

Blase Bonpane on WORLD FOCUS,  
Blase's Commentary on American Sniper/s  
Aired on PACIFICA RADIO NETWORK by way of KPFK, Los Angeles  
February 1, 2015

Hello, this is Blase Bonpane with World Focus, produced by the Office of the Americas and available at KPFK.org, where we are heard internationally.

Well, friends, Veterans for Peace, one of the great organizations that is dedicated to abolishing war, is co-sponsoring a national mobilization to shut down Creech Air Force Base in Indian Springs, Nevada. Since 2009, dozens of activists have been arrested for allegedly trespassing at Creech in attempts to stop the indiscriminate killing and burning of innocent people by drones. This year will be the largest turnout yet, and we hope that it will double the size of previous demonstrations. To quote from <http://shutdowncreech.blogspot.com/>:

"In 2005, Creech Air Force Base secretly became the first U.S. base in the country to carry out illegal, remotely controlled assassinations using the MQ-1 Predator drones, and in 2006, the more advanced Reaper drones were added to its arsenal. Creech drone personnel sit behind computers in the desert north of Las Vegas and kill "suspects" thousands of miles away. Recent independent research indicates that the identity of only one out of 28 victims of U.S. drone strikes is known beforehand. Though officials deny it, the majority of those killed by drones are civilians. In 2014, it was leaked that the CIA's criminal drone assassination program, officially a separate operation from the Air Force's, has been piloted all along by Creech's super-secret Squadron 17."

Friends, these are indiscriminate snipers. They have one person who may possibly perhaps I think maybe and maybe doubtfully might be perhaps doing something wrong. And they'll kill scores with a drone strike. This is unacceptable.

"Since 2009 dozens of activists have been arrested for allegedly trespassing at Creech, in

attempts to stop the indiscriminate killing and burning of innocent people by drones. At the trial of the "Creech 14," the first Americans prosecuted for trespass at a drone base, former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark testified that "to have a baby burn to death because of a 'no trespass' sign would be poor public policy, to put it mildly." In a time of burning children, the "no trespass" signs attached to the fences that protect the crimes perpetrated with drones are not legitimate, and they do not command our obedience. After all, it is the U.S. military that is guilty of lethal trespassing."

Those are the words of attorney general Ramsey Clark at the trial of the Creech 14. So we have movies and we have movies. We have movies about snipers, and somehow reflective of our culture and where it's going. And we look to those with a moral sense to try to analyze what is taking place. Snipers and drones indiscriminately killing people thousands of miles away. So together with his vast knowledge, Dr. Chomsky is a moralist, and so he's looking at this through the perspective of ethics and morals. So he was a little surprised by the glowing review the New York Times gave to American Sniper. That review begins by insulting America.

Everyday Americans showed up en masse for a patriotic, pro-family picture that broke all attendance records in its opening days. So Chomsky wonders aloud:

"What was the patriotic, pro-family film that so entranced everyday Americans? It's about the most deadly sniper in American history, a guy named Chris Kyle, who claims to have used his skills to have killed several hundred people in Iraq."

"I hated the damn savages I'd been fighting," Chomsky said, quoting Kyle. "Savage, despicable, evil — that's what we were fighting in Iraq. That's why a lot of people, myself included, called the enemy savages. There was really no other way to describe what we encountered there."

Chomsky also pointed out that The New Yorker loved the film, saying, "it was great, kept to the cinematic values, said it was well done." On the other hand, Newsweek's Jeff Stein, a former US

intelligence officer, deferred, calling it appalling. In that review, Chomsky says, Stein remembered a visit he had made to a “clubhouse for snipers, where to quote him, ‘the barroom walls featured white-on-black Nazi SS insignia, and other Wehrmacht regalia. The Marine shooters clearly identified with the marksmen of the world’s most infamous killing machine, rather than regular troops.”

“Getting back to Chris Kyle,” Chomsky said, arriving at his larger point. “He regarded his first kill as a terrorist — this woman who walked in the street — but we can’t really attribute that to the mentality of a psychopathic killer, because we’re all tarred by the same brush insofar as we tolerate or keep silent about official policy.”

“Now, that mentality helps explain why it’s so easy to ignore what is most clearly the most extreme terrorist campaign of modern history, if not ever — Obama’s global assassination campaign, the drone campaign, which officially is aimed at murdering people who are suspected of maybe someday planning to harm us.”

