

Boston College
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AND MINISTRY
Continuing Education Encore Events

**Transcript of “Evolution and the Primacy of Love”
16th Annual Evelyn Underhill Lecture in Christian Spirituality**

**presented on July 16, 2016 by
Ilia Delio, O.S.F.**

Thank you for the very kind introduction. And thank you for coming on a Saturday morning on a beautiful sunny day in Boston. It's not snowing here, and I can understand why you want to get out. And thank you for this opportunity to give the Underhill Lecture.

I have been working at the intersection of theology, philosophy, spirituality and culture—yes, I bring them all together—because we are living in conflictual times. And part of my work is trying to understand, how can we move beyond, you might say, the walls of conflict into a new breath of life?

Last year, Pope Francis issued a wonderfully comprehensive encyclical called *Laudato Si*. And there has been much discussion on this encyclical. But the subtitle of this work is “On Care for Our Common Home”—our common home. And Pope Francis looks around at the world and, for one, begins this encyclical, unusually, on the experience of a global warmed earth. In other words, the earth—global warming continues to proliferate. It is stripping the world of natural resources. It is causing glaciers to melt and polar bears to migrate. The poor are being affected disproportionately. And he asks us to wake up to a new consciousness of interconnectedness. In his view, option for the poor is option for the earth.

And so he is challenging us to think of the earth as our home. And while, on one hand, we can say, oh, that is wonderful, certainly it is our home, I wonder, where is our true home? And I take that not just as an earth question; I take that as a religious question, because I think part of our challenge still is that we live with a bifurcated mind, a religious mind that says my true home is there, in heaven, and here I am as a pilgrim and stranger on this earth, passing through. I think part of that consciousness, which I do see changing, slowly, is that we still in some ways have a theology that's deeply tied to a medieval cosmology.

Raimon Panikkar, I think said it best in his *Rhythm of Being*, where he said, cosmology and theology are deeply intertwined, that there is no cosmology without theology and no theology without cosmology. So instead of asking, what's your theology, I could ask you, what's your cosmology, and I'll know who your God is. The medieval cosmos, of course, was beautifully static and fixed and earth-centered, and we were at the center of that earth, and God, indeed, as Creator.

That cosmology of existence, you might say, became ontologized in the late—I would say, the high Middle Ages, where we began—in some ways it's a distortion of the Pseudo-Dionysius; but we won't go there, because it was a Franciscan actually, who could be—anyway, who's responsible there. But we have this idea of essence and existence. Right?

In fact, this summer, I was just telling Tom Groome, what am I doing in the month of July? I'm reading Thomas Aquinas and the Islamic philosophers. Thomas was very influenced by the Islamic philosophers, especially Avicenna. It's Avicenna and not really Aristotle, per se, where we get the distinction between essence and existence—God as pure essence, who bestows being to being, and we have existence. But that kind of cosmology and theology means, you might say, that gave rise to the idea of ladder of ascent. We make our way from earth to heaven.

And so Thomas's beautiful theology, and here, I would say, Thomas was a genius—he probably would have been a mathematician or a physicist were he alive today—but has a very Catholic worldview, in Thomas's view. And then the whole of theology fits his cosmology. In other words, God is Creator and we, you might say, are created. And we participate in that act of creation. But when it comes to the question of a true home, that's in a sense still how we think about things. Again, even the Hebrew conception of the universe, God, earth, underworld, or what we call the wedding cake cosmos, the

Boston College

three-tiered cosmos—and now I know this is not you, you're a very enlightened group—but there is still this operative image of God as the benevolent grandfather, the one who is watching over all from a distance.

This of course was challenged in the 16th century when Nicolaus Copernicus and others began to measure, you might say, the best they could, the rotation of the planets. And poor Nic, he was a Polish Catholic, and that didn't go well, because he said, I don't think we're the center here, I think we're moving, and I think the sun is the center. And he said, no, this can't be. So he buried his results under his pillow, and Tycho Brahe, Johannes Kepler, and others said no, Nic, you're right. We are moving. And that, I think, is the beginning of our troubles.

