fit? I personally cannot understand how Christians could support war. I can never understand it. The whole view of Christianity seems entirely contrary to war to me. But perhaps it's expected to much to expect consistency or reason. some churches operated.

For example, I went to protest the Iraq war in St. Paul. Guess who came with me? A pastor and her husband from a pious family. Who was... a nun. I thought that was entirely cool. Both of them have the courage to speak up. But other Christians, sadly, they're miserable.

The Catholic Church has come out and said, "This war is immoral." But as McGriff pointed out, "individual American Catholic organizations are left-leaning".

In 2002, I debated Chris Wagner's "What InterVarsity Christian Fellowship?" During the cross-examination portion of our discussion, I asked her the question, "What would Jesus do in regard to Iraq?" Her response was cowardly. She said, "We're not supposed to say what Jesus would do." I countered, "What?" You wear those bracelets." Instead of answering the question, instead of

reflecting upon it, she dodged it. Which tells me she's afraid of the answer.

These Christians invoke what would Jesus do about these minor moral dilemmas. If I would tell them I was thinking about stealing a paperclip from some office, they would say, "What would you do?" So when it comes to pressing social issues of the day, they avoid making a decision. That's cowardly, folks.

A year later, I was sitting with her having a similar discussion, continuing some of our discussion earlier. The reason I asked her what would Jesus do in regards to the war was because a friend of mine asked his parents and thus I borrowed this idea from him. She also was cholera-anxious. We were talking about alcohol. I was happy someone was actually agreeing with me about alcohol since few people do. Sadly, it was up only to a point. I said, "Jesus would probably go into liquor shops and knock the bottles off the wall." She said, "No, you react with love." Keep this in mind, what she said. When we're talking about the Iraq war, she said it was justified because our great president gave Saddam so many chances that it's right to bomb them to murder innocent people. She attributed only noble intentions to her cousin. That type of naivety makes you sick. Thus she was saying, Jesus would not knock beer bottles

off the wall, but he would bomb Iraq. If you're going to be consistent, if you're going to be cowardly, at least be consistent on the less drastic matters. You're going to say, Jesus would not tear vials off the wall, but he would not follow a rat [This last sentence was the raw transcribed version. I can't figure out what I originally was saying here]. That's an example of being inconsistent on the less drastic matters. She is not the only one.

There is an annoying motormouth named Gunnar Diekermann who is [calls himself] an expert about science and religion. That's fine if he wants to reconcile science and religion. I may not agree with him, but I don't have a major moral problem with that. Chi Alpha brought him into our school not once but twice to give his presentation.

Before one of these programs, he was advertising it, also talking to people about his discussion. Lots of people were asking him questions that didn't interest me much at all. Dry questions about his main subject, religious and science going together. I thought I would try to ask him an important moral question. I asked him, "Are you familiar, do you admire Martin Luther King Jr?" He gave a very small indication that he did. Then I said, "The more about the Luther King Jr. speeches." He said about a war in

his time, "Christians, ask yourself, what would Jesus do?" He believed Jesus would oppose the war of his day. Thus, I asked Luther King Jr., "What would Jesus do about Iraq?" claiming Jesus probably would not want to die right? Instead of answering the question, which would take some courage, he evaded it entirely. He rambled about nuclear weapons. Of course, as we've seen from many sources, the whole nuclear weapons issue was false as the administration pulled the wool over our eyes. Thus, his whole argument that it was just because he needed a weapon, is totally in his mouth. So he's just shut up. Answer the question.

Hopefully I can pin it down on him someday. I get an urge to find his email address, email that to him. But sadly, I'm sure he could even more easily evade email questions. Good or decommit has very poor conversation skills. Asking a question, you'll try to get a word in. He will blab, blab, blab, blab, blab.

I also tried to get him to concede a point which would have involved current regard to abortion. But sadly, he was too cowardly to admit it. He was talking about how abortion was bad. Thus, I was trying to show him our president sucks because our president doesn't care about abortion. I tried to get

him to admit our president sucks because our president doesn't care about abortion.

