

A Public Lecture by Timothy Cardinal Dolan

Sponsored by the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics
Graham Chapel at Washington University in St. Louis

March 2, 2016

12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

Chancellor Mark Wrighton:

Good afternoon. I'm Mark Wrighton, Chancellor of Washington University. Welcome to this special event, a public lecture by Timothy Cardinal Dolan, a great St. Louisan, leading on the world stage in a great religion. This is a special program of the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics. I'm deeply grateful to the Director, Professor Marie Griffith, for her great leadership in helping us bring Cardinal Dolan to our campus. She's doing a fabulous job. Cardinal Dolan, it's a great pleasure to have you on our campus and we're grateful for your making the commitment. To introduce the Cardinal, the honorable John C. Danforth, for whom the Center is named, also, a great St. Louisan and a great leader for our country. The honorable John C. Danforth.

John C. Danforth:

Religion can affect politics for better or worse, and analyzing these two possibilities is the work of Washington University's Center on Religion and Politics. The framers of our Constitution were well aware of how destructive religion can be. They knew that for more than two centuries, Catholics and Protestants in Europe had slaughtered each other, believing that they were doing God's will, and they were determined that nothing of the kind should happen here. So, they erected what Jefferson called the wall of separation between church and state. That separation remains in enduring American value. Instinctively, we are wary of religion in politics, and cringe at politicians who brag about their own religiosity or demean the faith of others. At the same time, many I think, most faithful people believe that religion is more than the individualistic salvation of isolated souls. The literal meaning of the word religion is to bind us together, not to set us apart. So, believers are unwilling to leave their faith at the doors of their houses of worship. They believe that they have a commission to change the world, to make it better. For Christians, it's a commission to advance the kingdom of God. For many, this commission entails political engagement. The relation of religion to politics, for better or worse, is the course offering of this Center and the subject of its online publication. Also, it is drawn to the campus's series of distinguished speakers, including columnist George Will, Judge Guido Calabresi, and last December, Rabbi Jonathan Sacks.

For years, Cardinal Timothy Dolan has been at the top of our wish list of guest speakers, and we could not be more grateful to him for making time in an exceptionally busy schedule to be with us. Of the two main reasons we have wanted him to be here, the first is obvious. As Archbishop of New York, before that Archbishop of Milwaukee and as former President of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Cardinal Dolan is the most prominent spokesman for Catholicism in the United States. The second reason is strictly parochial and personal, and it's the one I want to emphasize. He is one of us. Cardinal Dolan was born in St. Louis, raised in St. Louis, educated in St. Louis, and ordained in St. Louis. He served as a parish priest in St. Louis, taught theology in St. Louis, and was Auxiliary Bishop of St. Louis. His family is here, as are many friends, certainly within the Catholic church and beyond as well. In a special way, we

consider ourselves his brothers and sisters. So, your eminence, you are in New York, but we are with you. We have confidence in a simple maxim: you can take the Cardinal out of St. Louis, but you can't take St. Louis out of the Cardinal. [Laughs] When you accepted this invitation to speak at Washington University, I had what I thought was a bright idea. It was to present you with some piece of baseball paraphernalia. In our town, the title "Cardinal" has more than one highly esteemed meaning. So, I thought that having received the red hat, you should also receive a red cap. With considerable mirth, I told Archbishop Carlson about my wonderfully creative idea, only to learn from him that it wasn't creative at all. He told me that you had already received a Cardinal's cap several years ago, so because it wasn't an original thought, I considered abandoning the plan. On the other hand, is it possible to have too many Cardinal's caps? Besides, you may have worn out the old one from overuse. At any rate, I don't want you to leave town without a memento of our affection for you, so redundant as it is, here is yet another Cardinal's cap.

Timothy Cardinal Dolan:

Now you're talking, way to go. And the right size too

Danforth:

[Laughs] Yeah.

Dolan:

Thank you, way to go, Thank you.

Danforth:

Thank you.

Dolan:

You know, I got one signed by Stan.

Danforth:

Did you?

Dolan:

Yeah.

Danforth:

He said, "you know I've got one signed by Stan." More seriously and to the business at hand, we who know you well, respect you so very much. We could not be more grateful that you are with us today. Good people of Washington University, it is my great honor to reintroduce to you our own Timothy Cardinal Dolan, Archbishop of New York and, your eminence, on behalf on your many friends and your old hometown, welcome home.

Dolan:

Thanks everybody. Senator, thank you. What an extraordinarily gracious introduction. You forgot to mention that there will be two collections. Am I ever glad I left the Yankee cap on the airplane, alright? I do, right after it was announced that Pope Benedict had made me a Cardinal,