Now, Cardinal Bellarmine was not happy about this; he had plenty of good things, but not happy about this. Galileo, with a more powerful telescope, who confirmed the Copernican heliocentric cosmos said, indeed, we are moving with other planets around the sun. Bellarmine said no, the doctrine attributed to Copernicus that the earth moves around the sun and the sun stands at the center of the world without moving, is contrary to Holy Scriptures and therefore cannot be defended or held.

And we have had, you might say, a long journey since then to try to accept modern science. In some ways, we are, in a sense, here in some ways because the shift is slow and it's variable. We are not facing the east here, but we could be, but the fact is we still now have this conflictual relationship between science and religion. And we're not quite sure how they might fit together.

I think Descartes, in a sense being the true Catholic that he was, was trying to in a sense confirm the Thomistic world by, in a sense, separating out the mental from the physical. On one hand, I have a clear and distinct idea of myself, because I am a thinking, non-extended thing. And on the other, I have a clear, distinct idea of a body, in fact as an extended non-thinking thing. And it is certain I am really distinct from my body and can exist without it. Well, into the world [of] artificial intelligence, right, in the 16th century.

But we began to build a world where, not like Thomas or Bonaventure, the world became stripped of the sacred, stripped of the good, stripped of any divine meaning. It became a world of extended stuff. And so you can do with it what you want. Right? You can chop it up, splice it up, build on it, throw it out, it doesn't matter. The only really important thing is the spiritual life, the soul. And we began to envelop a thinking of dualism, body and soul, which is a thinking that still abounds. People still ask, what happens when I die to my body? Well, OK, your soul's going to heaven. Your body's going to earth.

OK, let's move on to Newton, because it becomes really tricky. Newton built on Descartes. Right? It's a world of stuff. But Newton, again, a great mathematician, began to see how this stuff was organized lawfully. So Newton's world is this overseeing God who sees a world of orderly stuff, law and order, the world as a machine. And we began to operate like this.

I often tell people, well, I take the common example of church on Sunday. Wherever you go to church, where I go to church, everyone sits in the same pew. That's Newton's world. We're like mechanically wired this way. So I came in to church one Sunday, and I was a little bit late. And I thought, there's someone in my pew. Now, no one ever said this is Ilia's pew, but we think like this. And therefore, when that happens, our whole being is upturned. We can't even go to Mass anymore, because now we have to go look for a seat, and it's not the same seat. We know, in religious life, the same thing: keep the rule, the rule will keep you; follow the law, and you'll be OK. It doesn't matter what you do, just follow the law.

And so we began to, I think, build a world like this, a world according to Newtonian principles. And in some ways, I think this is why our systems across the board are not working anymore, because this paradigm is, in a sense, giving way to something new. Barbara Brown Taylor says we started operating our churches like Newton's world. She says, walk into many churches, and you'll hear God described as a being who behaves almost as predictably as Newton's universe. So you believe in God, you'll be saved. Sin against God, you'll be condemned. So you're sorry, you'll be blessed. Obey the

Boston College

law, you'll be blessed. Sorry, you're forgiven. So people always ask, I pray. Why do bad things happen to me? Right? Newton's God has failed me.

Here's what I think has happened in our own day. Our cosmology no longer fits with our theology. And we are no longer the center of this wonderful cosmos. And I think we have been displaced, and we have become lost in space. And here we are falling off the earth. Teilhard de Chardin, who is in a sense a guiding figure, a major guiding figure, for my own work, a wonderful Jesuit paleontologist, very insightful, I would say a mystic in his own right, noted that the artificial separation between humans and cosmos is at the root of our contemporary moral confusion. We don't know how to act anymore because we no longer know how to read the stars.

