

# DO YOUR JOB

## —Part I—

### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

In the U.S. the most successful profession football coach by far is a man named Bill Belichick. He is an intelligent man. Over the thousands of football pre-game and post-game press conferences he has had across the decades, he has talked about nothing except his team and the recent or up-coming game of his team. This has not made him a darling of the press. In fact, it is quite the opposite. Even when there has been another one of those daily “breaking news” social scandals in the nation or in the National Football League—social scandals being the meat and potatoes of what is passed off as journalism today in North America—Belichick will not speak to the press about them, even if the people involved are on his team. He just says, *“My job is to be a football coach. All that other stuff will be handled by the League Administration.”*

His approach to his vocation, *“My job is to be a football coach,”* is humble, rational and practical. It is humble because many people, who get a mere a photon or two of media publicity start pontificating in areas outside their expertise, as if they were Aristotle, Plato or Thomas Aquinas, when in fact their expertise in what they are now pontificating on probably does not rise to the level of Joe the bartender, if that.

It is rational because he has no personal expertise beyond the average person on the subject and would never even be looked at by the press if he were not a momentary celebrity and the media could gin-up what he says, one way or another, to promote confusion, conflict, controversy and thereby sell their “news” product. Now, academic or professional expertise is by no means the last or only word on a subject nor is it by any standards a guarantor of truth. But, it at least significantly raises the probability that a person has given serious time and energy, from some motivation, thinking about a problem and its solution. When such time and energy is given by anyone trying to fathom a problem and its solution is that person’s opinion, even if it is by someone who is illiterate, deserves equal human respect as any opinion of any Ph.D., or professional public relations expert or profession media pundit, if he or she chooses to make it public. But note, once it is established, whether it be a professional expert or ordinary person, that he or she is just shooting off his or her mouth out of nurtured ignorance or planned deception, that opinion deserves no credence, even if he or she is voicing it from some type of high profile pulpit.

It is practical because of what is going to happen when a leader, especially a celebrity leader, starts opining on issues outside his or her expertise. He or she is going to bring confusion and conflict to the people he or she should be leading in a task. Extraneous thoughts, ideas and feelings are going to arise in the group. They are going to interfere with the leader’s authority, clarity and directions being communicated with maximal focus and demand lucidity for those whom one is leading to a goal, so that they can do *their* job and reach the goal they joined the group reach.

Also, it is practical because a successful leader is one who lives what he is teaching others to do so they can do *their* job. A good leader is one who is willing to walk through the furnace of his or her own teaching to show, indeed to prove, to his or her constituency that this is the right way. Belichick’s official motto for himself and for his team is one sentence, *“Do your job!”* By, *“Do your job,”* he means, if you are a left tackle on the team, do everything, absolutely everything, a left tackle must do to be prepared for a game and for a season of games, e.g., be at all practices and meetings on time, do

your film study of next weeks' opposing tackle and team, do all the hours of physical workouts and physical therapy needed to be in shape to play your best, and do not worry about other people's jobs, trust they will also *do their jobs* properly. From the moment a player signs a contract with Belichick's team and enters the practice facility to the moment before he goes onto the playing field he is surrounded by signs reading, "*Do your job.*"

How vapid those signs would be if Belichick were not on hand doing his job and *only* his job for fifteen hours a day, seven days a week, e.g., if he were out pontificating to the media on matters other than football. No one puts in the time Belichick does trying to make his group successful in reaching its goal. Leadership by example instills imitation. Perhaps two very telling notes are those on the importance he places on each person doing his job and sacrificing whatever has to be sacrificed to do it well, so that every group member can have full confidence that every other group member is doing his job. For, knowing that all are on the same page and on it giving a 100% is essential for group coherence, conviction and the individual's personal persevering commitment to do whatever it takes to do one's job well and achieve his and his teammates' chosen goal.

The telling notes are as follows, and they are certainly not meant to validate Belichick's draconian disciplinary approach for achieving his end. First, Bill Belichick removed from the team a player who was regarded as one of the very best in the league at his position after only a year, costing the team about six million dollars, because the player either could not do his job or refused to do it; Second, a player who had scored a remarkable four touchdowns on Sunday but who was late for the Monday morning team meeting to go over Sunday's mistakes, even though Belichick's team easily won on Sunday, was fined and never played in another game for Belichick's team that year or any other year. Neither player lost any salary that was due to him under his contract.

Does it not seem probable to the point of certainty that if Belichick changed his mind and his *modus operandi* and became a laid-back 9–5 football coach, continually making the media talk-show rounds pontificating on football but also on all other varieties of issues, his, "*Do your job*" motto would soon become a mere repetitious sound bite like, "No more war. War never again?" As the leader changes, so does the imitation of the leader change as well as his follower's conviction that he knows what he is talking about, regardless of how many inspiring talks he gives them. "*Do as I say, not as I do,*" is the most improvised form of leadership. If the leader changes, the group he or she is leading changes. It is a human propensity to say and believe, "*What is good for the goose is good for the gander.*" If a particular type of human behavior is good for one person, it should be good for another.

It is my seriously considered opinion that the Petrine Ministry, and indeed the entire operation of the institutional Roman Catholic Church Episcopacy, has run tragically amuck, because for a long, long, long time the pope and the bishops have not been satisfied with simply *doing their job*—the little job, that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit assigned to them. And, to religiously validate their disobedience rather than be repentant for their disobedience and that of their predecessors they have set up an incestuous intellectual and psychological Petrine petri-dish nurturing structure that will insure that no one will be selected pope or bishop who is not a clone of those who made him a pope or a bishop. This means that today and for hundreds of thousands of yesterdays only a clone of someone who is not *doing the job* he was commissioned for by Jesus and has no moral qualms regarding his disobedience will be a Pope or a Bishop under the present method of operating in the Roman Catholic Church. Even a perfunctory knowledge of Church history over the last 1700 years will expose the terrible and tragic consequences to the People of God for this structural

institutionalization of Popes and Bishops who are not content with doing the little job, the little service to the Church, committed to them by Jesus.

*(To be continued)*

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part II—

#### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

Contrary to the reigning mythology about Catholic popes and bishops, they are not doing their job and have not been for a long time. To understand the truth and tragedy of this sentence, it first must be stated what the job of bishops is, for without this information it cannot be determined whether bishops are doing their job or not. In fact, as opposed to the myths and PR that have arisen around bishops, bishops have a particularized job description, which was given to them by Jesus Himself. It is precisely set forth in Jesus' Great Apostolic Commission in MT 28:16-20 to the Apostles, who are the predecessors of the College of Bishops and hence of all legitimate bishops.

*Now the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain to which Jesus had directed them. When they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came and said to them, 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you. And remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age (MT 28:16-20).*

That is a straightforward statement of the extent and limits of what Jesus is assigning bishops to do for Him, for the Church and for humanity. It contains two tasks: The first is to make disciples and Baptize them. The second is to teach the Baptized to obey all that Jesus has commanded. Admittedly, this *all* has to include for bishops Jesus' invitation to "*Follow me,*" and to obey His "*new commandment,*" while they are teaching others to obey what Jesus taught. In Jesus' life both the word and the deed are teaching instruments and they are logically and morally consistent with each other, e.g. "*Love your enemies*" is taught by word in the Sermon on the Mount and "*love you enemies*" is taught by deed on Golgotha: "*Father, forgive them for they know not what they do.*"

It is this consistency of word and deed, this willingness to trust and live what one is telling others to trust and live that allows people to say of Jesus, "He teaches with authority." Do as I say and not as I do was not the pedagogy of Jesus and is not the pedagogy He commissioned the Apostles and their successors to employ when "*teaching them to obey all that I have commanded you.*" They are not to teach like the Pharisees and if they ever did teach like the Pharisees, it would be a tragedy—not a perennial, in-house, self-exculpating joke—because they would not be doing their job, which is participation in the salvation of all humanity. They would not be obediently serving God, Jesus or the Church and would not be part of the process that serves the Father's Plan as proclaimed by Jesus for the eternal salvation of souls. The commission all bishops have received from Jesus is clear and uncomplicated—and limited.

Now that we know the specifics of the job description transmitted to all bishops by Jesus, we can conduct a rational and observational examination to determine if bishops have adhered to the job specifications that Jesus laid down and that they agreed to follow when they accepted the job. As far as the commission given to bishops to Baptize people, bishops have done their job. On paper, and there is no reason not to accept what is on paper on this matter, there are now between one and two billion Catholics on the planet at this moment. But as far as teaching the Baptized to obey all that Jesus has commanded, which is the part of the job specs expressly given to bishops by Jesus, this has

largely been ignored since the Fourth Century. Bishops have taught, but what they have taught is not all that Jesus taught and commissioned them to teach, indeed, much of what they have taught by word and deed is the logical opposite of what Jesus taught. What power would move bishops to engage in such a defiant and irrational choice is difficult to fathom, since what they are refusing to teach or what they are altering is *the* revelation of the will of God as communicated by God Himself, God Incarnate, for the purpose of the eternal salvation of souls, for the eternal salvation of all humanity.

Christianity is an historical religion. Christianity bases its claim on facts of history it asserts as true. If these are demolished, Christianity is nothing but another esoteric, abstract religious mind-game, a mythology conjured-up to cope with evil, suffering, death and fear. But, Christianity is not this. Christianity identifies as historical truth the Jesus of history with His life's history of words and deeds and with His death in a particular manner, time and place as stated in the Four Gospels. Historical truth and faith are inextricably united in the Good News proclaimed by Jesus Christ. This means that interfering with, altering or ignoring the historical truth of Jesus as presented in the Gospels is immoral.

*“It is common knowledge that among all the Scriptures, even those of the New Testament, the Gospels have a special pre-eminence, and rightly so, for they are the principal witness of the life and teaching of the Incarnate Word, our Savior.*

*The Church has always held and continues to hold that the Four Gospels are of Apostolic origin. For what the Apostles preached in fulfillment of the commission of Christ, afterwards they themselves and apostolic men, under the inspiration of the divine Spirit, handed on to us in writing, the foundation of faith, namely the Four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.*

*The Church has firmly and with absolute constancy held and continues to hold, the Four Gospels just named, whose historical character the Church unhesitatingly asserts, faithfully hand on what Jesus Christ, while living among men, really did and taught for their eternal salvation until the day He was taken up into heaven. After the Ascension of our Lord the apostles handed on to their hearers what He had said and done. They told the honest truth about Jesus. For their intention (Lk 1:2-4) was that people may know the truth about those matters in which we have been instructed” (VATICAN II, DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON DIVINE REVELATION, 18,19).*

To say, as some have, that Jesus of Nazareth never existed is not a statement of faith. It is a statement concerning history. It must be challenged and shown to be true or false by historical evidence, not by theological arguments. To say that Jesus of Nazareth rejected violence and enmity and taught a love of neighbor that includes love of the neighbor who is the enemy—even the lethal enemy—is not a faith statement. It is a statement of historical fact based on the historical evidence that exists about Jesus of Nazareth. The dean of Catholic Biblical scholars in the mid-twentieth century, the late Rev. John L. McKenzie, confirms this historical truth about Jesus when he unambiguously states, *“If Jesus did not reject any type of violence for any purpose, then we know nothing of him...No reader of the New Testament, simple or sophisticated, can retain any doubt of Jesus’ position toward violence directed to persons, individual or collective, he rejected it totally.”* One of, if not the most respected Biblical scholar researching and writing in the twenty-first century on the historical Jesus, the Catholic priest Rev. John Meier, in his magisterial four volume, twenty-five years in the writing, *A MARGINAL JEW*, and after thirty-two pages of analysis and explication (p. 528-551) says that nowhere in the huge amount of material that ancient parallels provide, in the Old Testament or in intertestamental writings

“do we find the terse, direct, disturbing command, ‘*Love your enemies.*’ This command goes back to Jesus...We award it the “palm of authenticity.” No ecumenical councils, no infallible papal documents, no consensus of theologians is needed to authenticate this as the truth. It is a historically verifiable truth and fact about Jesus of Nazareth, whether He is thought to be the Messiah and God Incarnate or just another guy from Nazareth.