what arrives in overnight mail, but a Cardinal hat and its dear Father Tim, that's what he always called me, this is the real Cardinal's hat, signed Stan Musial. Isn't that great? When you come, when you come to my house, and looking around, most of you have been there, you see that right as you come in the doors, so I will treasure that one, Senator, thank you. Am I ever happy to be back home. Senator Danforth is right. I love St. Louis. It's in my DNA, I'm happy—I'm sure happy in New York, but St. Louis is my home and always will be. It's—St. Louis is a little different than New York, right? For instance, I was able to find a parking space. Now that—that just doesn't happen in New York. St. Louis has changed, though, hasn't it? See, when you—when you're away for a while and come back, you see that there's certain things that you used to be able to count on in St. Louis that aren't here anymore. I was home for Thanksgiving and when I came in, let me just give you a couple of examples of how things had changed, things that I had counted on, I thought I'm early enough, I'm going to stop by the Parkmoor at Clayton and Big Bend and get some breakfast. It's not there anymore. Alright, let me—at least, I'm in the neighborhood, let me drive by Lake Forest Bakery and pick up a gooey butter coffee cake. It's not there anymore. Alright, let me drive over to Garavelli's and at least get some—oh, not there. Well, let me try Betha's, remember Betha's, not there anymore. Miss Hullings, I said let me go get a split layer chocolate cake and bring it home, I couldn't find a Miss Hullings. Finally, I said, well certain things cannot change in St. Louis, so I stopped at Pat's Tavern down at Tamm and Oakland, remember, now that's still there, thank God. We used to call it McDermott's and I went up to the bartender and I said give me one of St. Louis's finest for the brewery. I'll be damned—it was a Stella Artois. What is going on? What happened to Budweiser? My, oh my. Well, listen though, what's greater is the things that have not changed in St. Louis that always make it enjoyable for me to return and let me mention a couple of them. We still have Senator Danforth, what a great and respected and esteemed leader you are, Senator, thank you. We've got a great local church. Religion is so important in this community and you'll pardon me for being particularly proud of the Catholic community here in the Archdiocese of St. Louis. I know Bishop John Gaydos, the Bishop of Jefferson City who's here, another expat, would share in my gratitude and my special gratitude that this local church is led so wonderfully by Archbishop Robert Carlson. Archbishop, I'm glad you're here. Good to see Brother Preece. I may be the Cardinal of New York, but the Cardinal of Washington University, Father Gary Brown, thank you for your leadership, right? I look around and see my brother Pat and my sister-in-law Mary Theresa are here. I see so many friends whom I love and cherish and who make returning home such a joy and thank God, as well, another thing that hasn't changed is this great university, Washington University. So, Chancellor and member of this Washington University community, thank you for your invitation and I really appreciate your extraordinarily warm welcome.

Religion and politics—that's what the Danforth Center specializes in, religion and politics, church and state as the Senator mentioned. By the way, when I was home for Thanksgiving, my little four-year-old grandnephew, Walt, who's at Pre-K at St. Francis Borgia grade school at Washington, Missouri, says to me, Uncle Tim, I know the Our Father and I know the Pledge of Allegiance. I said this is great, Walt. So, at Thanksgiving dinner I said look everybody, Walt knows the Our Father, why don't we have him do the grace before meals, so Walt was thrilled, he said [unintelligible] Our Father who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name, liberty and justice for all [laughs]. Too bad about that wall of separation. I put a lot of thought into this talk because, to be here I'm—my Lord, I feel so honored, especially to follow the pantheon of great speakers who have been part of it. So, I put a lot of thought into it, I said what could I, as a

churchman, speak about religion and politics? So, I had thought of some issues, I'm an American historian by training and background, I thought maybe I could sketch some issue or some school of thought in American history. What I finally thought is no, what if I look—what if I just kind of talked about leadership, which is important to both religion and politics, and what if I speak about three particular attributes that I think are essential to any person, every family, every organization, every institution, every university, every enterprise, every movement, every country, every political party, anything living, dreaming, daring, growing, needs a soul, a mind, and a heart, alright, a soul, a mind and a heart. And I thought what I might do for a half hour or so is propose to you three models of those, soul, mind, and heart, from our Catholic family that I think might be able to shed some light upon our topic: religion and politics. Let me propose to you that our last three Popes exemplify in their leadership style one of those attributes. Let me propose that Pope now Saint John Paul the Second would personify the soul, the soul when it comes to leadership. Let me suggest that now Pope Emeritus Benedict the 16th would speak to us about the mind and let me finish by trying to show how our beloved Pope Francis talks to us about the heart. Is that alright, for about a half an hour, 40 minutes? Marie, is that okay? Too late now, okay.

Let's start with John Paul II, the soul, alright, the soul in John Paul II. At his first visit to the United States in 1979, when then President Jimmy Carter welcomed John Paul II to the White House, he introduced him as the "soul of the world," and a little later, Billy Graham said about John Paul II that he's a providential prescription for humanity's exhausted soul. In the year 2002, I was honored as then-Archbishop of Milwaukee to go on a wonderful study tour to Israel and Rome with rabbis, and at that time Pope John Paul II was in declining health, and when a good friend of mine, Rabbi Gil Rosenthal, said "will we be able to meet him?" and I said you know, "his health is so declining, he's weakened, I don't know if we're gonna be able to," Rabbi Rosenthal said to me "we're not there to look at his body, we're there to see his soul." John Paul II and the essence of the soul. John Paul II would set as his mission the recovery of the primacy of the spiritual, seeking first the kingdom of God, as Jesus said. Take care of the soul, take care of your interior life, take care of the eternal enduring values, and, boy, everything else is gonna work out. Now, he himself, John Paul II, would have bordered on what I would contend was the mystical. You know what a mystic is, we don't meet too many of them. Every religion, every faith tradition has them. Most of us have to wait for heaven for that union with God, and sometimes, rarely here on Earth, we may have some experiences or flashes of that intimate union with the Lord that will be forever through the mercy of God in heaven. Mystics enjoy those moments regularly, and Pope John Paul II would have been one of those. Anybody who was ever close to him, anybody who had the honor of attending his morning mass, for instance, who would see him locked in prayer would know that this was a man of particular spiritual intensity. He was one that would emphasize, in the words of David Brooks, the *New York Times* columnist, he would emphasize the eulogy virtues much more so than the resume virtues. Now, why—where did this spiritual intensity, where did this emphasis on the soul in John Paul II come from? Well, probably for two reasons. One would be of the culture from which he came, the high-octane Polish Catholicism from which he came, and secondly, might I suggest that it's because he himself personally had lost almost everything in his whole life, so he would cling to the Lord.