Chomsky recommends reading some of the transcripts with drone operators, calling them "harrowing" in their dehumanizing treatment of people who are targeted.

The implication is clear and chilling. Are we all, at least tacitly, American snipers?"

Wouldn't it be wonderful to teach that in our fourth and fifth grade classes, that these are the real Americans just as our CIA director stated - that the people involved in torture are "patriots." We better bring that into the classroom to indicate we've lost our moral compass.

So we're looking for moral analysis. We're not looking for jingoism, nonsense, ignorance and double-talk.

We look to Chris, because he also focuses on the ethical and the moral. Chris Hedges writes:

"American Sniper lionizes the most despicable aspects of U.S. society—the gun culture, the blind adoration of the military, the belief that we have an innate right as a “Christian” nation to

exterminate the “lesser breeds” of the earth, a grotesque hyper masculinity that banishes compassion and pity, a denial of inconvenient facts and historical truth, and a belittling of critical thinking and artistic expression. Many Americans, especially white Americans trapped in a stagnant economy and a dysfunctional political system, yearn for the supposed moral renewal and rigid, militarized control the movie venerates. These passions, if realized, will extinguish what is left of our now-anemic open society."

Friends, this is really quite a moral tragedy. This man was called upon by God to use his gift to kill "evil-doers," and who are evil doers? Anyone he says are evil doers.

"There is no shortage of simpletons whose minds are warped by this belief system. We elected one of them, George W. Bush, as president. They populate the armed forces and the Christian right. They watch Fox News and believe it. They have little understanding or curiosity about the world outside their insular communities. They are proud of their ignorance and anti-intellectualism. And when they get into power—they already control the Congress, the corporate world, most of the media and the war machine—their binary vision of good and evil and their myopic self-adulation cause severe trouble for their country. “American Sniper,” like the big-budget feature films pumped out in Germany during the Nazi era to exalt deformed values of militarism, racial self-glorification and state violence, is a piece of propaganda, a tawdry commercial for the crimes of empire."

You know, Mikey Weinstein has done a great deal about the misuse of religion in our armed forces. He has really been a champion of identifying people in the Air Force Academy trying to teach and insist upon a bastardized Christianity that has nothing to do with anything except killing.

“The movie never asks the seminal question as to why the people of Iraq are fighting back against us in the very first place,” said Mikey Weinstein. Weinstein, who worked in the Reagan White House and is a former Air Force officer, is the head of the [Military Religious Freedom Foundation](#), which challenges the growing Christian fundamentalism within the U.S. military. “It

made me physically ill with its twisted, totally one-sided distortions of wartime combat ethics and justice woven into the fabric of Chris Kyle's personal and primal justification mantra of 'God-Country-Family.' It is nothing less than an odious homage, indeed a literal horrific hagiography to wholesale slaughter."

Those are the words of Mickey Weinstein. "Weinstein noted that the embrace of extreme right-wing Christian chauvinism, or Dominionism, which calls for the creation of a theocratic "Christian" America, is especially acute among elite units such as the [SEALs](#) and the Army Special Forces."

Friends, this is how religion is used as a cloak for malice. In the book Kyle relishes killing and war. He is consumed by hatred of all Iraqis. He is intoxicated by violence. He is credited with 160 confirmed kills, but he notes that to be confirmed a kill had to be witnessed, "so if I shot someone in the stomach and he managed to crawl around where we couldn't see him before he bled out he didn't count."

"Kyle will go to Iraq to extract vengeance. He will go to fight in a country that had nothing to do with 9/11, a country that columnist Thomas Friedman once said we attacked "because we could." The historical record and the reality of the Middle East don't matter. Muslims are Muslims. And Muslims are evildoers or, as Kyle calls them, "savages." Evildoers have to be eradicated.

Snipers are used primarily to sow terror and fear among enemy combatants. And in his denial of reality, something former slaveholders and former Nazis perfected to an art after overseeing their own atrocities, Kyle was able to cling to childish myth rather than examine the darkness of his own soul and his contribution to the war crimes we carried out in Iraq. He justified his killing with a cloying sentimentality about his family, his Christian faith, his fellow SEALs and his nation. But sentimentality is not love. It is not empathy. It is, at its core, about self-pity and self-adulation. That the film, like the book, swings between cruelty and sentimentality is not accidental."