When Jesus commissions His Apostles and by theological extension bishops to “*teach them to obey all that I have commanded you,*” He is giving them a job description that requires that they present history truthfully. What Jesus taught is a matter in the historical record, whether one believes it is the Will of God and the Way to eternal life or outright foolishness. Whether one desires to spend his or her life teaching what Jesus taught is a personal decision rooted in faith. But what Jesus taught is not. That is known history. If a person chooses to take a job to teach what Jesus taught, whether he or she is doing their job can be evaluated quite easily because what Jesus historically taught does not change from day to day or from place to place. For better or for worse it is what it is as recorded in the Four Gospels.

If a person were to teach the opposite of what Jesus taught, he or she would be teaching the opposite of what the historical record shows that Jesus taught. He or she would be teaching historical untruth as the truth of the historical Jesus. A waterfall of justifications based on faith or on philosophical speculations about what is the good, the true and the beautiful and what is “realistic” could be offered for doing this, but none of them could change the fact that this is proclaiming an illusionary Jesus who never existed in history teaching what is being said He taught.

If a pope or any other bishop is not adhering to the explicit commission given to the Apostles and hence the bishops by Jesus and is not “*teaching them to obey all that I have commanded you,*” the response to such a dereliction of divine duty is not to ask why is he doing this. The response on the part of everyone in the Church, including all other bishops, should be Paul’s response to Peter at Antioch, “*I opposed him to his face because he was clearly wrong*” (GAL 2:11). It should be to tell such a bishop or bishops in no uncertain terms to stop doing it—to do the job Jesus assigned to him or them, or else get out of the episcopal ministry.

Two questions: Where in Jesus’ Great Commission to the Apostles, and hence to Bishops, does He even hint at giving them, directly or indirectly, a commission to employ, personally or through surrogates, the power of violence, the power to hurt or harm any human being, Christian or non-Christian? Where in the Apostles’ job description given by Jesus, and hence in the bishops’ job descriptions, is there any explicit or implicit suggestion that they are called to or that they are permitted to rule the Christian community or assembly by creating institutional structures that require violence in order to exist and in order to function?

*(To be continued)*

EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part III—

#### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

An institution is a humanly created means to achieve an end. All the activities within it are designed by human beings to reach that end. An institution is like a hammer. It is a tool devised by humans to do a job. But, the hammer in order to do the job for which it was developed, e.g., put a nail in a piece of wood, must be employed according to its own intrinsic logic. The handle is held and the head of the hammer hits the top of the nail. To use a hammer contrary to its own logic, for example, to hold the head of the hammer and hit the side of the nail with the handle, is to misuse the tool and render it ineffective to achieve the end for which it was created. Once the tool is chosen its intrinsic logic must be obeyed.

So also, is the case with the means or the tool called an institution. Each institution is set up to achieve an end by employing specific means within the institution that are logically ordered to that end. To join an institution, whether as president or janitor, is to agree to use the means that the institution, the tool, requires to achieve its purpose for existing. A person does his or her job by obeying the logic of the institution's structure. If for example, a person joins the institution of the army, whether as a general or as a buck private, he or she knows the means that an army uses to achieve the end for which it was created, namely, victory in war. It kills people and makes people suffer. That being the case, George Patton is the person you want leading your army into battle, not Jesus Christ. Why? Because Patton can do the job that the institution of the army was built to do, namely, kill enemies—and Jesus cannot.

The choice of Patton is logically necessary because while a tank is a proper means for the institution of the army to have and to use to achieve its ends, a tank cannot kill and maim without a human mind operating it. Therefore, the human mind that is needed to do the job of operating a tank as a means for the institution of the army to accomplish its end is a killer-mind, a mind that will kill enemies, indeed kills them *en masse*, to achieve victory. This is not the mind of the Jesus of the Gospels who rejects violence and taught love of enemies, as He loved His enemies. Thomas Aquinas notes that means that cannot achieve their ends are illusions. The mind of Christ is an illusionary means for accomplishing what the institution of the army is constructed to accomplish. Jesus Christ cannot do the job, which any army would demand of Him. A tank operated by Jesus would have no kill power. Parenthetically, this is why military training is not only about teaching young people how to kill but also is equally about nurturing them into a killer's mind. Without military training drilling the killer mind into young recruits, most could not do their job in the army. The gun in their hand or the tank under their control would be a waste of military equipment.

The required consistency between the end for which an institution is created and the means the institution uses to accomplish that end, as well as, the job that someone who joins that institution is required to do raises the eternal life and death question as to whether the means adopted by the bishops of the institutional Catholic Church to achieve the purpose for which the Church was created are real or illusionary? This in turn raises the question whether the job the bishops are doing is operationally in the service of the commission Jesus really gave them or in the service of some illusionary idea of what a bishop and a Church should be?

Again, Jesus commissioned His Apostles and their successors to “*go and make disciples of all people,*

*Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to obey all that I have commanded you.*” This is the purpose or end for which Jesus founded His *ecclesia*, assembly or church, for this is the Way by which souls are saved, by which all humanity enters into Eternal Life, Eternal Communion with God. Therefore, it is a logical, moral and spiritual necessity that the means that the bishops of the institutional Catholic Church adopt to do this job be consistent with and not contradictory to the “*teaching*” that they have been commanded by Jesus to follow and to teach all the Baptized to obey. People are not taught to obey and live what Jesus taught and commanded by their bishops morally justifying that they do not have to obey and live what Jesus taught and commanded.

What is not being spoken of here is the personal sinfulness of bishops. There are no bishops who are not sinners, as there are no Christians who are not sinners. Jesus forgives any sin of any bishop who repents, just as He forgives any sin of any Christian who repents. He does this so that they can go forward in their lives obeying and living with vigor what He commanded them to obey and live for their welfare and for the welfare and the salvation of all human beings. *What is being spoken of in this article is calling the logical opposite of what Jesus taught “good” and then structurally institutionalizing it as the modus operandi, i.e. incarnational teaching, of the institutional Church.*

What are the chances that once a person enters, e.g. by infant Baptism, an institutional Church that justifies and requires the use of violence to operate, that he or she is going to proclaim by word and deed Jesus’ teaching of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies as the Way, the only Way, to live and to do God’s will. The probabilities of that person, so doing are statistically near zero, and they do not improve much above that if the person enters the Church as an adolescent or adult from a secular society rife with violence and its justification.

Now, suppose this person, whose consciousness and conscience are now well cemented by the Church and by the state in the moral acceptability of violence and its justification for Christians, were to become a branch manager of a segment of the institutional Church, e.g., a diocese? What are the chances when running his segment of the institutional Church that he would embrace a *modus operandi* different from the moral acceptability of violence in which he has been thoroughly neurologically hardwired by Church, state and culture? The chances are again statistically near zero. What are the probabilities if God Himself in the flesh made it clear, in writing, that the way in which this bishop had been morally hardwired and the manner in which his episcopal mentors and peers were ruling the institutional Church were incompatible with the Way He taught, would this bishop do other than adhere to the company’s way of doing business? Again, the chances are near zero that he would do other than “go along and get along.”

If he were to change his *modus operandi* in leading his diocese in order to align it with the teachings that the Church’s Founder said should be obeyed, he would be quickly marginalized and rendered effete by his fellow branch managers within the institution. Why? Because, a humanly constructed institution, whose method of operation depends on the use of coercive violence and whose fallback position is always violence—if it has enough power to get away with it—would be utterly discredited if its own leaders, who were justifying and using violence daily under one cover or another, e.g., euphemisms, Canon Law, serpentine theologies, were exposed by one of their own as doing the opposite of what their Founder, God Incarnate, taught as the Way His Apostles and disciples should live if they wanted to do the job they were assigned in the Church.

Two decades ago I sent an article to a Catholic journal on St. Edith Stein, the Carmelite nun and

philosopher who on August 9, 1942 was killed by Baptized Catholic and Lutheran Germans who operated the human slaughterhouse at Auschwitz. The article focused on Edith Stein being not only a martyr of the Church but also a prophet to the institutional Church regarding the evil consequences that have resulted from its long history of using and justifying violence as a way of following Jesus. The editor of the journal, a member of a religious order, thought the article acceptable except for one section, which I summarized with the sentence, *“Mainline and Evangelical Church leaders and their congregations do not want to live without the power of homicidal violence.”* The editor objected vigorously saying that he did not know about other Christian denominations but that this certainly was not true of the Catholic Church. After a brief response from me—which amounted to a look at the facts of the institutional Catholic Church’s historical record today and since the days of Constantine—communication ceased and the article was never published.

All major institutions, political, economic, religious, etc., struggle ferociously to keep the enormity and depth of their dark history of violence and its repulsive consequences under wraps as far as it is within their power to do so. They work diligently to hide, obscure and minimize the spiritual, moral and political, personal and social, atrocities that are the consequences of their justification and employment of violence. This is accomplished not only by withholding information on a massive scale but also by intentional deception.

These major institutions methodically nurture this ignorance among their memberships in order to keep them loyal to a particular political, economic or religious system and its leadership. For, if people knew how the system really operated and how the controllers of the system really operated and what really were the consequences in terms of suffering and death that the particular system has brought about, their loyalty to the system and its ruling personnel would be withdrawn.

Otto von Bismarck, President of Prussia, once remarked, *“There are two things that ordinary people should never know: how their sausages are made and how their laws are made.”* Why? Because, both processes are so vile that ordinary people would stop buying sausages and would stop buying the lies of their leaders. So, noxious are the dark sides of sausage making and law making, as well as of major wealthy political, economic and religious institutions in general, that they must be hidden and the sausages and the laws and the institutions wrapped in attractive packages for public consumption in order to maintain allegiance to the “product,” and indifference to the shrouded means employed to produce it. So intensely do major institutions—political, economic and religious—nurture the ignorance necessary for them to retain their membership’s loyalty that even if their product brings great suffering and death into the lives of their loyalist and the lives of their loved ones, they will continue to swear by its “goodness.” They will even serve the “product,” and by extension the *modus operandi* that created it, to others as something “good” at the funeral of a dear one who was killed by it and by the deceptions needed to sell it as “good.”

