

Sycophants or “Moral Agents?”

In light of tragic historical events associated with the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy — up to the present time — it seems right to ask “Are popes, people and truth well-served by the Jesuits?” The Jesuit Order has been the militant arm of the papacy since its founding at the time of the Reformation. An “inquisition” of the militancy of Jesuit history seems overdue in that it overtly involves institutional overreach.

Institutions do good things and bad things; they are boon and bane. They are good when they authentically represent and serve the people; they are bad when they arrogantly overreach people. For example, people, not institutions own “divinity consciousness.” People, individually and collectively, are Church. Institutional orthodoxists (absolutists) to the contrary, hold proprietary claim to theology and exercise it militantly over the people. This is true of high church hierarchy and institutional orders of clerics.

For example, by their sworn allegiance to the papacy, the Jesuit Religious Order comes off as bane as well as boon. In blind allegiance to the papacy are Jesuits blind to truth and their first obligation to people? There should be no breach between people-interest and church-interest. So, it is appropriate to ask, “Are Jesuits *moral agents or sincere menaces*”?

About “Uninformed Conscience,” John F. Kavanaugh, SJ, writes “If a nation or church forms its people to accept assertions blindly, without supporting evidence, it will form a community not of moral agents but of menaces. They may be sincere, but they will be sincere menaces.” AMERICA Magazine, June 21-28, 2010, pg 9

As a Society, the Jesuit Order straddles the ambiguity between “Theistic Evolution” (Teilhard de Chardin, SJ) and “Creation Theology” (Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, SJ), even though it is privy to science that reconciles Creation and Evolution. [Reference: John F. Haught, SJ, book, “Making Sense of Evolution, Darwin, God, and the Drama of Life”, Westminster John Knox Press, AMERICA Magazine, March 15, 2010, pg 23, reviewed by Ilia Delio.]

From the Fall of 2009 to the Fall of 2010, AMERICA Magazine carried my website ad that reads: “THE EVOLUTION OF SYMBIOSIS is nature’s pattern and God’s plan. Enrich your faith with the synthesis of science. Free resources at www.secondenlightenment.org, www.evolution101.org”

Only a few weeks ago I submitted a replacement ad to run from the Fall of 2010 to the Fall of 2011; this proposed ad reads: “EUCCHARISTIC ALTRUISM is Evolution’s Symbiotic Solution to gratuitous violence. www.divinicom.com”

But AMERICA Magazine rejected the proposed ad with no explanation, so I resubmitted a new proposed ad which reads: “Divinity Consciousness reconciles Theistic Evolution & Creation Theology. <http://www.divinicom.com>” As of now AMERICA Magazine has not responded.

By way of explanation, I made this observation to the Editors, "Reconciliation pertains to the Theistic Evolution (Vatican II) of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, SJ, and the Creation Theology (Trent) of Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, SJ. As a matter of conscience, I admit my personal complicity with church in gratuitous violence—thus my engaged commitment to broader reconciliation." [of conflicted worldviews.]

A fundamental teaching of moral theology is that Christians are obliged in conscience to settle their minds over issues morally conflicted. Surely, this obligation applies to Jesuits as to everyone else.

The last paragraph of the Introduction to my book *The POETREE WORLDVIEW, Leafing through History* reads: "When theology is revitalized in the ever new, open-ended vision of evolving Creation, and when humans are symbiotically harmonious with Creation, then, religion may come to be renewed (redeemed) continuously and may occasion the real possibility of human uplift in authentic moral exercise. And surely the healing of alienation and cultured schizophrenia can happen only with such continuing transformation, namely, with grounding religion not in erroneous, fixed presumptions of SWV [the Static-centrist WorldView] but in the open-ended dynamic of EWV. [the Evolutionary WorldView].

What I sense the Editors of AMERICA Magazine are telling me is that I am a theological nobody, that I am treading on their proprietary turf and that they want me to stop it. On the other hand, they seem to show some queasiness and uncertainty as to how they should handle the situation.