You can think of someone like Adolph Hitler who might be touched by a bird with a wounded wing, and sentimentally wants to do something - while he's involved in carrying out a Holocaust. "Sentimentality, the ostentatious parading of excessive and spurious emotion, is the mark of dishonesty, the inability to feel," [James Baldwin](#) reminded us. "The wet eyes of the sentimentalist betray his aversion to experience, his fear of life, his arid heart; and it is always, therefore, the signal of secret and violent inhumanity, the mask of cruelty."

"Savage, despicable evil," Kyle wrote of those he was killing from rooftops and windows. "That's what we were fighting in Iraq. That's why a lot of people, myself included, called the enemy 'savages.' ... I only wish I had killed more." At another point he writes: "I loved killing bad guys. ... I loved what I did. I still do ... it was fun. I had the time of my life being a SEAL." He labels Iraqis "fanatics" and writes "they hated us because we weren't Muslims." He claims "the fanatics we fought valued nothing but their twisted interpretation of religion."

"I never once fought for the Iraqis," he wrote of our Iraqi allies. "I could give a flying fuck about them."

He killed an Iraqi teenager he claimed was an insurgent. He watched as the boy's mother found his body, tore her clothes and wept. He was unmoved.

He wrote: "If you loved them [the sons], you should have kept them away from the war. You should have kept them from joining the insurgency. You let them try and kill us—what did you think would happen to them?"

Kyle was given the nickname "Legend." He got a tattoo of a Crusader cross on his arm. "I wanted everyone to know I was a Christian. I had it put in red, for blood. I hated the damn savages I'd been fighting," he wrote. "I always will." Following a day of sniping, after killing perhaps as many as six people, he would go back to his barracks to spend his time smoking Cuban Romeo y Julieta No. 3 cigars and "playing video games, watching porn and working out." On leave, something omitted in the movie, he was frequently arrested for drunken bar fights."

So this is what we're dealing with, and the liberal media seems to be supporting this. Kyle concludes: "For some reason, a lot of people back home—not all people—didn't accept that we were at war," he wrote. "They didn't accept that war means death, violent death, most times. A lot of people, not just politicians, wanted to impose ridiculous fantasies on us, hold us to some standard of behavior that no human being could maintain."

So, friends, this is what can happen with religion, with bastardized religion, with nationalistic religion - exactly what is the difference between a Christian fundamentalist killer and someone who translates his Islam in the same way? They are the same people. Arnold Toynbee made it so clear for us. Once you decide you have the exclusive truth, you will kill. Because outside of your truth, there are only devils. We seen Nazism now that we're praising in our snipers and in our drone killers, we see the Naziism also in the Ukraine. And I think we should take a look at that.

They're called the Azov fighters. "You have to be a proper white man" to belong to their group, they say.

Ukraine's bloody conflict against pro-Russian separatists in the east of the country has led to thousands of deaths - but it faces a new fight against the rapid rise of far right groups.

BAFTA-winning filmmaker Ross Kemp saw first-hand how militias, made up of football hooligans and current and former soldiers, are now fighting on the front line. Senior members of the battalion have now been given influential positions within Petro Poroshenko's government. Its commander, Andriy Biletsky, is believed to be in charge of two neo-Nazi political groups, and has been elected to serve in Ukraine's parliament while the battalion itself has been integrated into the country's National Guard.

Differences between Ukraine's far right groups have been put aside as the fighting continues, though one fighter – a teacher and psychologist – told Kemp that to become an Azov fighter

you had to be “a proper white man. You can be nationalist, you can be fascist or national socialist. It’s not the main thing.”

“Our future is a war – a war with Russia.”

So we seem to be in a situation where we're mimicking the Third Reich in so many ways. The weapons we're using. The instructions we're giving to our troops. It's very very serious. This is also reflected in our love for the former leader of Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia practices torture and arbitrary judicial murder. Women are beheaded in the street, liberal thought is punishable [by flogging](#), which can be a death sentence even more horrific, because it is more prolonged than having your head hacked off with a sword. It is a raft of fear and hatred lashed together, floating on unimaginable amounts of money, at least for the lucky few. Among the poor, not all of whom are slaves or foreigners, there is [tufshan](#), a special word defined by an anthropologist as “subtle and incapacitating torpor”.