So, before one can evaluate whether or not a bishop is doing the job assigned to him by Jesus it must be determined, as previously noted, what the job is that a bishop has been commissioned by Jesus to do. Then, it must be determined whether it is possible to do that job within the logical requirements of the humanly designed aspects of the institutional Church.

*(To be continued)*

—Emmanuel Charles McCarthy

## DO YOUR JOB

### —PART IV—

#### Pope Francis' WORLD DAY OF PEACE MESSAGE AD 2017

In his WORLD DAY OF PEACE MESSAGE for 2017 Pope Francis states, “*To be true followers of Jesus today also includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.*” This is a fine example of a bishop being what a bishop is commissioned to be by Jesus (MT 28:19). He is teaching the disciples of Jesus “*to obey all that I have commanded you.*”

He is not teaching some idea from some philosophy about the nature of nature and its ethical implications, nor does he go on to say what Jesus gave him no commission to say, that is, how he will punish or use violence against, those who do not follow the truth he is teaching them about being a true follower of Jesus. There is no threat of torture, or burnings at the stake, or denial of the Eucharist, or imprisonment, or excommunication, or censure. He simply proclaims, “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.*”

The truth of Jesus, the truth of His Gospel, is simply placed before the disciples of Jesus by Francis. They in their freedom are called to follow it, to be true followers of Jesus—followers of the Truth. In their freedom, one or many may refuse to follow, but no coercive violence of any type will be used to make them be true followers of Jesus and His truth. The bishop, in this case the Bishop of Rome, who is also the Petrine Minister in the Church, teaches Baptized disciples of Jesus to obey what Jesus commanded, thereby not only doing his job as a bishop (MT 28:19) but also doing his job as the successor of Saint Peter (JN 21:15-17).

But, for the Pope to state in the most public of forums, “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence,*” has incarnational consequences, since nonviolence by definition deals with human acts of thought, word and deed. For example, it self-evidently means a Catholic cannot continue to be in ROTC since this program includes learning how to kill and maim people by violence, which is the opposite of nonviolence. If he or she were to continue in such a program, they would cease “*to be true followers of Jesus.*” Or say, if a Catholic University were to have an ROTC program it would have to drop it or else it would be teaching its students not “*to be true followers of Jesus,*” and its reason for being a Christian university would evaporate and it would be nothing more than Harvard or Michigan State Universities.

These are but a couple of examples from untold numbers of instances where a change of mind (*metanoia*) and a change of behavior will need to take place in light of this unambiguous public Papal declaration that “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.*” Catholic homes, Catholic schools, Catholic journalism, Catholic religious education, Catholic media, Catholic seminaries, if they are not already teaching that “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence,*” must begin to so teach.

Outdoor bulletin boards of Catholic Churches should now display this ancient but long forgotten truth of the Catholic faith: “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.*” Priests and deacons who previously had been reluctant or resistant to even mention the word nonviolence in relationship to Jesus and discipleship in their homilies, should now feel totally comfortable in enthusiastically proclaiming it whenever they preach on Jesus and/or on being a faithful disciple of Jesus. Catholic bishops should now feel the glorious freedom of being children of God and to be able to oversee with joy the process of making this

truth known to every Christian in their diocese, while spiritually helping those who find it difficult to understand and/or accept as a requirement for being a “*true follower of Jesus.*” Of course, the tragic consequence of bishops, priests and deacons not now informing their people that “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence*” would be that their people and they themselves would be false followers of Jesus giving false witness about Jesus.

Every Catholic has his and her role to play in resurrecting this ancient Gospel truth regarding true discipleship from the grave of Christian non-awareness in which it was buried by history and by befogged, and perhaps even bedeviled minds. Encouraging, by every loving, nonviolent means conceivable that—bishops, priests, deacons, religious brothers and sisters, religious education directors, diocesan newspapers, as well as, national Catholic newspapers and magazines—teach with Pope Francis, “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence*” is now an essential task for the laity. I think we all realize, that unless each of us works energetically, according to his or her means and gifts, to prompt and urge, to buoy up and motivate the Catholics in charge of these various avenues of communication in our local Churches, Pope Francis’ declaration on being a “*true follower of Jesus*” will be dispatched to the graveyard of “non-existent non-thoughts” in the local and universal Church. A grace has been bestowed upon every Christian and the entire Church when Pope Francis professed and confessed, “*To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.*” But, those on whom this grace has been given must act on it, must do their job in proclaiming it in word and deed, in order for it to achieve its purposes—which are to renew the face of the earth and to bring eternal salvation to all people—no exceptions.

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

FEAST OF THE THEOPHANY, AD 2017

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part V—

#### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

*“To be true followers of Jesus includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.”* So, proclaimed Pope Francis on January 1, 2017 in a globally distributed Papal document. Popes have given lip service to peace and justice platitudes to no end over the centuries, and in recent times have even had a supportive word to say for the option of nonviolence. However, to the best of my knowledge a Pope has never said, since the days before Constantine, that embracing Jesus’ teaching of nonviolence is not optional, but rather is essential, to being a true follower of Jesus. This is an extraordinary statement and moment in the Church. Yet, to date I have not heard, nor heard of, a single sermon being given at a Mass by a bishop, priest or deacon on this Papal teaching. I have not seen nor heard of a single commentary on this extraordinary declaration by the Pope in a single diocesan newspaper or in a single Catholic magazine.

If the Pope means what his words self-evidently say, namely, that the only way to be a true follower of Jesus is to embrace—which means to accept and to struggle to live—His teaching on nonviolence, the implications of this for the institutional Catholic Church and for individual Catholics are seismic and sweeping. The institutional Catholic Church and at least 95% of all Catholics today live in a religious consciousness and with a conscience that violence and war can be activities in which they are morally permitted to engage when called upon by the state to do so, or at other times. Pope Francis’ January 1, 2017 statement eliminates participation in violence from the domain of being a morally permissible choice for a Catholic or for the institutional Catholic Church. It closes down Catholic Just War Theory in any of its iterations as a morally permissible option for Catholics. Nonviolence as an essential element of true discipleship represents an about face, a tectonic alteration of the content of Catholic consciousness, conscience and behavior from the thoughts, words and deeds that found their moral approval in what was called Catholic Just War Theory.

Whatever else nonviolence may mean in the person, teaching and life of Jesus, it means rejecting the use of violence without reservation, without any “ifs,” “ands” or “buts.” Nonviolence with a “but” in its definition is simply justified violence. The person who says, *“I am nonviolent, but if Albania is set to attack the U.S. with nuclear weapons, I am not going to wait to use violence against it until I wake up and find a mushroom cloud in my backyard,”* is simply articulating the point at which he or she will justify the use of violence. That “but-point” may be different for different people, however, it is axiomatic and glaring that nonviolence with a “but” is not logically or practically nonviolence and is certainly not embracing what Jesus taught as nonviolence by His words and deeds in the Gospels.

Suppose the Pope had taught in his January 1, 2017 message, *“To be true followers of Jesus includes receiving Holy Communion only on the tongue and not in the hand?”* If he had written that, the pulpits of the Catholic Church would be ablaze with admonitions telling Catholics this must be followed and informing them of the obvious behavioral consequences of it. Diocesan newspapers, Catholic magazines, religious education programs and other forms of Catholic

media would be glutted with information about what the Pope proclaimed pertaining to a requirement that must be met “*to be a true follower of Jesus.*”

Bishops, priests and deacons would be continually expounding with gusto on what the Pope taught about the manner of receiving Communion on the tongue and its relationship to being a true follower of Jesus—as well as the theology behind why receiving Communion in the hand was now absolutely forbidden in the Catholic Church. No Catholic after January 1 would dare to try to receive Holy Communion in the hand and every little Catholic child preparing for his or her First Holy Communion would be instructed with vigor that to even try to receive Communion in the hand would mean he or she was no longer a *true follower of Jesus* and therefore, *ipso facto*, would be receiving Holy Communion unworthily and hence committing a mortal sin. No amount of Church money or energy would be spared in order to make sure that this teaching of the Pope on being *a true follower of Jesus* entered into every nook and cranny of the Catholic Church world-wide and into every Catholic’s conscience.

Yet, when the Pope teaches, “*To be true followers of Jesus today also includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence,*” the response of bishops, priests and deacons is as if he had said nothing. Why? And, why will this continue to be the response of Catholic bishops, priests and deacons? There is a reason, a ‘why,’ for this silence. Chosen silence is a human act that communicates to others truth or falsehood, good or evil. Chosen silence serves some master. Will the answer to this ‘why’ disclose something good or something awful about the institutional Church and its ruling personnel? Will the answer verify that bishops, priests and deacons are doing the job that Jesus commissions them to do or will it expose that they are doing the job that someone other than Jesus wants them to do?

*(To be continued)*

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part VI—

#### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

The skills and institutional organization required to effectively and to correctly do your job as a bishop and “*teach them (Baptized disciples of Jesus) to obey all that I have commanded you,*” are essentially different from the skills and the institutional organizational arrangement needed to properly and effectively do your job as a CEO of a corporation. At Harvard Business School, they do not teach people how to create organizational forms and structures that require following the teachings of Jesus in order to be effective. They do not teach people how to be leaders of others in the model of Jesus, i.e., “*You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave*” (Mt 20:25; Lk 22:25; Mk 10:42). Harvard Business School teaches human being how to be corporate presidents, CEOs, etc., big shots calling the shots, i.e. using dominative power so that others must obey under the threat or fear of losing their livelihoods or worse.

The Church as a corporation is a corporation like any other and its makes not the slightest difference that it is a religious corporation. All corporations are creatures of the state and must follow the same legally mandated rules that require and/or permit the use of dominative power—violence—against human beings under certain circumstances. Failure to do so results in forced dissolution of the corporation, the state in charge of the distribution of whatever wealth it has and civil and criminal charges against its officers. Hence, it is not difficult to see why a “Christian” corporations, e.g. incorporated institutional Churches and their bosses would need to contort the clear teachings of Jesus, which reject all violence, into teachings that morally justify violence. Without this debasement and depreciation of the Nonviolent Jesus and His Way of Nonviolent love of friends and enemies, bishops could not be CEOs, let alone heads of states.

Beyond the normal avenues that CEOs secular corporations have of harming people who do not obey the corporate boss’ will—all of which avenues are available to and used by the Bishop-CEO— the corporate institutional religions, including Churches, have one special, extra-legal instrument for imposing their will by violence on others, namely, a God who will condemn a member of the faith to suffer temporal and/or eternal violence if institutional religious rulers and their rules are not obeyed. In institutional Christian Churches that are corporations, God or God Incarnate becomes their enforcer, who will pour never-ending suffering down on those who disobey the orders of the Bishops-CEOs of the institutional Churches. Formally, if a Catholic intentionally ate meat on Friday, Jesus would send him or her to hell. Presently, if a Catholic intentionally misses Mass on Sunday, Jesus will send him or her to hell. Oppose a Papal power grab and be excommunicate and sent to hell. This is not fiction. This is historical fact. At this moment, the Code of Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church, canons #1311–1399, deal with the penalties and punishments administered by the institutional Church and its rulers on fellow Catholics if institutionally created rules are not obeyed. All of these penalties and punishment it is held are ultimately backed up by Jesus’ violence in eternity.