Let's talk about Poland for a second. You may have had a chance to look at the new book that came out by Ian Kershaw, *To Hell and Back*, which is the story of Europe between the two world

wars, which he claims is really just one big war, and he has a long section on Poland. Poland, of course, politically was wiped off the map, right? There was no political entity known as Poland. Karol Wojtyla would have been born in 1920 when the political entity, thanks to the Versailles Treaty, had just come on the map. Poland, of course, traditionally would—is the bowling alley between Russia and Germany, with all the horror and all the attack and all the violence and all the war. But, because of that, because of Poland's shaky political situation, culture, culture, which is—keep that word in mind a little later in my address, culture would be the be-all and end-all. Then, the noble aspirations of the people that are captured in music and poetry and learning and art and history and yes, faith. It would be that high-octane Polish cultural Catholicism that would make John Paul II and so many Poles, people of the interior life, people of the soul, and secondly, folks, Karol Wojtyla, John Paul II's family baptismal name, had lost everything. He can't remember his mom. His mom died when he was young. His only sister died shortly after. He looked up to his older brother who was a physician, he himself would die tending to victims of the influenza outbreak in Krakow, and his dad, who was really the normative figure in his life, he would come home at 18 years of age only to find him dead on the floor, and then Karol Wojtyla, having lost everyone, no family, would describe in words that could not leave you with the eye un-moistened or the throat un-lumped, when he would describe September 1, 1939, when all of Poland would look up to see the Luftwaffe coming in to conquer Poland, leading to six years of hell under Nazi oppression. He would see his friends, especially his Jewish friends, disappear overnight. He himself coming home from hard labor in a chemical factory outside of Krakow would be hit by a truckload of drunken Nazi soldiers and left at the side of the road for dead. It was in that dreary situation that his faith came alive and that he was clandestinely formed to be a priest, ordained the year after the war, but remember what happened, folks. Poland was one of those nations that tragically lost the war twice because once the Nazis were defeated, the jackboots of Stalin came to take over Poland, and Poland then entered another era of tyrannical oppression. Is it any wonder that John Paul II would say over and over again “seek ye first the kingdom of God?” Only in God is my soul at rest. To not fear those who can kill the body, fear only those who can extinguish the life of the soul.” Is it any wonder that his first words on October 16, 1978 when he was elected successor of St. Peter, would be to tell the world be not afraid, quoting Jesus, because if anybody had the right to be afraid, it was he. The restoration of the exhausted soul of the world and the church became his mission so that, to the point of this lecture, the church could then be a witness to the world, alright?

Now, religion and politics—John Paul II would not become explicitly involved in the precision and detail of politics, but he would be very involved in politics, if you mean the definition of politics given us by Aristotle and by Plato. He would posit the principles upon which politics is based. I detect three of them, anyway, the dignity of the human person made in the image and likeness of God, the sanctity of human life, and a renewed anthropology, a study of the very nature of the human person that was teleological in nature, leading to eternity in which he would say the human person apart from God cannot be understood. In fact, it's a contradiction. His, then, approach to politics, everybody, would be the prophetic, like an Old Testament prophet, one of the great prophets of Israel, so he could stand up to those on the right, people like Marcos or Stroessner in Paraguay. He could stand up to those on the left, people like Castro. He could be equally prophetic with the Ronald Reagan and a Bill Clinton, alright and then would come what historians since call the nine days that changed the world, June 1 to 10, 1979, when John Paul II

returned to his beloved Poland. Nine days that changed the world, Mikhail Gorbachev would say, a decade later, that that was the beginning of the end of communism. Gorbachev would say it was that trip that took the first brick out of the Berlin Wall. Henry Kissinger would say that John Paul II did for Poland in that trip what Winston Churchill did for the people of Britain on the outbreak of the second world war and it's that trip that would give us a new kitchen table word called solidarity. John Paul II for nine days, seventy-five percent of the nation would see him, never once would he say the word Russia, never once would he say the word communism, never once would he say the word Karl Marx, never once would he use the word Soviet Union, but what would he say? The people of Poland stood and for the first time, were able to lift up their heads and look around with confidence and what began to ring in their hearts with solidarity. We are not alone. We are not a number. We are not a cog in a machine. We are not an animal. We are not a soulless machine. We are not some anonymous collectivity. We have a name. We have heritage. We have a culture. We have a destiny. We have a soul. We have innate natural rights. We have a dignity. We have a faith and final day, the last day, two million people in Victory Square in Warsaw, everybody figured this would be John Paul II's last time in Poland, because they sure weren't going to let him come back, alright, as a matter of fact, they did, but at that time two million people John Paul II preaching and he had only started to preach when, in the corner of the throng, a three-word chant started. It began to spread and get louder and louder, three words. So, before long two million people chanting at the top of their lungs three simple words, what were they? Russia go home? Down with communism? No. The three words: we want God. We want God, over and over again, went on for a minute, two minutes, three minutes. The still formal people's master of ceremonies came over and whispered to John Paul, perhaps, Holy Father, you would want to stop the crowd and continue with your sermon, and he looked at him and said "are you nuts? This is what I came for, alright?" 11 minutes. We want God. The KGB telegrams after that—one of them simply said "it's over." It's over. The discovery of the eternal, the discovery of the dignity of the human person, the discovery of the reflection of the divine deep down in the soul of the human person. Solidarity: we are one with one another. We are one with our past. We are one and dreaming of our future. We are one with God. Solidarity. Necessary for politics, no?