The might compare and contrast what was said when Hugo Chavez died with what they said about the death of the ruler of Saudi Arabia. Think about it. We demonize Hugo Chavez of Venezuela in his death. We were told that he was a "dictator." Funny sort of dictator. He had seventeen elections and referenda since 1998. And some say, "oh, they were rigged." No. When he won by a huge margin in 2006, former US president Jimmy Carter was among those declaring he had won fairly and squarely. In the last election in October 2012, Carter declared that, “of the 92 elections that we've monitored, I would say the election process in Venezuela is the best in the world.” I was there: perhaps you think I was like those hopelessly naïve Western leftists who visited Potemkin villages in Stalinist Russia.

I was with a genuinely independent election commission, staffed with both pro-Chavez and anti-Chavez sympathisers, who had previously been invited by the opposition to run their own internal elections. We met with senior opposition figures who railed against Chavez, but acknowledged that they lived in a democracy. When they lost the election, they accepted it. That's Jimmy Carter. He's speaking about the man we demonize, and the man we're still trying

to punish with endless sanctions, and then we try to laugh that there are shortages in Venezuela. This is exactly what President Nixon did to Allende in Chile. He said, "make the economy scream." We have the power to do that, and we're doing. We put a Nazi in power in Chile, Augusto Pinochet. And we supported him and other dictators until the end. It seems to be our favorite form of government. Look at the history of Latin America, look at the history of Egypt, look at the history of Saudi Arabia. We seem very comfortable with some of these people.

Let's take a look at the religious aspect here. According to FOX News, Jesus would love the film "American Sniper" and would personally thank snipers for dispatching godless Muslims to the lake of fire. Now that's the outrageous claim made by Todd Starnes, a prominent FOX NEWS radio host, responding to documentarian Michael Moore's criticism of the film. Starnes' portrayal of Jesus as an anti-Muslim warmonger is staggeringly ignorant and offensive to Christians and Muslims alike -- and yet Fox is giving him a massive radio and TV platform.

Fox News contributors may say a lot of ridiculous things -- but when they start invoking Jesus to justify violence against Muslims, we have a moral obligation to speak up.

Utterly amazing. I think we have to take a look at the religious aspect here. In my book *Imagine No Religion*, I have a conversation with God, which may help to bring out some of the points that are obvious in what's called Liberation Theology. So the first question I ask of God is: What religion do you belong to? God responds: I don't have a religion. Of course God doesn't have a religion. He doesn't need a religion. Religion is from the word *religos*. That word means to relegate and to toss aside. So you get relegated to a creed, to a dogma, and there is the problem. We as human beings try to say we know something about God. We don't. Aquinas made this so clear, Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologica*. We cannot comprehend God. Anything we say about God is analogy. We might say that if we try to state these things in an absolutist way, they will make no sense whatsoever. So God does not have a religion. Religion would limit god to dogma.

So the first thing we have to do in liberating ourselves is to put the dogmas aside. They are man made. Many were made by Emperor Constantine together with the bishops in the 4th Century at Nicea. They made up a creed. They really did not know what they were talking about, but they wanted to have one imperial group, one imperial church, and if anyone opposed that church, those people would be eliminated. And of course that was the beginning of muscular Christianity. It has really nothing to do with the almighty. It had to do with a series of human conclusions that were made at a council called by an emperor. And that led to Christendom eventually, which was this very violent approach to religion. The Crusades. The Inquisition. The Conquistadores. All of that. It certainly was not a positive thing. It did not reflect the teachings of Jesus any better than FOX News does.

So the next question, which is really just an observation, that we humans have religion. God responds: Of course. Religion is a human attempt to define the undefinable and the bind certain groups of people together in that effort. Religion is a fact of anthropology.

Then my next question was: Are religions a bad thing? God responds: not necessarily, but they are bad if they separate people from the unity of the human race. And what do you think of the ersatz Christianity taught at the Air Force Academy? Divide the human race into people that have to be killed because we say the infantile words, they're bad guys. Then the next question logically would be: What about all those people who do not believe in you, God? God responds: That's understandable. It may be because of all the dumb things they've been told about me. They may not believe in me, but that doesn't mean I don't believe in them. Of course, when people think about what they've been told about God, it seems that it would almost be required to declare themselves athiests because of all the gobbledygook they've heard. Because preachers often, regardless of what church they're in, whether they be cardinals or priest or preachers, they often think they know something about God, and when they're reverent they'll say "we don't know anything." When they're irreverent, they'll tell you all about God, because they're making it up as they go. God will do this, won't do that, they don't know what they're talking about.