It is not possible to “Do your job” as a bishop and simultaneously “Do your job” as head of a corporation or a state. Why? Every corporation, profit and non-profit, secular or religious requires the use of violence. If there is any corporation that does not require and legally legitimate the use of violence, I shall be glad to hear of it. If the legal head of a corporation happens to simultaneously be a bishop—whose commission from Jesus is “*teach them to obey all that I [Jesus] have commanded you,*”—then we have a direct conflict of values, moral imperatives, choices and acts. The same is the case if a bishop is simultaneously head of state and head of government as is the Pope at this time. To be the ruler in a structure that integrally requires the use of violence to operate instantly renders nugatory any attempt to “*teach them to obey all that I have commanded you.*” Why? Because the institution itself and its leaders would be the immediately visible, self-evident contradiction of the truth they were proclaiming that others should live.

The ends of a corporation or state are not the ends of the Church of Jesus Christ. Therefore, the means chosen to achieve the ends for which a corporation or state exist cannot be the means a Church uses to achieve its ends. Yet century after century the Church and its bishops have chosen to mimic the institutions (means) used by secular businesses and states as its means for achieving the ends its was commissioned to achieve by Jesus.

A corporation or state cares not a jot about achieving the ends Jesus commissioned His Apostles (bishops) to achieve, namely, to “*teach them (Baptized Christians) to obey all that I have commanded you.*” So why should any Apostle (bishop) think that by mimicking John D. Rockefeller’s institutions or Caesar’s, which universally require the use of violence as a non-negotiable piece of their *modus operandi*, he could achieve the ends for which he was commissioned by Jesus? The adoption of secular forms and structures by the bishops to organize the institutional Church and operate it, *ipso facto*, requires the adoption of the logic of these forms and structures, the adoption of the logic by which secular institutions keep themselves in existence, namely, the logic of violence as their universal fallback option to insure order, efficacy and earthly survival.

The unbridgeable dissonance between ruling over such a structure and “*teaching them to obey all that I have commanded you,*” is stark and impossible to avoid, unless one chooses to not to see it—as most popes, bishops and Christians choose to do. That the bishop of the *ecclesia*, the assembly, the church is its leader is not in question here. The issue here is that a bishop cannot do his job, the job Jesus commissioned him to do, if he simultaneously is doing the job of CEO of a religious business or ruler of a state. The roles and demands of each office are incompatible logically and operationally. The episcopal office at present and for a long time in the past is an attempt to do the impossible, namely, to serve two masters with diametrically opposed means and ultimate ends, namely, to serve the corporation or the state and Jesus.

Christian moral theologies of justified violence are not only needed for states that have Christian populations living in them, populations that the bosses of those states want available to them to execute state violence when called upon, but Christian moral theologies of justified violence are also needed for morally validating the *modus operandi* of institutional churches constructed on the models of secular governmental and corporate organizations. The ultimate source of all alliances between the institutional church, big business and the state is that all are institutions

of dominant power, coercive violence, that need each other to continue to exist as such. The state needs the institutional Church to religiously validate its violence and to tell the Christians in its care that it is God's will that they join up to kill people when the local Grand Pooh-Bah calls upon them to do so. The institutional corporate Church needs the state to support its violence against its members and others who threaten its survival as a corporate institution. It is just the same old power and money game of one bloody hand washing the other bloody hand and thereby mutually absolving each other of the carnage they both leave behind.

The institutional Churches and their Bishops-CEOs use and dependence on violence, internal and external, their own and the state's, is so normalized today that it is all but invisible. It is just a taken-for-granted part of the Christian's and the institutional Church's life. No problem "exists" for either because no problem can be seen. And, what cannot be seen does not "exist" and is by that fact alone incapable of being morally evaluated in the light of Jesus' teaching—especially when Jesus' teaching of the Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies is just about as invisible to the average Christian as the institutional Church's utter dependence on violence.

In 1931 when Gandhi visited England he asked a Bishop why he was not instructing the Christians in his Church on the nonviolent teaching of Jesus, since he, the Bishop, must know from the Gospels that this is what Jesus taught? The Bishop responded with one of the tried and true, long standing episcopal evasions: "*My people are not ready for it.*" Gandhi replied: "*Bishop, are you sure it is your people who are not ready?*"

*(To be continued)*

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### PART VII

#### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

The leadership of an institutional Church possesses the option to create a Church as an organization structured on the teaching of Jesus or to create a Church as an organization structured on the model of a corporate bureaucratic business or on the model of a state. But, to choose the corporate model or the state model is to abdicate utterly the task of creating an institutional Church structured in conformity with the teachings of Jesus.

A person can be a bishop who is faithful to the commission given to him by Jesus or he can be a bishop CEO. He cannot simultaneously be both. A person can be a pope faithful to his ministry as bishop and as the successor of Saint Peter or he can be a pope head-of-state. He cannot simultaneously be both.

*“Jesus left no instructions on how his Church should be governed; he left instruction on how his Church should not be governed, and that is according to the model of secular power. As long as this corrupting influence is excluded he seems to have little interest in how the leaders of the Church were to exercise their leadership. Jesus commissioned the Church to find new forms and new structures for an entirely new idea of human association—a community of love”*

—Rev. John L. McKenzie, *AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH*, (*Imprimatur* 1966)

The above quotation pinpoints the single most all-pervading, deep-rooted, severe, longstanding and destructive episcopal dereliction of duty in the history of Christianity. Because of the corrupting influence of institutionalized secular power, the institutional Church and its rulers are absolutely impeded from proclaiming by word and deed what Jesus proclaimed by word and deed, namely, the Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies as an unalterable, nonnegotiable essential in the moral life of every Christian\*—as well as other teachings of His. From this primal dereliction of duty by bishops, a duty for which they were commissioned by Jesus, comes all just war theories, just capital punishment theories, just torture theories, just Inquisition theories, as well as, all the deceits and intrigues demanded by dominative power for the acquisition, preservation and enhancing of worldwide luxury wealth that runs into untold trillions of dollars. Luxury wealth can only be defended by the corrupting power of violence—the greater the wealth the great the structure of violence that must be in place to protect it.

To sustain any project that requires more than one person necessitates organizing the two or more people who are needed to make the project work into a logically ordered unit, organization or institution that can achieve the particular end desired. If an organization is formed to do carpentry, it does not hire astronomers to do the job. That would be illogical and would render the organization ineffective in relation to the purpose for which it exists. If an organization requires that a multiplicity of task be continuously done for it to be a means to achieve the objective that is the reason for its existence, then all of these tasks must be logically ordered so as to be in conformity with the organizations goal. Any intrinsic logical discrepancy between the end sought and the means the organization employs to reach that end must result, *de facto*, in the organization not achieving its purpose—although it still may achieve other ends.

The commission (MT 28:19-20) to a bishop(s) is to make disciples for Jesus, Baptizing them and teaching them to obey all that Jesus has commanded the Apostles to obey. This is not a complicated job description, nor is it one hard to understand. There is nothing in this commission that in any way suggest that a bishop has the right or the need to substitute the corrupt influence of the power of violence as an alternative for Christlike words and deeds. There is nothing in a bishop's commission to *teach them to obey all that I have commanded you* that necessitates or authorizes any bishop to substitute violence in any form for Christlike love (*agape*) against anybody for any reason—Christian or otherwise. When the Truth of the Gospel and Christlike love fail to bring a person to freely follow Jesus or fail to keep a person *a true follower of Jesus*, rules, laws and orders backed up by violence are no substitute.

There is nothing in a bishop's commission from Jesus that makes him a ruler in any sense in the Christian *ecclesia*, assembly, community, church. Jesus never refers to His Apostles as rulers nor does He call upon them to rule others. *"If Jesus had wished to say that those in authority in His Church should rule with justice and kindness, there are dozens of ways in which this could have been said. But such words as 'rule' are exactly the words he did not use,"* writes Rev. John L. McKenzie in *Authority in the Church*. Indeed, Jesus is most definite, telling His Apostles and their legitimate successors the very opposite regarding what their position is in the Christian community. He is explicit in excluding violence based on secular models of ruling power as a way of fulfilling the commission He gave them. *"Jesus called them (the Apostles) to Himself and said, 'You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It is not to be this way among you; whoever wishes to become great among you shall be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be your slave.'" "He said to them, 'The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them like to be called benefactors. But not so with you.'"*

Jesus is here warning the Apostles of the universal human problem of human beings who satisfy their lust for power and passion for prestige by joining the culture of professional religious bosses and bureaucrats. Jesus instructs His Apostles in no uncertain terms that there is no place in His Church for them—or anyone else—to satisfy or exercise their *libido domanandi*: *"Be on guard against the leaven of Herod"* (MK 8:15).

However, the pre-arranged institutional organization in which a person becomes a bishop has for most of Church history required that he not serve as Jesus his leader served but "serve" as the leaders of this world's political, financial, military, etc. institutions serve, namely, as a monarchical bishop employing secular and canonical violent power to get done what he wants done in that segment of the institutional Church, his diocese, which he rules.

The word monarch is derived from the Greek word *monarkhēs*, *monos* 'alone' + *arkhein* 'to rule'. As noted above, nowhere in the Gospels does Jesus use the word "rule" in relation to the ministry of the Apostles. Nowhere in the New Testament can one find a monarchical bishop. *"The institution of the monarchical episcopate, in which each Church is governed by a single bishop, does not appear in the New Testament,"* states Catholic Biblical scholar John L. McKenzie (DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, *Imprimatur*, 1965). The first monarchical bishop is St. Ignatius of

Antioch (d.108). He not only asserts himself to be a monarchical overseer, bishop, of the Christians in his area but he is also an active proselytizer for that understanding of the ministry of overseer within the *ecclesia*. He is a proselytizer for this understanding of the episcopacy because, beyond it not being the understanding in New Testament times, it was a disputed understanding of the ministry of overseer in the *ecclesia* at his time.

It takes no special psychological training to see the telltale signs of the corrupting influence of the *libido dominandi* creeping up on the ministry Jesus gave to His Apostles and their successors. And, it takes little historical awareness to see the terrible, all pervading, corrupting influence it has had upon the Church since it became a *de facto* and a *de jure* part of the organizational structure of the institutional Church. Its trickle-down effect has not only poisoned the episcopate with the leaven of Herod, the leaven of Caesar, the leaven of violent power, but also has been a toxic agent infecting just about every structural ministry in the institutional Church.

The issue here, however, is not one person or several persons being the overseer of a Christian community. The issue is the corrupting influence of violent, dominative power in the episcopal ministry—a power that is in no way needed to fulfill the commission Jesus gave to His Apostles, indeed a power that is hostile to the mission of Jesus and to the commission He gave to His Apostles and their successors. “*As long as this corrupting influence is excluded Jesus seems to have little interest in how the leaders of the Church were to exercise their leadership.*” Not only has this corrupting influence not been excluded from the *modus operandi* of the episcopacy and the Church, it has been institutionalized and normalized in the Church as a form of power a bishop possesses just by being bishop. It is the need to theologize and morally justify before the Christian community and the world the use of this type of power by bishops and the institutional Churches they rule that is the root of all the deceitful moral justifications of violence by Christians in history. It is the primary reason that Jesus’ teaching in the Gospels of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies has been anathema to bishops and calculatingly suppressed and squelched by every means available in the institutional Church for at least the last 1700 years.