Finally, I think the last thing that gel John Paul II's emphasis on the soul is his own suffering, his own intense suffering, right? If you've read Doris Kearns Goodwin's beautiful biography of Lincoln, *Team of Rivals*, she suggests that what really honed Lincoln's greatness was his intense suffering. He suffered from depression, apparently, the death of his son, the death of his—the woman with whom he had loved earlier on, before the woman he married, and intense suffering. If you read Alonzo Hamby's excellent recent book on FDR, what made him a great—he was a fine organizer and all, but what really made him a great political leader was his suffering from polio, which gave him a solidarity to those in need. John Paul II suffered, took three bullets: the cancer, the broken leg, and the botched operation, the advanced Parkinson's. Pardon a story, when I was in Milwaukee, a young married couple were at morning mass and they said afterwards "oh, Archbishop, we're going to Rome on our honeymoon," and I said "would you like to see the Pope John Paul?" I said "Newlyweds always get to meet him after the Wednesday audience" and she was very excited, he didn't seem that interested but he said "fine," he said "I was kind of hoping you could help me out with some restaurants." I said "I can do that too, alright?" but anyway so two weeks later there they are back at mass and I could see was excited. He said "Archbishop Dolan, thanks for getting us to see John Paul." He said "I was very moved,"

and I said “what moved you?” and he said “well, thanks to you we had great seats” and he said “John Paul began to speak,” this would have been about the year 2004, “John Paul II began to speak, we could see him very closely and after about ten seconds I saw him reach into his pocket and pull out a handkerchief and wipe his mouth because he was drooling.” He said “I was very moved to see this Pope drooling.” He was not afraid to let the world watch him suffer. He was not afraid to let the world watch him die because he had a soul. I don’t go to many Broadway plays or musicals in New York, I do like *Les Misérables*, you’ve seen that, right? Probably because it’s one of the few plays I’ve ever seen that treats a Bishop halfway decently, alright? You know, the Bishop in *Les Misérables*, Jean Valjean—oh excuse me, Jean Valjean is the character who says about the Bishop who had kind of redeemed him “he told me I had a soul,” and this—this kind of criminal was led to a conversion and a fresh start and a new life because that Bishop had told him he has a soul. There’s John Paul, the soul important for religion and politics.

Let’s go to the mind, can we? Pope Emeritus Benedict the 16th, now we’re talking about the mind, the brain, the intellect, the gift of reason. This is a—Benedict would just recover that ancient wisdom of philosophy that reason and faith, an ancient wisdom that I hope is alive on this campus. That reason and faith, they aren’t enemies, they’re allies. It’s a great insight of Saint Anselm, the great medieval philosophers. It’s the great insight of a blessed John Henry Newman of a century and a half ago, and it’s so timely, everybody, in a world of the New Atheism, isn’t it? Where a secular culture on steroids attempts to reduce belief to a private hobby at best, or a silly oppressive superstitious toxic movement at worse. Reason, Pope Benedict would say over and over again, reason itself shows us the truth and leads us to God, and when reason is tethered with revelation and faith, it’s the most liberating force in the world. It affirms all that is true, good, and beautiful in the human project. So, Benedict the 16th would posit that the church is the engine of genuine human progress and the church’s rich intellectual tradition is hardly sub-museum piece but is as timely as they come. So, as John Paul would try to revive the soul, Benedict would try to restore the intellectual wattage of the church. Now he’d do that in a bunch of ways, but in the context of our talk today, let me mention just a couple, okay?

One would be his insistence, he didn’t use the term, but it would be—it would come to be called affirmative orthodoxy. He knew that the church was characterized as some crabby, nagging, naysaying parent, who wanted—who lived in mortal fear that his or her children might be enjoying themselves, alright? So, Benedict was—Benedict said wait a minute, no, no, no you got it backwards. The church isn’t about the no, the church is about the yes. The church says yes to everything that is good and true and beautiful in the human person. The church says yes to everything that brings nobility and enlightenment in human and progress to the human person. The church only says no to something that negates that and a no to another no is, guess what, a yes. So, the church is in the business of yes, affirmative orthodoxy. A second way Benedict would try to restore the mind, the vitality—the mind is now what historians are calling his September legacy. Every September in travel, mostly in Europe, he would give a major intellectual address. You might remember the controversial one when he made remarks about Muhammad that didn’t quite go over too well, alright. They were later clarified and he recovered well, but this September legacy talks at places like Regensburg and Paris and London led to some remarkable insights that have had an effect on, not just religion, but also on culture and also on politics. Let me give you one or two. He spoke, for instance, on something called the

interior ecology. You ever heard of it? We've all heard of ecology, this is in Germany at a talk at a university like this one, where he said you know, we all are united in the protection of the environment. We must protect the environment, Benedict said, and we've learned that there are certain rules that are implanted in the environment and when those balancing principles lose their pizzazz are when we as human beings begin to knock them off course by introducing toxins or dangerous things into the environment. There is hell to pay in the external environment. Benedict would say, guess what, there's also an internal ecology. Within the heart and soul and mind of the human person, God has put a balance, a coherence, and set of kind of innate principles that would guide human living and protect the common good, and if we, boy, if we pollute that interior ecology, we're gonna have hell to pay as well, just as we do when we pollute the external ecology. Finally, the next principle of Pope Benedict is when he urges us, and this, by the way, has been picked up by politicians, religious leaders all over the world, when he warns us against the two extremes when it comes to religion, alright. What are the two extremes? You know them as well as I do, but we needed a man like Benedict to issue this caveat. One extreme is reason without faith. Reason without faith, we call that rationalism, right? Reason without faith leads to his chilling quote given at the Bundestag not far from Hitler's bunker, leads a quote: "gang of robbers in the Berlin bunker leaves to the dictatorship of relativism where the only constant is the subjective truth of my wants, my needs, my conveniences, my viewpoint, my opinion at the given moment." That's a nasty rationalism that is an extreme that destroys the person religion and politics and the other extreme, sadly arising more and more today, would be faith without reason. This leads to a shallow knee-jerk simplistic mind control, a hollow, what's called fideism that will not hold up to intellectual scrutiny. Benedict says we got to avoid both of those pits or we're in trouble. In the middle, Benedict would say that via media, again that is at the heart of Christian wisdom, is that belief that faith and reason are in a magnificent walls of checks and balances that leads to genuine freedom and truth and happiness as the good, the true, and the beautiful are embraced. To accent the good, as he did it, remember, at the lawn of the White House in April of 2008, speaking and calling us to task by speaking about the glories of the American dream. To see the mind as the atrium to the infinite, to engage culture rather than to clash with it, to see in the world—this world an invitation to the next, and to see in the human person the reflection of the divine. That's Benedict and the restoration of the mind.