And so I think it is helpful to take a little spin through the cosmos we actually inhabit, the cosmos not just we inhabit but that has given birth to our lives. It is what we know today as a hot, Big Bang cosmos, and it is old. If you're feeling old, just think of the age of the cosmos. It's about 13.8 billion years old, and we cannot get our heads wrapped around that. We are here for a very, very short amount of time, 70 for most, the psalmist says, 80 if you're strong, and I would say 90 with good drugs.

It has a beginning we simply don't know. In fact, physics breaks down at that point. Mathematics breaks down. It's called the singularity. We don't know how this universe came into being. But what we do know is that it came into being as a hot, dense something and rapidly expanded. And as it expanded, it cooled. And as it cooled, the forces, the fundamental forces, were set in place. It has been expanding ever since. And we know that it takes time, developmental time, deep time, for galaxies and planets to form. Much of the universe is dark energy, the energy of expansion. And a small percentage is dark matter, so that we don't fly off into the outer limits of space.

Some predict that this universe will continue to expand indefinitely, so it has a very, very far future. But we are saying it invites us into a new theology and a new philosophy. Now, this universe is expanding, and we know ourselves expanding with the universe at times. This is how we know we are one with the cosmos. You ever hear the joke about the mystic who ordered a hot dog? He said I'll have one with everything. Yes? OK.

It's a world of energy. And here is where I would say our shift still needs to take place. We talk about energy. We are even in an energy crisis. But we yet do not have a consciousness of energy as the stuff of life itself. And yet that is what Einstein's theory of relativity has bequeathed to us, that this is a world of energy in which mass and energy are interconvertible. And so in the early part of the 20th century, physicists began to realize that there is no such thing as a concrete substance, that what we call stuff, matter, is really this pluralistic, strange phenomenon of a wave particle duality. And we don't know what something is, physicists tell us, unless we observe it. We must measure it.

So in a quantum world, we're realizing that it's a participatory universe. We must make the act of observation for the real to come into existence. Otherwise, it is a world of potentialities and possibilities. In this world of quantum reality, the stuff of life, matter, is not like Newton thought—individual building blocks, like little billiard balls with fundamental laws. Rather, it's more like complex webs of relations, so that we're seeing that this cosmic life is intrinsically relational on the most fundamental level, that there's a universal communion of everything with everything, so that the term interconnectedness is not just a New Age term or a postmodern term. It is simply the most apt description of what we are.

Now, we know that Einstein had a difficult time with quantum physics. He was pretty sure that God does not play dice. Right? And he struggled with some of the own outcomes of his theory of relativity. One of them was this notion of entanglement. It took his post-doc students—it's always good to have post-doc students, because they want to publish and get ahead, so they'll be very creative—and two of them said to Einstein, "Al," they said, "what if these two particles that have interacted, if we took them apart, and if this is really all about field energy, and we put a particle here on a podium in Boston and the other particle on the moon, what would happen if we move this particle here on the podium?" And so what his post-doc said, "I bet the particle on the moon is going to turn, you might say, in response to the particle on the podium." And Albert said, "are you kidding, really?"

Boston College

And they said, “no, I think it’s true.” This was later shown to be true by the Scottish physicist John Bell.

And so this term quantum entanglement means that two particles that have interacted will be interactive forever, so that, if one particle changes in one locale, the other particle will also change as well. So we call this non-local action at a distance.

And one of the common phenomena, I think, of this is, you might say, in our everyday experience, consciousness. I often give the example, I have a friend, actually I’m going to visit her this afternoon, but we worked together for a number of years. One day I was thinking, gee, I wonder how Pat is doing. I no longer had thought that, how Pat is doing, and about a half an hour later, the phone rang. And it was Pat. I said I can’t believe this. I just thought about you. We used to say before, “what a coincidence, I was just thinking about you.” Now we can say we’re quantumly entangled. Be careful who your friends are, really they are with you forever.