However, the longevity of a falsehood does not convert it into a truth, and even less does the religious status of a person living a falsehood turn a falsehood into a truth.

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## **DO YOUR JOB**

### **—Part VIII—**

#### ***USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops***

The author of the note below is a practicing Catholic and retired military officer with combat experience in two wars. He is a highly intelligent searcher for truth and has read voluminously on all sides of the issues of Catholic Just War Theory and Jesus' teaching of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies. He, therefore, is well versed with the moral seriousness and nuances of what is theologically and practically involved here. He has concluded over time that the Jesus of the Gospels teaches to those who believe in Him a Way of nonviolence and love of enemies in imitation of Him. He is perplexed as to how his bishop and his Church can continue to justify Catholics participating in war. For over a year he sought a meeting with his bishop to discuss this issue. The following is the note he wrote to me after he met with the bishop.

Charlie,

My bishop finally agreed to meet with me. What I learned is that for him the ends justify the means and no amount of contradiction or obfuscation about the morality of war is too much to use when talking with a fellow Catholic when his beliefs are at stake. When he finally informed me that the meeting was over because I wouldn't listen and that my logic was poor I was quite sad. Not shocked, just sad.

I got the distinct impression that my "impudence" in questioning the validity of his logic and facts wasn't appreciated. I doubt that he would willingly debate me in public. The look on his face when I questioned his points let me know he understood his problems. We rarely stayed on a point for long, once it was lost because his facts or logic were flimsy. I asked him to explain how my points were illogical—his responses were like an authoritarian professor who is above explaining past his verdict.

Later, he described Gen Sherman's drive to the sea campaign as moral since it shortened the war!!! When I pointed out from my own detailed and scholarly knowledge of Sherman's March to the Sea that Sherman's armies targeted civilians for murder and rape, which in Catholic Just War Theory are morally grave and intrinsically evil acts, he looked at me as if I were naive. I've dealt with some pretty unsavory characters in my day as a military officer during two wars, but that is the lay of the land in war. I was not prepared to hear what came out of this bishop's mouth.

Fred

Is this bishop doing his job as a CEO and "protecting the brand" of the Roman Catholic Church, Inc.? Is he doing the job he was commissioned to do by Jesus (Mt 28:19-20)?

The following is another note I received from a Catholic man working diligently to stop the murdering of third world people, mostly innocent children, women and men, by US Predator Drones directed from Hancock Air Force Base in Syracuse, NY.

Hi Charlie,

I would not attempt to have a piece published in the Diocese of Syracuse publication. However, I noted on a Syracuse TV interview and in a letter to the editor that Bishop Cunningham met with some of us (before I went to Jamesville Penitentiary on a three-month sentence for the crime of a nonviolent die-in calling on our government to stop the killing by drones). The Bishop said to us (four Catholics and a former Catholic): “You all need to know that our use of drones keeps boots off the ground...besides, a lot of Catholics work at Hancock.”

Jack

Is this bishop doing his job as a CEO of the Roman Catholic Church, Inc. by protecting the cash flow from the government and the military into the coffers of the institutional Church and by protecting the flow of young Catholic boys and girls into the military? Is he doing the job he was commissioned to do by Jesus (MT 28:19-20)?

However, over the decades I have received scores of correspondences from Catholic Peace and Justice folks who have met with a bishop(s), formally or informally, who raised the issue of Gospel Nonviolence with him and received another type of response. It amounts to approximately the same answer that Cardinal Dolan gave to a Catholic friend of mine committed to nonviolence who presented him with the incontrovertible evidence of the Gospels that Jesus is nonviolent and that His Way is nonviolent. The Cardinal-CEO of the second wealthiest diocese in the world said, “I respect your choice and I will pray for you. But, I am a Just War Catholic.”

What is unsettling about this response and about all other similar responses given by a bishop(s) under similar circumstances, is that in most instances the Catholic NV peace and justice people and organizations found such a response acceptable and were often effusive that the bishop gave a certain amount of approbation or a tip-of-the-hat to Gospel Nonviolence! This is exactly the result that such bishops desire to evoke from individuals and groups committed to Gospel Nonviolence by this rhetorical strategy. It affords them the escape of not having to personally or publicly seriously dialogue about the truth and consequences of Jesus’ teaching in the Gospels, nor about the truth and consequence of Catholic Just War Theory.

“You believe in the Nonviolence of the Gospel and I believe in Catholic Just War Theory, case closed. Have a nice day.” Such bishops simply proclaim as the Gospel of Jesus Christ the logical and moral equivalent of the Gospel of Linus from the Peanuts comic strip, “All right, so you believe in Santa Claus, and I believe in the 'Great Pumpkin.' The way I see it, it doesn't matter what you believe just so you're sincere.” Then all parties are at peace, nothing changes, a moral teaching and its contradiction continue to be interchangeable as God’s will and Catholics continue, as they have for seventeen centuries, to go off by the tens of millions to train to kill or to kill untold numbers of people on the say-so of politicians, believing they are being true followers of Jesus.

“All right, so you believe in Santa Claus, and I believe in the 'Great Pumpkin.' The way I see it, it doesn't matter what you believe just so you're sincere,” as a valid interpretation and application of Jesus' Great Commission to bishops, “Teach them to obey all that I have commanded you,” is as phony as interpreting Jesus' command, “Love you enemies,” as meaning a Christian can slaughter his or her enemies or as phony as interpreting Jesus' New Commandment, “Love one another as I have loved you,” as meaning that a Christian can kill people on behalf of the Mafia, one's ethnic group (Greek, Irish, Romanian, French, Turkish, etc.), one's political organization, one's business, one's economy, one's religion, one's ideology, etc. and be “loving one another as Jesus has loved.”

Are individual Catholics and Catholic groups who believe that the Jesus of the Gospels teaches a Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies helping a bishop(s) do his job when they court his favor by silently acquiescing to the spiritual and moral validity of an episcopal teaching by word and deed that proclaims, “You go ahead and believe in Jesus' teaching in the Gospels of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies, and I'll believe and proclaim Catholic Just War Theory. We'll agree to disagree and will thereby have unity and peace in the Church?” Or, should they be vigorously, continuously and perseveringly pushing-back against it, denouncing it as grossly incompatible with the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels, as well as morally absurd. When nonviolent peace and justice Catholics and Catholic groups, implicitly or explicitly, communicated that bishops proclaiming that Catholic Just War Theory is an acceptable alternative to Gospel Nonviolence, they are aiding and abetting the most cunningly serpentine and destructive untruth that has ever burrowed itself into the institutional Church blighting Christian souls and lives *en masse* for centuries?

I have watched for decades various groups and associations inside and outside the institutional Church—Marian groups, Charismatic groups, military groups, political groups, peace and justice groups. Etc.—curry favor with Catholic CEO- bishops by fawning in various ways, including monetary largesse, over any bishop who would give the group the time of day. But such unctuous activity cannot and must not be part of the modus operandi of any person, group or association committed to proclaiming Jesus' Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies as the truth of the Gospels if the fawning includes the debasing of human integrity by violating the principle of non-contradiction and the “bad faith” Christian acceptance of Catholic Just War Theory as morally equivalent to or as morally a substitute for God's saving will as revealed by Jesus in the Gospels.

It is imperative that those persons and groups committed to the truth of Jesus' Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies keep in the forefront of their minds that the person who is in the ministry of bishop is merely another human being subjected to the consequences of the Fall and therefore his eternal salvation must be of primary concern if we encounter him. The office neither sanctifies the man nor makes the man. Permitting someone to believe he is doing the right thing by equating or substituting Catholic Just War Theory for Jesus's antithetical teaching in the Gospels of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies is not an acceptable strategy for procuring a bishop(s) name on an organization's letterhead or for acquiring or maintaining his approval, respect or praise. It is a failure of that love and truth, which the Nonviolent Logos of God Incarnate teaches by word and deed, is the saving power of God in this world.

Tolerance applies only to persons, never to verifiable untruth. Intolerance applies only to verifiable untruth, never to persons. If a person is telling people to jump from the 52<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Empire State Building because it will not harm them, it is both anti-human and anti-Gospel to try to ingratiate oneself to him by the lie of morally equating jumping out of the window on the fifty-second floor with its logical opposite, i.e. not jumping out of the window on the fifty-second floor, or by saying that jumping is a valid moral alternative to not jumping. Likewise, it is anti-human and anti-Gospel for Christians and Christian groups committed to the truth of Jesus' teaching of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies to cultivate being in the cultural good graces of a bishop(s) by pandering to his holding that Catholic Just War Theory is logically compatible with or derivable from or a substitute for anything that Jesus ever said or did in the Gospels. To choose one way as the truth of the will of God for a Christian is to totally abdicate the other, logically and incarnationally—and Jesus gave no Apostle, no disciple, no follower the right or permission to substitute the way of violence and enmity for the Way of Nonviolent Love in imitation of Him.

If those, who believe that Jesus is their Lord, God and Savior and that He teaches a Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies for those on whom He has bestowed the gift of faith, do not help a bishop(s) do his job by explicitly informing him as long and as often as is necessary to stop explicitly and/or implicitly teaching Catholic Just War Theory as a way compatible with authentically following Jesus, who will? Any time a Catholic or a Catholic group or association committed to the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels gives a bishop a pass who says, “I respect your choice and I will pray for you. But, I am a Just War Catholic. You go your way and I’ll go mine,” he, she or they are not doing their job. Personal or institutional Church unity and/or peace purchased by explicitly or implicitly acquiescing to a falsification of the teaching of Jesus is the unity and peace brought into existence by handing a life or an institutional Church over to some spirit other than the Holy Spirit, who is the “Spirit of Truth” (JN 16:13, 14:17; 1JN 5:6).

*(To be continued)*

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part IX—

#### *USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops*

To paraphrase an old saying, “*The only organizations that hide things are organizations with things to hide.*” It is generally recognized what is most secretive in an institution is what is most dangerous to those who live within its jurisdiction or scope of influence. The institutional Catholic Church keeps an iron curtain around the processes by which bishops are selected and by which popes are elected. The Vatican keeps an iron grip on the keys to its archives, because if Catholics became aware of the atrocities large and small that have emanated from institutionalizing the Church as a form of organization that requires and justifies the use of violent dominative power against Catholics and non-Catholics alike, they would be outraged and cry out that this way of structuring the institutional Church ended. But the damage, physical, moral and spiritual, done to human beings by an institutional Church that has for over a millennium and a half adopted the model of violent secular power structures as its organizational blueprint is for the most part kept hidden from the public in the off-limits Vatican Archives.

True what modern secular history has exposed about the continuous and monstrous atrocities, large and small, that are the product of organizing the institutional Catholic Church around a principle that Jesus Himself rejects—violence—is substantial and significant. But it is a drop in the historical bucket in terms of the immensity of physical, moral and spiritual harm that this manner of organizing the institutional Church has brought down on Catholics and others. And to make matters infinitely worst, it has all been morally justified by the Bishop-CEOs as necessary for carrying out Jesus’ commission to His Apostles and Jesus’ mission of eternal salvation to all humanity.