And finally, folks, we're just not soul or not just mind, we're also heart. And might I suggest that Pope Francis can teach us, leaders in both church, society, academia, and politics, the importance of heart. Think of the names for men at Benedict: Saint Benedict the great 6th century towering figure of Western history, the emphasis on learning and the intellect, the emphasis and the cultivation of the life of the mind and soul, the preservation of Western Christian wisdom, what we call Christendom, a Eurocentric vision—that's Benedict, that was Pope Benedict. Now think of Francis, Francis of Assisi. Oh, what a difference and we knew there was going to be a difference when he chose the name, the emphasis on imagination, poetry over prose, heart over head, love over reason, people over ideology. When he—and you see it all the time and the simplest things in the world, right after—see, so look, I'm not supposed to talk about the conclave, but once he says yes, the conclave's over, the next question is by what name shall you be called and he said Francis. He was quick to say of Assisi, not Xavier because he's a Jesuit and Francis Xavier is a Jesuit. He wanted to make sure we knew it was Francis of Assisi and then, he goes off to get—to change. See, that's true they have the three white cassocks in this waiting room, they had the three white cassocks ready for the new Pope. They had small, medium, and

large. I knew I had no chance when I didn't see an XXL alright, but so when he comes out we're all supposed to kind of solemnly come up to him and he starts running down the aisle. We thought where's he going. There were two of the Cardinals in wheelchairs and he went to them immediately. That's very simple. That's very routine. That's very normal, but would you not agree with me that such simple courtesy is unfortunately, tragically uncommon today. So, from the beginning with the name and his gestures, we knew this was a man who would emphasize the heart. A heart that's tender. March 19th, the feast of Saint Joseph in the Catholic calendars, when he started—the big mass starting, yeah usually popes give this real long, ornate, diplomatic, nuanced, intellectual talk. He spoke for eleven minutes, which, right away, I thought I like this guy alright and he spoke about tenderness. He said you know what? We got a tender God and we ought to let him tenderly love us and, by the way, we ought to love one another with tenderness and we ought to take care of the environment with tenderness. Afterwards, I had an interview with a well-known journalist, if I told you her name, you would know who it was, but it was rather personal, and before we went on, she had tears in her eyes, she said you know, Cardinal Dolan, I spent all my days covering wars and epidemics and violence and drugs and rapes and corruption and famine, and she said I come here and this man speaks about tenderness in a world that has grown harsh and coarse and nasty. He speaks about tenderness and I need that, a heart that's tender, a heart that's merciful. Mercy much more than sin. A heart that's not afraid to publicly break. Remember his words at Lampedusa, when the boatload of immigrants sank, remember his tears? He wasn't afraid to cry when he spoke about the war in Syria, or the impending war which historians think may have avoided a military—a precise military clash. A heart that senses those, that beats with those at the side of the road who've been neglected and overlooked. A heart that's not afraid to take risks and dare, not afraid of accidents, not afraid of a messy church, alright. A heart with a particular solicitude for the poor and a heart that is downright authentic. You see, this is a man who's not scripted. I remember when I got home from the conclave, I live—I happen to live on Madison Avenue, and—which is the PR capital of the world, right, and I remember seeing some people and they said oh my gosh. They said Cardinal Dolan, this new Pope, he is doing everything right, who is doing his PR work? Well, nobody's doing his PR work. He's not scripted, he—it's just natural. It's spontaneous and spontaneity, of course, comes from the heart. So, to restore the warmth and the love and the tenderness of the church and once again, in doing that to allow the church to witness tenderness to the world and to politics has become his mission statement. He loves to describe, if you look at St. Peter's Square from above, if you were in a helicopter, you'd see those colonnades of Bernini that are just reaching out, and he says those are the arms of the Lord who are reaching out just to bring people into his embrace. That's the heart. The church, he says, it's not some NGO, it's not some cold institution, it's not some agenda-driven body, it's not just an ethical society of rights and wrongs. The church is people and the church is a person, who happens to be the second person in the most blessed Trinity, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

My friends, this lecture series, this excellent lecture series is on religion and politics, so let me close for a couple minutes with a bit of a synopsis on what these three popes would teach us about religion and politics, okay? I think I got five or six points here, see if you agree. Number one would be a respect for politics, but also a recognition that politics is not mighty and it's not a surefire cure-all for everything that is wrong with humanity. What's wrong with humanity isn't out there, what's wrong with humanity is in here and the role of the church is to touch the inside, so that then we can bring that to the outside. Religion, according to John Paul, Benedict, and