Now, what scientists are beginning to tell us is that increasingly we’re beginning to realize that reality is non-local, that the nature of material substances is deeply entangled fields of energy, so that the nature of the universe is undivided wholeness—undivided wholeness. Paul Dirac, in a little dinner they gave for him before he accepted the Nobel Prize in physics, said this, and I think it’s meant to be descriptive rather than, it’s meant to make a point: “Pick a flower on earth, and you move the farthest star.” Our actions, our local actions, can have cosmic consequences. But we do not think like this. We have no awareness that my actions can actually impact the cosmos itself.

David Bohm, a contemporary of Einstein, had a slightly different view on quantum physics. He thought that there was a quantum potential that was holding this realm of quantum reality. And he said this at one point, he said, as human beings in societies, we seem separate. But in our roots, we are part of an indivisible whole and share in the same cosmic process. What does that mean for us, as we look about our world at this moment? We are sharing in the same cosmic process.

And that process, and this is where Teilhard really, you might say, brings to light a new view, that process is not a static process. The word process itself lends itself to a lawful orderliness in the openness of life, that there is a role, you might say, for spontaneity. I might say God is not that boring, really, that there’s a playfulness even within nature, so that it is not a static, fixed, mechanistic world. Rather, it’s dynamic, it’s changing, and it’s open to newness.

Now, for those of you who are bibliophiles, if we were to think of evolution as an encyclopedic volume, 30 volumes, just to give you an idea of where we fit into this story, each volume, 450 pages, each page, a million years. That’s a big book. Volume one is the Big Bang; volume 20, lifeless and mindless matter; volume 21, that’s where our earth story begins, about four billion years ago, million years ago; and volume 22 is where life begins; volume 29, that’s where *Jurassic Park* enters in; and volume 30, the dinosaurs go extinct as a new type of hominid emerges. We are on volume 30, page 450, and the last line, the last two words of that line would be homo sapiens, and that would be us.

This volume, this set, is not complete. We are not just simply the last word of evolution. We *are* evolution, now on a new level of self-consciousness. So what we are saying is that nature is marked by change. This change is orderly. It does have chance and law within it. But what we are saying is that new things happen. There are no fixed essences. And time is irreversible.

Teilhard saw evolution as a threefold process –a process of convergence. Given sufficient amount of time and the proper conditions, things will converge. They will be drawn together and unite. As they unite, they form new degrees of relationships, complexity. And he said, in that complexity, consciousness rises. I take consciousness here as the flow of information. So what he’s saying is that evolution is not just background to the story, because people always ask me, well, do you believe in evolution? I’m like, well, it’s not a belief system. It is the best description of how we’re here. And it is, in a sense, our story. So we are not in evolution. We are self-conscious evolution.

And how do we know that? Well, look at technology. Thirty years ago, I grew up in New Jersey, and I remember when, probably in the ‘70s, someone said to me, AT&T now has a cell phone, like a phone

Boston College

you can carry around. And I said you're kidding. In New Jersey, we had a phone on the wall. It had a cord. And so, sure enough, this huge thing came around, and people are walking around now with cell phones. And it was rare. I mean you really had to buy one of these things, it was costly.

In just a short amount of time, we're saying 40 years, we have gone from the phone on the wall to the computer in my hand; from having telephone operators to the fact that you can reach out and touch someone in Australia at the click of a button. Technology is our fastest evolver today. But we know that there's still part of the species that is still evolving. It's a slow process. I live in hope because it's an expanding universe with a long future.

Now, here is where I think Teilhard really helps, you might say. To me, he brings new light. For one, he did not see evolution just simply as the emergence of a human species. He described evolution primarily as the rise of consciousness. It's not just things that are coming together and complexifying, but consciousness itself is increasing. Now, this of course is the hot topic today, because up until now we were pretty sure that mind was an epiphenomenon, a phenomenon exclusive to the human species. Now we're beginning to realize more and more that mind may indeed be part of matter.

Thomas Nagel, in his book *Mind and Cosmos* a few years ago, made this about turn, he who was warranted against any mindful matter now in a sense is acceding to it. What we are beginning to see is that the Big Bang seems to emerge out of a quantum wholeness. Quantum is the name of the game here, so that life might begin with consciousness and wholeness.