What arrant nonsense! Nothing, absolutely nothing, that Jesus commissions His Apostles (bishops) to do and nothing, absolutely nothing, the Church must do to be an extension of Christ and His mission in time and space requires the use of violence internal or external to the institutional Church. Whatever requires the use of violence to succeed is not something that is needed to fulfill the commission Jesus gives to the Apostles and is not something needed for pursuing and implementing the mission Jesus gives the Church. To say as I have heard so many bishops and priests say, “*The Church needs wealth and secular (violent dominative) power to carry out its work for Christ in the world,*” is to speak a falsehood. It absolutely does not need such means. Indeed, such means obstruct and hobble the Church from serving Catholics and all human beings, as Jesus desires they be served.

In the world—*world* used here in the pejorative sense—men and women of great secular (violent dominative) power do not voluntarily relinquish it. It has to be taken from them by people who have access to a greater power of violence. A Christian who believes that the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels who teaches a Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies is the Messiah and God Incarnate cannot use violent power to wrest the power of violence from the hands of those who have it in the Church or in the state. To try to do so would make the Christian a living witness against his or her own professed truth, namely, that the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels

is the Messiah and God Incarnate. But, a Christian who believes in the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels cannot just sit on his or her hands and do nothing while gross untruth is being propagated far and wide as the truth of Jesus. Since in everyday consciousness silence gives consent, the Christian who believes in the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels, who says with Peter, “*Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life,*” (Jn 6:68) cannot merely standby as his or her fellow Christians, regardless of rank in the institutional Church, teach that the opposite of what Jesus taught as the truth of Jesus, saying in effect that they “*have the words to eternal life.*” This would not only be complicity in false witness, it would also be cowardliness and an absence of personal human integrity in relations to the most important matter confronting each human being and all humanity—his or her future beyond death and its relationship to his or her choices in life before death.

The history of Christian men imprisoning themselves in an institution whose logic requires that they use violence against their fellow Christians is long, continuous, sorrowful and tragic. A bishop to be a bishop must choose to accept the offer of the power of the kingdoms of the world to be a bishop of an institution, a diocese, that has as part of its *modus operandi* violence in various forms. At times in Church history there has been a shortage of priests here or there for one reason or another. But, the lines to become a bishop have always stretched around the block. And, why not? The *libido dominandi*, the lust for power, the lust to rule others, is one of the all-pervading consequences of the Fall and hence is a temptation that any man or woman may have to face in small matters or in large.

The Church is an institution with its own instruments of violence—Canons #1311-1399 of the Code of Canon Law deal with the penalties and punishments administered by the Church on fellow Christians. It also has total access to the state’s instruments of violence. Having the power to call upon call on God’s violence and the state’s violence is the *libido dominandi’s* dream scenario. The state, the Church and a violent “God” to morally approve of the state’s and Church’s violence is an unmatched troika of violence for the unleashed *libido dominandi* to have at its disposal. The possibility of achieving controlling dominative power in such an institution as the Church must cause certain personality types to salivate psychologically and to be willing to make any sacrifice of self or of others to become king of the hill in the Christian *ecclesia*. A monarchical bishop in an institution organized around wealth and the willingness to employ violence cannot carry out Jesus’ commission to “*teach them to obey all that I have commanded you.*”

The contrived theology beneath all of this, which allows for a collective episcopal pseudo-peace on mind among monarchical bishops ruling Church institutions constructed in imitation of secular models of dominance institutions, e.g. states, corporations, is summed up in the Christian Orwellianism, “*To dominate is to sever.*”

In his homily at his first episcopal ordinations as Pope, Francis said to the newly ordained bishops, “*Keep in mind that you were selected to serve, not to dominate.*” This is exactly what Jesus teaches in the Gospels. It is a clarion warning that the evil called the *libido dominandi*, the lust for power, the lust to rule others, never ceases to lurk in the psyche of the one who leads in a Christian community.

Now, what the Pope Francis said is incontestably Gospel truth. The problem is this is coming from someone who is the last absolute political dictator of a recognized state (Vatican City State) on earth, one who has absolute dominative jurisdictional, executive, legislative and juridical power over every aspect of the institutional Catholic Church, e.g. its wealth, its personnel, etc. “*Keep in mind that you were selected to serve, not to dominate,*” is a nice sound bite but it is blatantly inconsistent with the daily *modus operandi* of the Papacy or of any bishop of any diocese. The pre-arranged organization into which a man becomes pope or a man becomes a bishop requires that he not serve as Jesus his leader served but rather rule as the leaders of this world’s political, financial, military, etc. institutions rule. He is to be a monarch-CEO employing secular and canonical dominative power to get done what he wants done in that segment of the institutional Church, his diocese, which he rules with violent secular legal power and with violent institutional Church canonical power as his always available default option.

It is taken-for-granted knowledge that the institutional Church is a power structure, one of the great power structures of the world, that operates internally and externally no differently from any other institutional power structure of the world. For a pope to tell a bishop not to dominate in such a structure, as Pope Francis did, is disingenuous. It is taken-for-granted knowledge for 1700 years that the bishop has the right to use violent dominative power against Catholics and others to the extent that he can garner it and get away with using it.

As CEO, the bishop does his job like every other CEO. Since the organizations they all run are structured in a way that requires the use of violence against people, they all act the same. Catholic bishops, when the long-hidden evidence of clerical child abuse became public, acted no differently than the CEOs did in the cigarette industry once what they were hiding about the dangers of cigarette smoking gradually began to surface, namely, that cigarette smoking kills millions of people yearly. And, as the truth about cigarette smoking became more and more visible the cigarette CEOs calculatingly began to smear and ridicule the messengers, and delegitimize, make light of and ignore, via multimillion-dollar public relations campaigns, what the objective evidence was logically communicating. The cigarette industry’s CEOs carried on this charade of denial and obfuscation effectively for twenty-five years, with little concern for the millions worldwide who were being destroyed by the product they were giving to people and enticing people to use.

There is no doubt the CEOs of the various cigarette companies did their job as corporate CEOs here, even though they sent millions of people to early deaths over those twenty-five years. Their CEO job was to ensure the survival of their institution, which included “Protecting the Brand” from being publicly impugned. This they did with religious zeal—whole heart, whole soul, whole mind and whole strength—using every deception they could conjure up or purchase to present falsehood as objective truth and objective truth as falsehood. And when the evidence became publicly overwhelming that cigarette smoking destroyed the health and life of people by the millions yearly, the CEOs of the cigarette corporation did not stop making, promoting and selling cigarettes to the already addicted and the young, but simply altered the lies and deceptive methods they employed to keep old customers and attract new ones. Now instead of professing that cigarettes did not do grave harm to people’s health, they printed a notice on each pack warning that cigarette smoking may be dangerous to peoples’ health. Then they blistered the

media with insidious multi-million dollar advertisements to emotionally motivate non-smokers, especially the young people, into taking up smoking, e.g., the Joe Carmel campaign. The CEOs of the cigarette corporations no longer tried to deny the objective evidence before them or the truth of the warning on their own packs of cigarettes; they just ignored it, and established crafty programs and processes to divert people's attention from what was in black and white before them and its serious consequences.

The CEOs of the cigarette corporations were murders and deceivers but as CEOs they did their job. Now, what about the CEOs of the Church, Inc.? Is it not sheer fantasy to believe that the CEO-bishops of the institutional Church, as it is presently structured and as it presently operates, will ever proclaim what Jesus proclaims about violence, that is, that the Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies is an imperative obligation of discipleship and not merely an available option, if the disciple cannot think of a better way of responding to violence and enmity?

*(To be continued)*

(REV.) EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part X—

#### *USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops*

DO YOUR JOB, Part IX concludes with the question, “*Is it not sheer fantasy to believe that the CEO-bishops of the institutional Church, as it is presently structured and as it presently operates, will ever proclaim what Jesus proclaims about violence, that is, the Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies as an imperative obligation of discipleship and not merely as an available option if the disciple cannot think of a better way of responding to violence and enmity?*” The presumption behind that question, indeed the implicit assertion within it, is that the bishops in the institutional Church in its present form will never do their job and “*Teach them to obey all that I Have commanded you.*” They will never teach what Jesus teaches about love and nonviolence.

Some, perhaps many, might object to the above conclusion, noting that the last three Popes have publicly rejected violence as a way for Christians and/or they have publicly stated that nonviolence is the way of Jesus. They would point to the historical fact that Pope John Paul II on September 29, 1979 in Drogheda, Ireland said, “*To all of you who are listening I say: do not believe in violence; do not support violence. It is not the Christian way. It is not the way of the Catholic Church. I appeal to the young people. I say to you, with all the love I have for you: Do not follow any leaders who train you in the ways of inflicting death.*” They would also point to Pope Benedict XVI’s words on March 11, 2012, “*The truth is that it is impossible to interpret Jesus as violent. Violence is contrary to the Kingdom of God. It is an instrument of the Antichrist. Violence never serves man, but dehumanizes him,*” as well as his Good Friday proclamation in 2012, “*Violence never comes from God. Jesus is thus a strong voice against every type of violence.*” And perhaps most of all they would invoke Pope Francis who on several occasions during his papacy has said approximately what he said on August 19, 2013, “*Faith and violence are incompatible! Faith and violence are incompatible,*” or on January 1, 2017, “*To be true followers of Jesus today also includes embracing his teaching about nonviolence.*”

There is no contesting that the three most recent popes made such statements. There is also no contesting that they were all “speaking with a forked tongue”—to employ a native American saying that originated as the result of the French Catholics tactic in the 1690s, in their war with the Iroquois Indians, of inviting the Iroquois to a Peace Conference, only to slaughter the Iroquois leaders and capture their people. Creating ever-new nonviolent costumes in which to dress ever-new Christian Just War Theories is a forked-tongued enterprise for contemporary popes—and for many Christian liberals, and even, radicals.

Not one of those Papal pronouncements mentioned above means what it seemingly says. Not one of them means following Jesus’ teaching and example in the Gospels of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies as the only Way of responding to evil in all its manifestations. While all those Papal statements are self-evidently Gospel truth as stated, not one of those Popes meant them to be taken literally as the universal teaching of the Catholic Church. They were all spoken with unspoken mental reservations. Those unspoken mental reservations changed the meaning of those statements from being proclamation of nonviolence to being proclamations of Christian Just War Theory masquerading as Jesus’ Nonviolence. For the three Popes mentioned above, nonviolence means nonviolence and not-nonviolence.

Soon after John Paul II made his September 29, 1979 speech in Drogheda, Ireland, many Irishmen in both Ireland and in the U.S. who supported the IRA's violence against the colonizing British asked, "Does Pope John Paul II mean that Polish, British and American boys should not join the Polish or British or American Army and *"follow the military leaders who will train them in the ways of inflicting death?"* The answer was self-evident. He did not mean this. He said, *"Do not support violence. It is not the Christian way. It is not the way of the Catholic Church."* But he meant do not support unjust violence as he defined "unjust."