Francis, would speak to the principles upon which politics builds: truth, virtue, trust, the common good, the dignity of the human person and the sanctity of human life and the duty of government to protect those last two. Secondly, those three popes would say that religion by its very nature is to unify and never to divide. Francis would say that a religion that hates is an oxymoron, a religion that kills is a nauseating perversity, a religion that divides is a sham. Three, virtue in words that would ring true with the Washington and Madison and Jefferson, virtue is necessary, and this is a particular message of Benedict the 16th. Virtue is necessary for a noble, enlightened society. Virtue is the opposite, the antidote to a libertarian egotism and a hyperbolic self-interest. Number four, dialogue and civility is essential, always preferable to clashes, especially preferable to military arms. Compromise can be an answer, not always a problem, and religion is the counterweight to excessive self-interest, particularly with Francis speak of that. Number five, religion works in the arena of culture. Politics is only part of culture. One could make the contention today that the equation of politics and culture is less than helpful. Culture would be the chapter heading, if not the title of the book, and religion works on culture more than politics. Culture by its nature tends to ask the what and the why, while politics asks the how. John Paul II would remind us of humanity's common aspirations, at the service of the human person, both individual and in solidarity. And six, the popes would say that religion is a necessary moderating influence on politics. Politics is not the be-all and end-all. I was touched by the homily that Father Paul Scalia gave for his father, Justice Antonin Scalia, I don't know if you heard it or not, and for many reasons, but Father Paul Scalia speaking about his dad said you know, you all have rightly praised my dad for many epic achievements. My dad would think that his greatest achievement was that he was a believer, he was a dad, and he was a husband. Politics was mighty important to him. It was not the be-all and end-all. Religion also tempers politics by emphasizing the common good over partisan goals, by emphasizing the communal over the private, the personal, and the autonomous self and religion tempers politics by creating an atmosphere of respect, trust, and civility. That would be my attempt in those six points to summarize what John Paul II, Benedict the 16th, and Pope Francis would think about religion and politics. The best summary that I've heard of late is in an excellent book called *The Relevance of Religion: How Faithful People Can Change Politics* by a man named John Danforth. Now, he didn't ask me to say this, folks, alright, and actually, I didn't read the book until after I had written the talk and I said my God, he's just the conclusion of my talk, alright, and I, Senator, I doubt if you had studied those popes to come to this. I think it's just part of our common tradition. So, let me end with a word of praise for people like John. Do we ever miss you, John, and wish you were in the political process today, right? You're not. It ain't too late, alright? A word of praise to Almighty God for popes like John Paul II and Benedict the 16th and Francis. A word of praise for spaces—important spaces like Washington University, where conversations like this can occur regularly. A word of praise for enlightened folks at the Center for Religion and Politics who work so hard to see that these conversations continue, and a word of thanks to people like you who are kind enough to be interested in what my words might teach. Can I conclude, keeping all those people in mind, with the words of our own T.S. Eliot from the *Four Quartets*? “To apprehend the point of intersection of the timeless with time is an occupation for the Saint,” and I would propose to you that we have close to saints in John Paul, Benedict, and Francis. Thank you very much. Alright. Thank you. Did I—as long—thank you. Hey, guys—thank you. Thanks, boy! This wouldn't happen in New York. As long—heck as long as I got more applause than Rabbi Sacks, I don't care, alright?

Prof. Marie Griffith:

Thank you so much. We have some time for Q & A and we invite you to—if you would like to ask a question of His Eminence, he’s graciously agreed to address any questions. Please queue up here at the mic and try to be brief and around 1:20 to 1:25, I’ll announce that it’s the final question. When we’re done, we are having a public reception over in Umrath Hall, just across the way and you are all very warmly invited to come, His Eminence will be there. Thank you.

Dolan:

Senator, do you want to make the announcement now or what? No [laughs]. Come on up, sure. Marie, you want them up here, right? [Unintelligible].

Audience Question #1:

Since this is religion and politics, I’d like to ask you about Christianity and the violence. The first question would be about the Joshua Conquest as a model for American conquest. The second question is can Christianity and the Christian church serve as a peace [unintelligible] instead of [unintelligible] of colonialism, imperial expansion which caused mass [unintelligible], mass killings, and mass sufferings? And I’d like to ask you, can Christians and the Christian church can preach the gospel of peace to all peoples, especially to the poor, the marginalized, the oppressed? Can church can become a peace [unintelligible]?

Dolan:

You’re asking the same kinds of questions Pope Francis is, so I’m glad you’re the lead-off batter in the— [drops banner at front of podium] excuse me—in questions here. You heard the question and it’s a darn good one. We have to admit, Christians are big time into what we’d call examination of conscience, right. So, you examine your life, and most of the time you hang your head in shame because, boy, we sure preach a great message, but we’re not too good at living up to it. That’s certainly true individually, tragically, it’s true corporately when we look back over the two-thousand-year history of the church, we have some very very dark pages. The gentleman just mentioned some of them, whether those would be the example of imperialism, whose corollary would be colonization, whether that be the oppression of peoples, whether that be violence and exclusion for the sake of conversion. What we have to say, of course, is first of all, honestly, admit those, honestly admit those, we can’t deny those and we cannot sugarcoat history. Number two, we have to also say that well, I’d like to think we learn from our mistakes and that we might be of help to the world today where people still want to do that. We might be able to say to them hey, take it for us, we tried that centuries ago and it didn’t work, alright? Number three, we would want to say that the good would outweigh the bad. So, as much as we can—as much as we would turn to some of those dreary, somber, dark, and oppressive chapters in the church history, there’s some glorious ones as well, and number five, we would have to say with Pope Francis that history always calls us to conversion and that what the most important part of history would not be subsequent chapters where we got it wrong. The most important part of history would be returning to the one who had it infinitely right, namely the teachings of Jesus. If we return to that, then Christianity, of course, becomes based, by the way on the wisdom and revelation of Judaism, then Christianity and a Judeo-Christian culture can indeed become the engine of peace and reconciliation, justice and charity. History would bear that out just as it would bear out the exceptions. Now, there’d be one—it was very interesting living in New York because of the extraordinarily rich, colorful diversity of New York, so I spent a lot of