But his stupid, cowardly response was “the president really can't do anything about abortion.” Is he completely stupid? Of course the president can't do something about abortion. The president apparently doesn't want to because if he did, we would have no abortion. If he put half as much energy into getting rid of abortion as he did in the Iraq war, it would be gone. If the president can't do anything about abortion, no one can. Of course people can, therefore, Gunnar Diekermann's cowardly response is cognitive dissonance. Wherever you guys keep these [unknown], apparently it doesn't weed out the idiots. Because Gunnar Diekermann is an idiot.

Even as soon as I have not read the Bible, I memorize [unknown] and verses Gunnar Diekermann says, "Shut up, idiot." He was too cowardly to embrace social justice movements of the day that may not be winning. But he also, earlier in his conversation, claimed “Christians led all the great social movements in history.” He claimed those because they won.

It's easy to be a bandwagon hopper. When someone wins, everyone wants a part of it. When someone is

struggling financially, During the day, no one wants to embrace it. Football fans say this all the time: “There's some fans that are true and tried fans. 0-16, they will stay with the team. 16-0, they will stay with the team. Other people will only be there when the team is in the playoffs.” Good or de-committed is that type of person.

One aspect of religion which I find particularly repulsive, as many others do, is fundamentalism. Fundamentalists are often characterized by fighters with stones. When I was about 14 is when I first truly felt there was something wrong with organized religion, specifically Christianity. When I became a senior in high school, I really started to reflect upon religion. I've been reflecting upon it ever since. What I found particularly egregious, what I found particularly offensive about protestant christianity was the issue that protestant christianity demanded belief in God as a necessary condition to get to heaven. If you did not believe, not only would you not go to heaven, you would go to hell for eternity. That seems irrational and unjust, unjustly. In fact, I consider that the epitome of injustice. Just because, even if christianity is true, it may not be right.

In fact, I may be willing to be the ultimate martyr. An atheist can be the ultimate martyr by spending

eternity in hell because the major premise of Protestant Christianity is immoral. Think about it this way. Most of us find regimes that persecute people based on their beliefs to be immoral. Thus, when God persecutes people based on their beliefs, it's immoral too. God, however, is doing it for eternity, while these others are not doing it for the better of the law. Eternity is worse than infinity.

Oftentimes folks consider fundamentalists to be intolerant. John McCain may have put it best when he called “Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson agents of intolerance and forces of evil.” Oftentimes we see lots of hate for fundamentalists about gays, about Catholics, sometimes even about Jews. Usually at camp, if someone tells everyone they're going to hell, that turns them up. I have had my battles with two fundamentalists. One fundamentalist is [unknown]. That Quaid does not macho enough to admit God was right, claimed “Jews who were Holocaust survivors would be spending eternity in hell because they were Jews.” That seems horrible, horrible, horrible to me. That reminds me of the movie "Seven." In the movie "Seven," One of the men who was tortured was going to hell, therefore someone condoned him: “He already has been through more pain than anyone else, than most anyone else. Now

he's going to hell". That's what Geisinger used to celebrate in the Holocaust.

I'm reading a number of books about so-called extremists. What many of these authors consider extremists to be, especially Laird Wilcox's John George is "people who see the world in just black and white, not seeing the great." Thus, many times, they're considered fundamentalists to be, see the world in black and white. I have had many discussions with fundamentalists, very frustrating, because as Laird Wilcox and John Ronson [*Them: Adventures with Extremists*] say, "these extremists, in our case, fundamentalists, instead of thinking critically, is about the same tired clichés."

Fundamentalist Christians are expert at this.

Although not always, but most of the time, you will get the same response and the same question asked by Fundamentalists. I have seen Catholics see more graves. In fact, when a Catholic says that indeed that is the case. Catholics have just more theory of the world. We don't support every single one of those, or oppose every single one of those blindly. But instead, use a number of rational criteria for evaluating them.