The next question to God is, Are you Jewish. Are you Protestant, Catholic, Hindu or Buddhist? God says: No, those are human configurations. Next question is: Some people say you are many. God says: Well, perhaps, they may see many facets and individualize those facets as many gods, that could be called many. The next question: How do people serve and honor you? God answers: By serving, honoring, and loving each other. Well, what about all the religious figures that have been deified over the centuries? Jesus, for example? And God responds: here is where language is defective. Jesus demonstrated unity between himself and all of mankind. He was asking everyone to share in what he was. He did not separate himself from the human race or deny the divinity of the human race. Well what religion was Jesus. God responds: He was Jewish. Was he sectarian? No. He was universal in his approach and made it clear that everyone who lived the truth understood his message. Question: you mean even if they never heard of God? And God responds, Of course, anyone devoted to the truth, justice and peace gets the message, regardless of their religion or lack of religion.

You seem to be saying that we can't comprehend the word God. And God says, that's correct. You can only speak of me in terms of analogy, you can never comprehend me.

Question: What about all the various religions, customs, liturgies? God responds: these are all of value if they are celebrating the good you are doing, or planning to do. Think of the liturgy as a party, a celebration. It will not build a house. You can celebrate the fact that you're going to build a house, or that you have built the house, but liturgy will not feed the poor. It can be a celebration of the quest to change the conditions that produce poverty.

Then should we pray? Of course, as a way to elevate you mind from the nitty-gritty of daily life, and enter into the unity of creation. Did you say creation? God says yes I did; there's never been any conflict between creation and evolution. Science is an effort to understand my work. People should revere science as an effort to know, and use science to advance justice and peace.

Are you aware, God, that many people and nations are using religion as a cloak for malice? God responds: Yes, I am. And I find it truly disgusting. Thanks very much for this conversation. God says, You're welcome.

Well, that's my little questionnaire for God. When we say people saying Jesus would love the film American Sniper, and we see our great people in Code Pink accusing Kissinger of being a war criminal and attempting his arrest while he testified before warmonger John McCain. And we heard John McCain say to these people who understand religion perhaps better than anyone, people like Medea Benjamin, people like Kathy Kelly, they get it. They understand it. They are not sectarian. And to hear this war criminal say to them that they were scum - I think that's how he feels about the electorate, and how the government feels about the electorate, when they go ahead doing exactly what we don't want them to do.

So how did the concept liberation theology come to be. Well, in recent years, it developed during Vatican Council II in 1962 and 1965. It was there that many of the cardinals and other people that were thinking realized that our dogmatic approach was limiting the ability of people to develop a sound spirituality. Being in the field as a missionary in the wake of that council called by Pope John XXIII. We were hearing new messages coming from the Vatican. Like, "enter into the hopes, desires, anxieties of your people. Hasta las ultimas consecuencias. Wherever it takes you.

This was a new message, but it resonated with us because we realized in our very progressive type of training, that we were never stressing dogmatics of the church. We were stressing the dogmatics of behavior, of feeding the poor, of dealing with those in prison and those who were sick, and these weren't dogmas - these were behaviors that made us able to develop the spirit of love and joy and endurance. All the spiritual qualities that every religion would support. What ruins religion is when they try to tell you they know something.

I'm working on a new piece called "Reverence in Critique." Because reverence is essential if we just look at where we are. We live on a rock going around the sun. We should be holding hands.

We're not holding hands, we're fighting each other because of our dogmatic stupidity, our ideologies, because of our doctrines that demonize the other and that are used for the worst of political interests that create snipers and drones. So we were in the field at this time. And we were hearing this, and it did resonate because we were saying to each other, you know, all the years in the clergy, I've never promoted the doctrines, the dogmas. I've promoted a life style, a life style of compassion, of working together, of endurance in love and joy. We got it and began to put aside all sectarianism. We wanted to enter into the thoughts of those who were atheistic humanists, of those who were theistic humanists, and realize that we have the same objectives. Now, today, we hear that we're in a post-humanist period, one of the silliest things I've ever heard. It's part of pseudo-academia, that people are involved in who are hired by the Koch brothers to go into academia and to make it really stupid, and to not allow any difference from the national canon that our foreign policy is the policy of Jesus, and anyone who differs from it is a devil. And that's basically the policy, and it hasn't changed much.