my time meeting with non-Catholics, a lot of my time in excellent conversations with Jewish neighbors, and now, more and more, with Islamic neighbors and when you get them one on one, they will speak about their chagrin with what we would call radical Islam and they would ask us—they would ask me, and I hope I can direct them to people who were more conversant about it than I could ever be—they would ask us about what led—because they know, as the gentleman pointed out, we've had that in our past. We got over it. We learned the hard way, okay, so now, of course—and I'd attribute this to the three popes that I just mentioned—now, the church and Christianity is thought of as the most ardent defender of human rights and the unity of humanity on the face of the Earth. That's not always true. That's not always—happens. So, my new Islamic neighbors will often come to say help us understand how you came to that insight. Help us understand how you left behind Crusades and pogroms and ghettos and persecution and where now you have learned the futility of that, that that is—that is drastically contrary to the teaching of the Gospel. Help us understand how you discovered that and how now you are a force for unity and amity and liberty, I try my best to do that. So, that's an answer, the gentleman's honest question, could lead us to become pessimistic or could lead us to say who—what kind of hypocrites are we that we would stand up and preach about religion being a force for good in human progress, when we know the sorry pages in our past. I'm wondering if that sobriety in recognizing that makes us an even more credible and effective witness to that. Hope so. [Picks up banner that he dropped earlier] Alright, there you go. You don't have one for St. Louis U, do you?

Audience Question #2:

Hi, you just talked about conversing with neighbors of yours that are of different faiths and I was wondering—it seems to me that in a lot of areas of the world, faith is getting a lot less monolithic and so, I was wondering your thoughts on how people of different denominations and faiths can work together to make a positive impact in the political sphere and is there a requirement or a necessity for that?

Dolan:

Great question. Are you a student of [unintelligible] Brown, he's a—great question, you see, what your thoughtful question is predicated upon is the belief that is classical, that religion needs to be monolithic. It needs to be sort of the only game in town, and that was the classical belief, wasn't it? Are we not now discovering, I think, that religion does not need that at all. While it is part of the nature of every religion to do our best to offer an invitation to those to be part of us and where we look forward to the day of religious unity, I think now we all recognize with gratitude that the diversity and the richness in religion is actually a sign of God's embrace and as that could actually be part of his long-range plans that will always defy our ability to analyze it under a microscope. Is that not—while I'm not a proponent of what we call American exceptionalism, I am a very grateful and I hope, patriotic American and I think that's a light to the world that we could be to other countries. Once again in New York, when I have so many people come maybe from cultures where there is a more monolithic approach to religion and they are amazed at the diversity and the amity of religions in a place like New York and in a place like the United States of America. Once again, not just as a Christian but as a Catholic, we Catholics were slow to admit that when the—when Catholics first came to the United States, the situation that the Senator described at the beginning, the constitutional geography of religion and politics of state and church was looked upon with suspicion by our teachers in Rome. They were

a little worried that could religion thrive in a country where religion was not given a privileged place and where religious unity under one religion was expected as necessary, and an expectation for the common good, so they were a little bit suspicious and it took them a long time, actually it took them until December 8, 1965 to say that, you know what, the situation of church and state and the situation of religious diversity in the United States is actually, we think, not only consonant with traditional Catholic teaching, but it's probably the way God intended it. Jesus says the truth will set us free, so we never—sometimes we are, mea culpa, but technically we should never be afraid of the truth, the truth that would be reflected in different ways of arriving at God. They usually make us much more enthusiastic about our own, much clearer in our understanding, and much more appreciative of the journey of the other people. So, way to go. I would like to say, hey, we in the United States could be an example in a lot of things of what not to do, but when it comes to religious freedom and the way we look upon religion in the United States, I'd like to suggest we're an example of what to do for the rest of the world.

Audience Question #3:

So, I feel, I feel like a lot of perception, and, perhaps, a lot of the action on sort of the lower levels, the sort of marching orders, perhaps, of, say, organizations like the USCCB are strongly perceived as being solely single-issued, for example with abortion or the march for pro-life, and I guess my question is getting at this concern that while we have these really wonderful qualities of sort of the examination of conscience, the soul, mind, and heart—that translation as it moves towards sort of the marching orders just gets singled out on particular issues and so, to give an example, the recent encyclical, now that a lot of the hubbub has died down, it seems like that sort of moves back onto the back burner. So, how do you see, I guess, the USCCB, other larger Catholic organizations, working to, rather than singling out particular issues, bringing those sorts of examinations of conscience, those sort of higher-level goals into the general public when, for example, it's a common perception that just abortion matters, for example?

Dolan:

Way to go, good question. First of all, thanks. Thanks for paying attention to what the USCCB says, I didn't think—I've never met anybody that actually listened! This is great, on the campus of Washington University, to hear somebody quote the USCCB. No, you're right. First of all, one of the things we've got to work—it is such a wide array, such a wide array. Now, granted, at any given time, there's going to be one issue that would kind of rise above the rest and say, boy, this is particularly urgent and timely today. The Holy Father thinks that the plight of refugees is, he thinks that the environment is, these are particular issues today. At times in our country, perhaps, some of the issues that the gentleman mentioned, whether it be the rights of the baby in the womb or the defense of traditional marriage, whatever, there's strategically, there might be times when we hone in on a given issue. We never want to lose sight of the greater array. One of the things we need to work on, you—way to go in distinguishing between perception and reality—the perception is that bishops still give marching orders. Bishop Gaydos and Archbishop Carlson will agree with me that we don't give marching orders anymore and we know that that doesn't work, if it ever did. Pope John Paul II, again, he says the church never imposes, the church proposes. We're in the invitation, like Jesus, he will never—now does he ever speak with an urgency and an authority that captured the imagination of the people around him and the opposition, by the way—but, he never coerced. He never forced himself. It was always the invitation. The most common parable that he would speak of was the invitation of the banquet,