Now, we don't know what exactly this means. It is speculative at this point. But what we are beginning in a sense to perhaps turn toward is the fact that our consciousness has emerged from this wholeness and continues to be part of it. In other words, what accounts for the human mind is already active in the universe. So I would say this, that in and through our minds, and that's a deep consciousness, that we are part of an undivided whole that is our home, the cosmos.

In a sense, I think Pope Francis would like to turn us in this direction. Henry Stapp, the physicist, says this, he says not only are our minds part of this cosmic reality, but our thoughts do something. Whereas Paul [Dirac] directs that, if you act by picking a flower, you'll move the farthest star, Stapp is saying, if you think about something, you will also affect something else. He says what a person chooses to do in one region seems immediately to affect what is true elsewhere in the universe. We are finding ourselves more and more, from science, strangely, deeply entwined in this cosmic story.

So Teilhard would say we are evolution become conscious of itself. It matters to matter how we think and what we do. We are no longer center of the cosmos, but we are the arrow. We are in a sense on the frontier of what the next stages of evolution will be.

Here is where I think Teilhard—and I think Teilhard's great contribution is not just spirituality. I actually think it's philosophy. It's metaphysics. He introduces a new metaphysics, but he never really quite spells it out or completes it. And I would call it his phenomenology of love. For one thing, Teilhard says we must attend to the real. And the real is energy. It's not a concept of being. It is energy. And he's saying there's a fundamental energy in the universe that's an energy of attraction. No matter how you look or where you look, things come together. And he calls this tangential energy. But as they come together, the same energy, in a sense, transcends. The coming together itself is an act of transcendence. It's moving beyond in a sense what it is, so a radial energy. So in a sense he puts this in the terms of love and consciousness.

Even Philip Hefner asks at one point, can we entertain the hypothesis that love is rooted in the fundamental nature of reality, including the reality we call nature? Now, love here I take as the highest good. It is in a sense the platonic world now writ onto an evolutionary universe, so that love is deeply unitive, love is generative, love is creative. Love is always the more. And so Teilhard says love is the most universal, the most tremendous, the most mysterious of cosmic forces.

Now, scientists would say, OK, I'm with you up until now. But love as a cosmological force, really? The fifth force in the universe is love? In a sense that is what Teilhard's saying. He looks at—even in the smallest of molecules, he says there's an indistinguishable force of love energy present from the

Boston College

Big Bang onwards. And it's an energy of attraction, it's an energy of union, and it's an energy of emergence.

So what Teilhard sees is that, as love energy attracts elements together, there is in a sense a flow of consciousness and an increase of consciousness, so that we can speak about mindful matter as relationality and informational flow, so that this whole cosmic process is in a sense a process of attraction and transcendence, love in a sense increasing with increased consciousness. Now, you do not have to be a physicist or a scientist, or even any trained degree, to realize that love shifts our consciousness. All you have to do is fall in love.

Now, I'm assuming that everyone here at some point in your life has fallen in love. When you love, your consciousness shifts. It changes. It moves into a new horizon. Love is that force of attraction. People say, how did she ever fall in love with him? Well, who knows? It's mysterious, right? There's a mysterious force of attraction. And in that attraction, consciousness moves to a new level. You see things in a new way. You're attentive to life in a new way.

In a sense what Teilhard is saying is precisely that phenomenon writ on a cosmic universe. So he says the physical structure of this universe is love. The physical structure of the universe is love. He begins then to develop a philosophy of love. Now, where Thomas Aquinas, following the Aristotelian paradigm, would see being as the primary category, Teilhard sees union as the primary category. And in his view, being flows from union. Well, mm-hmm, yup, bring two things together, and you have something new. So he says union gives rise to being; and that being is new. It's emergent. It is not reducible to the two elements of attraction, but it is a flow out of those elements. So emergent being, in a sense, will itself attract more being and complexity. And this, he says, is in a sense what the nature of nature is.