Pope Benedict XVI's March 11, 2012 statement and Good Friday proclamation of 2011 could not have been any more clear or precise in their total and unequivocal support for the nonviolence. In fact, they were so clear that the Italian Prime Minister asked him if he was a pacifist. Pope Benedict XVI told him, *"No."* A few weeks later he went to an Italian Military base and blessed the troops. So, while Pope Benedict XVI's words were a self-evident, transparent proclamation of Gospel nonviolence, *"Violence never comes from God...The truth is that it is impossible to interpret Jesus as violent. Violence is contrary to the Kingdom of God. It is an instrument of the Antichrist"*—what he meant was something other than that. He in fact meant that violence that was unjustified in his eyes *"never comes from God"* and *"is an instrument of the Antichrist."*

Pope Francis' August 13, 2013 doubly emphatic words were as clear on the surface as Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict's statements on the nonviolence of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Pope Francis' World Day of Peace Message made nonviolence a required condition for being a *"true follower of Jesus."* Yet on March 13, 2015 he said, *"On some occasions it is necessary to repel an ongoing assault proportionately to avoid damage caused by the aggressor, and the need to neutralize him could lead to his elimination."* [Emphasis added. Christians, especially popes and bishops, consistently employ forked tongued euphemisms for homicidal violence, e.g. "force," "eliminate," because they know very well there is something very wrong with what they are supporting or doing and desire to hide the truth of what they know from themselves or others.] A few days after Pope Francis' March 13, 2015, John Allen, a long-time insider Vatican correspondent, wrote:

*"In an unusually blunt endorsement of military action, the Vatican's top diplomat at the United Nations in Geneva has called for a coordinated international force to stop the 'so-called Islamic State' in Syria and Iraq from further assaults on Christians and other minority groups. 'We have to stop this kind of genocide,' said Italian Archbishop Silvano Tomasi, the Pope's representative in Geneva. 'Otherwise we'll be crying out in the future about why we didn't do something, why we allowed such a terrible tragedy to happen.'*

*"The call for force is striking. It builds, however, on comments from Pope Francis that the use of force is 'legitimate...to stop an unjust aggressor.' 'What's needed is a coordinated and well-thought-out coalition to do everything possible to achieve a political settlement without violence,' Tomasi said, 'but if that's not possible, then the use of force will be necessary. 'Tomasi called such international military action in defense of beleaguered minorities 'a doctrine that's been developed both in the United Nations and in the social teaching of the Catholic Church.'"*

So, all three Popes are cleverly being duplicitous. They are speaking with a forked tongue when they speak of nonviolence as they do above. According to the Oxford English Dictionary the phrase, *"speaks with a forked tongue,"* means to deliberately say one thing and mean another, to act in a duplicitous manner.

The forked tongue is, of course, the tongue with which a snake is endowed. Therefore, it is most symbolically appropriate that it is a snake, speaking with a forked tongue that deceives Eve into believing that God is lying to her about not eating the fruit of a particular tree in Eden because God knows if she eats from that tree she would be like God. It is the forked-tongued snake, representative of the devil, that attacks the crystal-clear Word of God by imbuing it with a false meaning that is the opposite of what God actually says, intending thereby to entice Eve to disobey God, to treat God as a liar, to sin and to motivate Adam to fall—and the rest is history.

*“Speak nonviolence but carry a big stick”* would just be another utilitarian public relations tactic for a CEO of a corporation of this world or for a head of a state in this world. However, to *“Speak nonviolence but carry a big stick”* by the religious leader, bishop, of a Christian community is a moral and spiritual catastrophe that makes the reign of suffering and death unleashed by the duplicity of the cigarette corporation’s CEOs mentioned in Part IX on human beings a mere tragedy in the lower case. To deceitfully manipulate the Word of God Incarnate so that Christians, who trust in you for their moral and spiritual guidance, are channeled from the cradle onward into believing that they can do the opposite of what Jesus explicitly taught is tragedy, the enormity of which is unfathomable. The cigarette corporations’ CEOs are killers of the bodies of those they entice into smoking by their forked tongued presentations of the objective evidence that was known to them. The Church corporations’ CEO-bishops are killers of the bodies and souls by their forked-tongued presentations of the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels. Cigarette smoking has killed the body of tens of millions. Christian Just War Theory has killed the body and soul of perhaps hundreds of millions. *“Do not fear those who kill the body but are unable to kill the soul; but rather fear the one who is able to destroy both soul and body”* (MT 10:28).

To *“Speak nonviolence but carry a big stick”* is not the Way Jesus taught and is not the Way Jesus lived. It is not what any bishop or pope, who has been commissioned by Jesus to *“Teach them to obey all that I have commanded you,”* should be teaching. The job Jesus mandates for a bishop is easy to understand and easy to execute (MT 28:16-20)—provided a bishop does not desire also to be the CEO of one of the religious businesses of this world or a head of state. When that happens the Christian religious leader, now a bishop-CEO or head of state, must speak with a forked tongue, since his job now is to do the logically and morally impossible, that is, to serve two masters who require contradictory choices by him in his thoughts, emotions, words, deeds and *modus operandi*.

Addressing forked tongued religious leaders of another time, Jesus said, *“You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father’s desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies”* (JN 8:44).

*“Speak nonviolence but carry a big stick,”* or *“Speak nonviolence but live by a just war theory”* is not the teaching of Jesus, is not the Way Jesus lived and is not the Way Jesus told His Apostles and disciples to live and teach. Jesus was not a forked-tongue person. He spoke the truth of God and only the truth. A pope or bishop who teaches in contradiction to what Jesus taught is making a forked-tongued proclamation of Jesus teachings and not doing his job (MT 28:20).

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part XI—

#### USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops

Belief in nonviolence as good and efficacious, like belief in just war theory as good and efficacious, is a faith position. Reason alone cannot prove either position to be objectively good and efficacious. There are innumerable just war theories in which to believe, there are innumerable forms of nonviolence in which to believe.

Gospel Nonviolence, the nonviolence taught by Jesus by word and deed, is nothing more and nothing less than a perpetual commitment to choose the power of Christlike love as revealed in the Gospels in all situations small and large and never to choose the power of violence in any situation small or large.

This is the essence of, the *sine qua non*, of Gospel Nonviolence. It is neither essential nor even necessary in humanist nonviolence, in Jewish nonviolence, in Muslim nonviolence, in Buddhist nonviolence, in Hindu nonviolence or in the nonviolence of mere political tactic and strategy. And of course, a perpetual commitment to choose the power of Christlike love as revealed in the Gospels in all situations small and large and never to choose the power of violence in any situation small or large is not an essential or even necessary in any just war theory, whether Christian, humanist, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu just war theories in the just war theories of mere political tactic and strategy.

The reason that a perpetual commitment to choose the power of Christlike love as revealed in the Gospels in all situations small and large and never to choose the power of violence in any situation small or large is the essential dynamic of Gospel nonviolence is, that according to God *made flesh*, the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels, only love as He loves saves. Only love as He loves has the power within it to conquer evil and death forever for all humanity. Only such love can bring one into eternal union with God—*who is love* and who revealed the content of Divine love to humanity by becoming a human being, living a human being's life, dying a human being's death and rising from the dead never again to be touched by the powers of evil and death in any of their guises. And, by doing all this with a perpetual commitment to choose the power of Divine Nonviolent Love of all in all situations small and large and never to choose the power of violence in any situation small or large.

This is a faith commitment and stance rooted in faith in the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels as Lord, God and Savior and hence by logical necessity faith in His teaching by word and deed as the Will, the Way and the Truth of God unto the fullness of Eternal Life for all—no exceptions. This is the heart of Gospel Nonviolence. Without it, even if nonviolence is called Christian, it is not—unless the word Christian here means the nonviolence is Christian merely because it is Baptized Christians who are doing it. But in that case a state or an army must be called Christian merely because Baptized Christians are running it and engaged in its operation.

REV. JOHN L. MCKENZIE, THE POWER AND THE WISDOM, (*Imprimatur* 1966)

*“The power which destroys all other powers is the power of love, the love of God revealed and active in Jesus Christ. God revealed in Jesus that He loves man and will deliver him through love and through nothing else. To power, in the vulgar sense, one renders submission, admiration, obedience and other such responses; the response to the love revealed in Jesus must come from the person, and it must come with freedom. The power of love has its own way of action and it is not the way of compulsion. One would think that this revelation would have expelled compulsion from the Christian community once and for all. The power of love is not the power to dominate but the power to communicate self; and the response is communication, tending toward complete identity. The saving act of Jesus is an act of love of the type which He recommends in the Gospels. He loves God by loving His fellow men. Theologians distinguish the “God-ward” and “man-ward” aspects of the saving act; but the New Testament does not use such distinctions. The saving act is all God-ward and all man-ward; it moves toward God by moving toward man, as Jesus tells His disciples they also must do. And He leaves no room for man to move toward God except through his fellow man. John said that the Christian cannot prove his love of God except by his love of man. Matthew makes it very clear that it is not really proved unless the person we love is an enemy. The Christian can be an object of enmity, but not it’s subject: one who is loved ceases to be an enemy.*

*The saving act is unitive: it establishes man in a new community of which God Himself in Jesus Christ is a member. There is a subtle Christian logic in John 13:34: “A new commandment I give you, that you should love one another as I have loved you.” A more humanly reasonable logic would conclude: “...that you love me as I have loved you.” And this we would conclude, were not the New Testament so insistent upon its own logic...The disasters of Israel in the Old Testament arise from Israel’s refusal to submit itself to the will of God; and ultimately man is proved helpless in the face of the evil which he himself has wrought. He has no hope of recovery or of survival except in the saving act of God. The power of love is seen in the death of Jesus; it is seen more fully in His resurrection. For love is a communication of self; and the Christian is not identified with God in Jesus unless he is identified with Jesus risen. Christ lives. The potentialities of man are no longer inhibited by the dominion of Sin-Death. The new life conferred upon man is the life of Jesus. The resurrection is the beginning of a new life and a new world in which Jesus is living. The revolutionary point in the Christian event is the enduring presence of God’s love in Jesus Christ, the enduring presence of the power which entered the world in the incarnation. Because of this power man is enabled in any condition to live the life of Jesus and to continue in his own person the love which is the saving act. The resurrection is the climax of the saving act. The pivot of the Christian moral revolution is love [agape]. This is the entirely new and unique feature of Christian moral teaching; it is not the center of a moral structure, it is the entire moral structure. No one questions the centrality of love in New Testament morality; it is questionable whether Christians have always grasped how different it is and how total it is. I venture to state its totality by saying that in the New Testament and act which is not an act of love has no moral value at all. There is no moral action in Christian life except the act of love. The Christian obligation of loving one’s enemies—and by implication the sinner—does not require that we cease to recognize him as engaging in wickedness. No higher model of Christian love can be found than Jesus Christ, whose love was not the affirmation of the goodness of men, but a desire to confer on them a goodness that they lacked. There is a world of difference between Christian love toward the sinner and a sentimental sympathy for him. Christian love will spare nothing in order that the one doing evil, an agent of iniquity, be redeemed from his condition. Sickly sympathy with the wicked, however, is not true compassion, even for the wicked.”*

Again, Rev. John L. McKenzie in his Plenary Address to the INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES IN THE FIELD OF RELIGION (1972):

*“I simply do not believe in the Great Warrior God who exterminated the Canaanites. Some who share my faith do. They also profess belief in Jesus Christ the Son of God who said that he who would save his life must lose it, and who implied that a good way to lose it quickly is to love those who hate you and pray for those who persecute you. How does one speak of a god who exhibits both these features [Great Warrior and a Christlike love of enemies]? I am compelled to say simply that he does not exist, and that those who profess this monstrous faith worship an idol. That they are sincere touches me lightly: so, I suppose were most of the worshippers of Baal and Anath, and most witch-burners.”*

Let us all do our job and make an unreserved commitment to choose the power of Christlike love as revealed in the Gospels in all situations small and large and never to choose the power of violence in any situation small or large.