Lots of people call religion a drug. Karl Marx, called "religion the opiate of the masses." Usually, they say this based on certain criteria. These are the

characteristics drug addiction inspires in people. These are the characteristics religion inspires in people. But I see it more on a visceral level. Look into the eyes of someone drunk or someone stoned. You will see their eyes, twinkling, wave, there's a pulse, contrast that to someone who is straight edge. You will see realness that you will not see in the eyes of the drugs. Look into the eyes of the fundamentalist. I get the same vibe. that they are a drug just as the vibe I get from a drug or a stone person. It's not exactly the vibe, especially because different drugs give different vibes. A stoned person is different from a drunk. A drunk person, just as a fundamentalist person, is different from a drug. a drunk person. There is even a self-help group called Fundamentalists Anonymous [as Wikipedia and other sources described]. Thus, I have asked myself the question: Is it just fundamentalism I don't like about religion, or the religion itself? After some reflection, I am deciding to probably believe in a self I don't like. Though, your role in religion is not so bad.

Some claim religion has special principles. We have to wonder about this. Christians often claim we have the golden rule of all these other morals. Religious scholars have contended many values are consistent across religion to religion: From Buddhism, Taoism,

to Hinduism to Islam. In fact, I've seen this one sheet where it's told how virtually every religion had a variation of the golden rule. Some humanists contend, thus, there is something in a humanity, not in a religion, that inspires this.

One of my Catholic friends said, “any christian worth his or her weight in salt believes social justice is important.” Gunnar Dieckerman. One part of his lab is intended: “christians led all the major social justice movements.” Then when I tried to pin him on the fact he's not doing much, the fact of all his social justice, He said, "We christians are different." That sounds like cognitive dissonance to me. When it serves him okay, he latches on to social justice, to education. When it does not serve him, he detaches himself.

I'm getting to the point where good religion and bad religion is divided. Very precise line. Religion that I want to give time to is divided by this line. This is the line that's stable of who gets my ear. If you're on one side, of the line, you're not going to get my ear. While you're on the other side of the line, you will get my ear. That line is social justice. These christians who say social justice is not important turn me off. Those who support immoral Proposition, even if they're activists, turn me on.

Those who did as my friends in high school believe “we're supposed to support all secular governments. We're not supposed to be civil disobedience even when the government is immoral.” Pitch it off and then say, "Render out a decision, or the decision will be in the God's hands." That's what he means. It is not only a bad principle. This author's mouth was out. But, render unto Caesar what is Caesar's senior becomes render unto Hitler what is Hitler's. That is law. Hitler was bad. You don't render honor.

Gunnar Dieckerman, in all his foolishness, promise, and toiling behavior, idiocy, may have had a kernel truth. When he was saying that Christians need many sources of wisdom, he may have because if you look back at many social movements in history Christians often are actively involved because of civil rights that's very true christians were leading civil rights movements Martin Luther King Jr. a man who was very far from worldly ministers strongly believe in religion and christianity. According to today, it's read by christians who are religious, christians who go into the trenches, as so, say their friends they should. Not people who are like, communicating about stars, other conditions. Every movement I've studied in life was largely led by churches.

In fact, [unintelligible] in the room, me, had a quote. which I read in a book by Robin O'Garrett, which said, "The Federated Church in Action Against the Pollution". I also read a quote in one of their yearbooks, which said, "Damage to the Unionist War of the Church". I find the existence of the liquor industry could be very noble. If today there was a battle raging between the church and the liquor industry, in any heartbeat, I would embrace the church side, because I hate political history, perhaps more than anything else in this world. Sadly, on the issue of all Catholic Catholics are generally worried and compromised in Also, as I mentioned earlier, some areas they are better. But I urge athletes to emulate computer podicons while podicons emulate the sphincter called aft.

When you are out there at the ticket line, Sometimes even in the jailhouse. Working for social justice is when you are doing your best business. I don't care about how many times you fail me, how many bibles there you have, if you're not doing social justice, I'm not going to give you the time of day. You need to be feeling my values. You're not showing me, by example, that social justice is important. I don't feel obliged to embrace your views. If you are actively participating in social justice, then they start to

think, "Why, if their god gets them to do that, then maybe their god is not as bad as maybe their god is."

Social justice is paramount. The state of the church takes every person's portal on social justice. During some war protests with Sister Gladys, that sister I mentioned earlier, I went to the big protest in the state, but how do we find, I think, churches? You must oppose the war. The church depends first and foremost on with attitude and action in regard to social justice.

Good evening.