okay, because, as Pope Francis reminds us, the only force in the world more powerful than the salvation and mercy offered us by God is our own free will, which also comes from God. All he wants is our love, see, as Pope Francis tells us, and love can never be coerced. So, marching orders shouldn't be part of the vocabulary of any, I would maintain, any religion, certainly not one that looks to Jesus as its founder. But, you're right, you're right, my friend, the perception is that we are into that. So, what we always have to separate, of course, is strategy and principles. Senator Danforth mentions that in his excellent book, that the church, really religion, is at her best when she sticks to the principles, the encouragement, the articulation of those eternal values, and where the strategizing is left to the prudential judgment of the believer. It was, of course, Thomas Aquinas building upon Aristotle who would say that prudence is one of the key, one of the cardinal virtues. Pardon me for name dropping, but it's one of the cardinal, one of the cardinal virtues because it's the choice of how, the method, the strategy of implementing the gospel. So, my young friend, that reductionism of the wide symphony of the gospel to any single issue is usually not only contrary to the wisdom of the gospel, but it's strategically counterproductive. Might I suggest that it would characterize both sides, so depending on whether you're going to read *First Things* or *Commonweal*, you're going to find single issues, usually different ones, alright? Once again, Pope Francis, people, principles over ideology, okay? But, the question was a darn good one and it's part of the bishops, pastors, religious leaders of all stripes constantly saying because it gets into our evangelical effectiveness. How are we best going to—how can we not—how can we present the gospel without taking its salt away, its tanginess away, as Jesus warned us about, without driving people away? It's a biggie, thanks for bringing it up. John, you told me there wouldn't be Catholics here, what's going on? This is—okay.

Audience Question #4:

Cardinal Dolan, thanks again for your address. I wonder what you make of, considering the increase of unaffiliated young adults identifying as not being affiliated with any religion, and I think studies are also showing that, you know, they're not showing up at the polls as much either, but where do you see the correlations there and how does religion help young adults engage civically and how does—what you said today—how do we get to the hearts of young adults so that they see how our, their religion can help them be better engaged in civics?

Dolan:

You got it. Once again, we're into a question of perception versus reality, right? My young friend has got it right. The perception is that religion, creed, belonging, church, faith is going to diminish your political effectiveness, your involvement in society, your work on behalf of the common good. I would obviously maintain that that perception is tragically wrong, as would Senator Danforth if you read his book. Traditionally, folks, and this was once again where we believers in the United States can be a light to the world and salt to the Earth, if—and again, I was happy thanks to a predecessor of Archbishop Carlson to be able to do graduate work in American religious history—every single movement in American history that has led to liberation and enlightenment has been religiously driven. If you believe Winthrop Hudson, who's one of the premier historians of America. The Revolutionary War itself was a direct result of the first Great Awakening, a sense of religious cohesion that came from the preaching of George Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards, alright, that gave rise—in a way analogous to what John Paul II did in Poland—that gave rise to a sense of being an American instead of a colonial for the first

time. Abolition, the end of slavery, the progressive movement, the labor movement, voting rights, work for the poor, the civil rights movement, the anti-war and the peace movement, the pro-life movement, the environmental movement, all great progressive causes in the United States have been religiously motivated. Now that should tell us, the data then should let us know that one of the best ways to ensure that we have a vigorous debate on any issue and that we have a very robust public square, which is going to lead to an enhanced sense of the common good is going to emphasize religion. Our founding fathers knew this, as you know, they would maintain they weren't particularly what you might call fervent members of any given church, believers in a deistic position—a deistic philosophy and religion—that would believe that democracy cannot survive without virtue and that virtue cannot survive without religion and faith and the church, so that the church is essential to a vibrant democracy and a republican form of government. You would know from your studies here the most perceptive commentator on the public scene, the Frenchman who visited, remember in the 1830s—de Tocqueville. De Tocqueville would say I'm coming to this country that I heard was founded on the separation of church and state and I've never met a more religious society in my life. Hilaire Belloc would say America is a nation with the soul of the church, so that would lead us to want a vigorous religious life. Now, as my friend just mentioned, with the—today, we have the development of the believe, yet not belong philosophy. We're told, prestigious groups like the Pew Research Center or the Center for Applied Research on the Apostolate at Georgetown who know their game and you can hardly take exception to what they find out, will find that young people today especially have no trouble with belief. They got a lot of trouble about belonging. They don't mind faith. They don't like religion. They want God as their father as long as they're the only child, okay? They—right? I think. They want the king without a kingdom, right? They want the shepherd as long as they're the only sheep in the fold, alright? They want Christ without his church and that, of course, biblically is a no can do. To restore that sense of the tethering, the free tethering of faith to belonging to religion to creed, is very essential. Now, I'm not a pessimist, you could—a pessimist would believe that the reason our young people find it odious to belong is because we're hypocrites and because the institutional churches have done such a stinking job of passing on the faith that we don't deserve belonging and that's—they got a point—and that certainly would probably inspire some people. I wonder if it's more of a cultural phenomenon that would come from an overly impersonal technocratic age that would come for a preference with gated communities and which lead, in the words of David Brooks, to bowling alone, that we just don't like joining. Joining is part of the American success story. It's not so much true anymore, even in religion. So, I don't know if it has a negative interpretation. It's certainly true. What to do about that, everybody, in my mind, is a major pastoral challenge that religious leaders have: to restore the luster of the church so that one can conclude that the best way for me to nurture a faith in a belief that I take very seriously is to be in intimate spiritual union with other people who share that, to protect it and to foster it and to be with and for one another in times when my religious belief might be so low that I need the witness of another person, and then I can provide that in another time. That's the major pastoral challenge that we got. My hunch is that we got no better Amway salesman for that than Pope Francis because that's what he's—that's part of his message. Marie, what's cooking? When's lunch? I want an Imo's pizza and some Steak 'n Shake, alright?

Griffith:

I think we should thank His Eminence for your wonderful talk. Thank you all.

Dolan:
Alright. Thanks.

--