And let us, whether we be bishops, priests, ministers, deacons, pastors or lay people, Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant or Evangelical, not be embarrassed or ashamed or fearful to say to one and all that we believe in and are committed to following the Nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels and His Way of Nonviolent Love of friends and enemies because our faith is that He is God Incarnate and He therefore knows what is the Way and what is not the Way to eradicate evil and death and their consequences from the human community and to lead all human beings into the fullness of life forever.

Emmanuel Charles McCarthy

## DO YOUR JOB

### —Part XII—

#### *USCCB—A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops*

Before this year of the hundredth anniversary of the United States' Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) comes to an end, a few indelicate words should be said.

As is well known historically, the present USCCB is a direct descendant of the National Catholic War Council, which was established under the leadership of uber-Americanist Bishop, Cardinal James Gibbons, along with thirteen U. S. Archbishops and four U.S. Bishops in 1917, soon after the U.S. entered into World War I on April 6, 1917. The purpose the National Catholic War Council, described by Gibbons in a letter to the other U.S. Bishops was, "*the mental and moral preparation of our people [Catholics] for the war.*" As the biggest player among the American Catholic Bishops, Gibbons became the public voice among Catholics supporting President Wilson's "War to End all Wars." He delivered the following heretical instruction to all U.S. Catholics: "*The primary duty of a citizen is loyalty to his country. It is exhibited by an absolute obedience to his country's call.*"

I mention the origin of the USCCB and the Cardinal who was the moving force in establishing the National Catholic War Council because it is pertinent to the subject of this article, namely, *USCCB: A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops*. As the old saw reminds us, "the fruit does not fall far from the tree." The spiritual DNA with which an organization is created stays with that organization until that organization ceases to exist. Changing an organization's name does not change its spiritual DNA; no more than changing a person's name changes his or her DNA. The fact that the National Catholic War Council has had several name changes over the last one hundred years is but cosmetic. Its historical continuity with the present USCCB is well established and its original purpose for existence, "*the mental and moral preparation of our people [Catholics] for the war,*" is still intact and operating as effectively as it did in 1917. Only the names of the U.S. wars have changed over the decades.

For example, fourteen years of calculated and collective silence from the USCCB while Catholic men and women from the U.S. bombed, burned and blasted the be-Jesus out of millions of human beings, sons and daughters of the *Father of all*, in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria is of one spiritual and moral piece with "*the mental and moral preparation of our people [Catholics] for the war,*" of the National Catholic War Council.

More to the point of this reflection, fourteen years of silence from every individual active Catholic Bishop in the U.S., save for one at the very beginning of this carnage in 2003, is indisputable evidence that the present National Conference of Catholic Bishops serves today exactly the same role it has served since its inception. It is a hiding place for U.S. Catholic Bishops once U.S. media, U.S. politicians and the controlling U.S. economic elites decide to let the dogs of war loose and call Catholics to kill people like packs of lethally-trained and equipped pit bulls. Once a Bishop is tucked away within the USCCB he no longer feels any moral or pastoral obligation to personally tell the people of his diocese whether the present war is in conformity with the teachings of Jesus in the Gospels or even whether it is in conformity with the minimalist *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* standards of Catholic Just War Theory—standards to which according the Catholic moral theology

the Catholic, whether lay person or Bishop, must strictly adhere if he or she is not to be engaged in murder when he or she kills another human being or countenances the killing of another human being in war.

Once a Bishop cloisters himself, and more pertinently cloisters his conscience and pastoral obligations, behind the collective veil of the USCCB then what the Catholics of his diocese have for moral guidance is the agreed upon opinion of some members of the National Conference presented in a press release, which opinion in no way possess the teaching and moral authority of the Bishop of a diocese. Yet, Catholics have been engineered into operationally believing that what the USCCB says, or even does not say, has the same ecclesiological moral authority behind it as a statement explicitly given by an Ordinary to the people of his diocese. It does not!

This march to “safety in numbers” by most U.S. Catholic Bishops is fueled by fear: *fear of being reproached* by their USCCB peers, especially by the “big time players,” with “big time ties” to “big time” American and Catholic wealth and power, and to the Vatican. “Go along and get along” is not just a political and business adage for keeping in the “good” graces of the “big timers,” who run the show. The lemming-like parade to “safety in numbers” by American Catholic Bishops is also fuel by the *fear of reproaching*. If a Bishop in a diocese that had within its geography a drone-warfare instillation were to declare to his people as Bishop, “*There is no way that what is being done at that instillation is in conformity with the teachings of Jesus in the Gospels or even in conformity with Catholic Just War Theory, and therefore working in such a facility is morally forbidden to the Catholics of this diocese,*” he would instantly become one of the most despised people in his area as well as nationally among the Catholics of his diocese and Catholics and non-Catholic far beyond his diocese. Who wants to be detested by others, especially if one has grown accustomed to having a place at the head table? Fear of being reproached and fear of reproaching—even if one is morally certain that killing children of the *Father of all* 12,000 miles away as if they were only dots a computer screen has no sane possibility of being in conformity with the teachings of Jesus or Catholic Just War Theory—drives the episcopal dive for trying to pass-off Divinely imparted episcopal obligation to a group when the moral going gets tough, e.g., when his country starts killing people and starts recruiting the Catholics of his diocese to kill people for it.

It is fear—fears of all genres—that moves U.S. Catholic Bishops to go and hide in the USCCB pack where they can no longer be seen and held personally accountable. They morally blend in and no longer feel threatened. They will still speak personally and boldly on the moral issues that the National Conference speaks boldly on even to the point of threatening those in their diocese with blackballing, excommunication, censure or eternal damnation on such issues as artificial contraception, abortion, intentional missing Mass on Sunday without a serious reason for doing so, as well as on every issue that the government and the media throw out there to chat about, e.g., immigration, housing climate change. But on all matters related to Catholics from their diocese going 7,500 miles for the last fourteen years to slaughter human beings in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria, etc. on the orders of such sterling moral characters as Bush, Obama and Trump, not a peep! They let the pack’s silence speak for them.

What is the probability that all of the approximate 300 U.S. Catholic Bishops individually and in good conscience believed in the beginning and/or for the entire past fourteen years that the human destruction by the U.S. in the Middle East was in conformity with the will of God as revealed by Jesus or in conformity with Catholic Just War Theory? The probability is zero. So why have those Bishops among the 300 who believe that this killing and maiming was clearly contrary to the

teachings of Jesus and/or Catholic Just War Theory stood silently by and permitted those Catholics in their spiritual and moral care in their diocese become part of the mass murder operation?

When a Bishop, a pastor of souls, is afraid to assert what is God's will and what is not God's will to his flock on a grave moral issue of his time, has he not turned his back on his flock by remaining silent? Has he not betrayed the charism God has bestowed personally on him? When he orchestrates his silence by trying to do what he cannot do, that is, when he tries to abdicate to a national conference of Bishops his episcopal obligation to morally guide into the Way, Truth and Life of Jesus the people of his diocese, e.g., in all matters related to killing human beings on behalf of the ruling class of the U.S., does he not become just another CEO hireling abandoning his flock to the wolves of war? Can such a Bishop's personal silence on an immediate and intrinsically grave evil—achieved by concealing himself within a covey of likeminded Bishops—ever be considered a morally acceptable prudent silence, once his silence is interpreted by Catholics in his diocese as morally permitting their supporting and participation in an intrinsically grave evil, e.g., murder—killing human beings without adhering to the teaching Jesus or Catholic Just War Theory.

So, let us be clear. In Catholicism, the individual Bishop is the Vicar of Christ for the people of his diocese, not any National Conference of Bishops. Only the Pope possesses an ecclesiological authority superior to him in his diocese. While every Bishop's ministry is exercised in communion with other Bishops, it is absolutely not necessary that it be exercised in conformity with them.

But I suppose that every Bishop, who does not do his job as Bishop and who tries to hand his Divinely mandated episcopal obligations to a National Conference of Bishops and/or one of its committees can—when the rotten fruits of his decision become visible—salve some superficial earthly peace of conscience with the morally infamous Nuremberg War Crimes Trials defense: *"I am not responsible. That's how the USCCB decided."* But, there is nothing in the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels that says His disciples can do in a crowd what is forbidden for them to do alone—even if the crowd is a crowd of Bishops. If more is morally expected by God from a Bishop in the face of an epidemic of intrinsically grave evil spreading through the souls of the Catholics of his diocese, then silence is evil, even if it is executed by blending into a crowd of equally silent Bishops.

Today, December 29, on the liturgical calendars of the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church is the Feast of St. Thomas Becket, the martyred Archbishop of Canterbury, who in 1170 was murdered in his own Cathedral by agents of King Henry II. He was decapitated because he refused to allow his Church to do the bidding of the state, i.e., the King of England. He not only refused to join a crowd of fellow English Bishops who wanted him to "go along and get along" with the political powers-that-be—whom he believed to be trying to co-opt authority that was in the domain of the Church—he excommunicated those Bishops. I thought that a few of the thoughts that motivated his bold resistance to governmental evil would be a fitting conclusion to DO YOUR JOB, Part XI: *USCCB, A Hiding Place for U.S. Catholic Bishops*.

St. Thomas Becket:

*"We know that no trust can be placed on princes and that cursed is the man who placeth his reliance on an arm of flesh."*

*"How carefully would I atone, if I might, for the time I have lost!"*

*“With shame, be it spoken: by her fall, the Church's liberties have been sacrificed for the sake of temporal advantages. The road to her ruin lay through the sinuous paths of riches: she has been prostituted in the streets to princes; she has conceived iniquity and will bring forth oppression to the undeserving.”*

*“I was called before the king's tribunal like a layman and was deserted in the quarter where I had looked for support. My brethren, the bishops, sided with the court and were ready to pronounce judgment against me.”*

*“When is constancy required, except under persecution. Are not friends then proved? If they always yield, how can they ever succeed? They must, one time or other, make a stand.”*

*“Hereafter, I want you to tell me, candidly and in secret, what people are saying about me. And if you see anything in me that you regard as a fault, feel free to tell me in private. For from now on, people will talk about me, but not to me. It is dangerous for men in power if no one dares to tell them when they go wrong. Better are the blows of a friend than the false kisses of an enemy.”*

(ST. THOMAS BECKET ON HIS WAY TO HIS ORDINATION AS BISHOP TO A FRIEND.)

—EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