So we put that aside and realized that people who were thinking from the standpoint of humanism (some accused us of trying to make Jesus into a humanist - well, we don't have to make into a humanist, he was a humanist, and he talked about humans and their interrelationships. They were never sectarian. We see countless examples in his life. When he wanted to prove who was going to be saved, he identified someone who had nothing to do with his religion. He identified the Samaritan that his own religious people hated. He said the Samaritan did something, he stopped to help a wounded person, took them to an inn, and showed compassion. That's how how you're saved, according to Jesus. That was his whole point. Sectarianism had nothing to do with it. And he didn't do this once, he did it many times. He was constantly talking about people who fell through the cracks, who didn't belong, who were outside the fold and who had allegedly no religion, and put them up as examples.

Fascinating story in the fourth chapter of Luke where he goes to preach in the synagogue, and he identifies the prophets and what they have said. And he said that he came to fulfill what they wanted. And the congregation was delighted with his words. And then there was part two

of his sermon, and that's when people got upset. He began to talk about the spirit of God reaching outside their synagogue. He began to talk about the spirit of God reaching the Syrians. This was too much, and the parochial group was so upset that they tried to throw him off a cliff and kill him - because that's what religiosity does, that's what dogma does, it makes them sure they have the truth. It has nothing to do with their morals and ethics. People were eliminated by the Inquisition because they didn't want to say that Jesus was God. That isn't a test of anything. They were eliminated for doctrinal reasons, which were really political reasons. Liberation Theology broke through the dogmatics and reached to the lifestyle. If we look over the years at many doctrines, we find they were ultimately political. How did the Byzantine Church break away from the Roman Church? Well, there was a lot of discussion about whether Constantinople would be the center of Christianity, or Rome? This was a political issue. Some of the Crusaders went into Constantinople and stole everything they could. In spite of the fact it was Christians - that didn't make any difference after a while. If you start grabbing, you'll go anywhere and keep on grabbing in the name of God. So an argument broke out. The Byzantine Church said, all right, it's absolutely clear that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the father only. And Rome said no, you've got it all wrong, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the father and son.

So since 1054, this doctrinal dispute has separated the two churches. Did either one know what they were talking about? Absolutely not. Have they tried to change it since then? Very little, because there are political interests involved here. So that's how doctrine is used in a political fashion, and many doctrines have their relationship to politics. That's why Constantine was so concerned about what is the doctrine. This is the doctrine of the Roman Church, and outsiders will not be permitted. We will kill them. This was muscular Christianity and Christendom. The effort of liberation, which I guess terrifies the Vatican, is to get away from this and to constantly focus on behavior. Why can't Mahatma Gandhi be canonized by the church? Because he didn't like the doctrine. He said he loved Jesus, and hated Christians because he had seen them as British imperialists who were totally obnoxious. He didn't have a problem with Jesus. He had a problem with trying to adhere to a dogmatic approach to what Jesus was and is.

If you take a case like Dr. King. Why couldn't Dr. King be canonized? Well, he was a Baptist. You can't canonize a Baptists - why? Because they have a difference doctrine. Slightly. Really not very much at all. And, of course, we are proud of the film made about him recently. It did justice to him. He was truly a human being, he did not purport to be an angel. Do you see how dogmas divide? Do we know anything about them? No, as my mother used to say, they are all man made, and often made for political reasons.

Where did Islam come from so many centuries after Jesus? I have a personal view. I think it came in response to muscular Christianity. It took from the old and new testaments in the bible and made a new holy book, but it was a response to militarism in the churches. Showing a reverence for Jesus, as Islam does, and the mother, as Islam does, only to come under attack from Christians practically from day one. In the Al Jazeera story about Marco Polo, they propose that Polo was working with the pope in order to put down Islam and to request the help of Ghengis Khan from the Chinese where he spent 17 years, and then working together with Gengis Khan, he talked them into attacking Baghdad. Unbelievable. It was destroyed in 1258 by Ghengis Khan, and now you see the US blowing up Baghdad.

So the story goes on. Use religion as a way to carry out your political interests and make it into something it never was. That's why I title my book "Imagine No Religion." You can be Christian, Islamic, agnostic, atheist - and be totally in sync with humanity. This is not the age of post-humanism except in the minds of the war machine, in the minds of the military industrial complex. Why post humanist? Because they are post humanist. In a time of drones and snipers and neo-Nazism, we don't have to accept this - we should review our own insight into what true spirituality is all about.

Thank you for being with us today.