And so you might say he lays out for us the principles of love energy, that "to be, or not to be," is not the question. To be is to be with. It's what we can call an ontology of relationality, intrinsic relationality, so that reality, as he's learning from the physicists, is being with another in a way more open to union and being. And since being is existence toward another, being is intrinsically relational and exists for the sake of giving. And I want to just highlight that point, that being doesn't exist for the sake of its own existence. It exists in and for otherness. So, as one writer says, I do not exist in order that I might possess. I exist in order that I might give myself, for it's in giving that I am myself. So union, as Teilhard would say, is differentiation.

We are saying that, in Teilhard's philosophy of love, that cosmic life is intrinsically communal, that the universe is thoroughly relational and in the framework of love. I will call this, in Teilhard, not a philosophical metaphysics but a theological metaphysics. And this is where I think part of our shift needs to take place. We still might, say, build our constructs on a philosophical understanding of things. And I think Teilhard brings, you might say, a new understanding of God and reality together to ask—at one point he said who will give evolution its own God? He said we're still too tied to an old Greek metaphysics. We're still too tied to an ancient understanding of God.

Well, when I read this, I thought, well, I'll give it a try. Who will give evolution its own God? At one point he thought, well, like Bohm's quantum potential, Teilhard says there's a principle within nature of wholeness. It's the whole that holds the whole together. He called this omega, the absolute end of wholeness, but he saw that the omega is already in the beginning – in the beginning of life. And he calls this omega God, very scriptural. I am the alpha and the omega. The omega, the end, is already at the beginning, so that this principle of centrality or centration is within the Big Bang moving through cosmos into human life and mind.

But what he sees is that God's imminent activity in creation is in a sense what Trinity is about. He doesn't spell out a theology of Trinity, but it is in his writings. And he's saying that what we call being, end, is in a sense that imminent principle, omega, that's drawing this dynamic process of evolution toward more being. So he says it's not about metaphysics. It's hyper-physics, being towards more being. He says the foundation of things is not so much a ground sustaining things but a power of attraction, something drawing us from up ahead. And he uses the word trinitization, that

Boston College

God is actively, you might say, self-giving love, empowering reality into new life, Trinity at work in this creative reality.

And of course this is consonant with what we know from the New Testament of love. God is love. Love is self-giving and self-gift. But I think Teilhard would say love is not something that God does, like hanging out in this heavenly realm deciding that he should love or she should love. Rather, love is what God is. And I think that's hard for us, because even conceptually we think of God as person, and we put features to that person. And yet what we are saying is love is what God is. And love is always personal and relational. And therefore it speaks to us of a God who is dynamic Trinity, so that we can say a relational God empowers a relational universe.

This is the image, a stained image, of a neuron here on the left, and this is a NASA image of the universe. It's pretty incredible to see the amazing intrinsic relationality of this thing we call life.

Teilhard in a sense sees this active presence of God in this world as something alive, new. Meister Eckhart said centuries ago, he said God is the newest thing there is, the youngest thing. And when we are united to God, we become new again, new and young. And we act old, very old, and static. And yet this is what Teilhard's saying: God is up ahead drawing us within and ahead, drawing us to something new.

And therefore it begs the question, what is the meaning then of Jesus in evolution? Because we've got the whole story, from the medieval cosmos, what is the story now in the world we actually live in? So Teilhard saw that God is active and involved from the beginning. We can say the Word becomes evolution, so that he does not, in a sense, separate Creation and Incarnation. I think we do that to get a three-year degree, course in creation, you can have one incarnation, and you can have one in eschatology. Then you get a degree, and you go on.

But he says, no, really it's all one act of God's self-involving life, self-gifting love. God brings into being, God enters into that which is brought into being. As God enters into it, things are reconciled, brought together. So he sees Creation, Incarnation, Redemption as three dimensions of one self-gift of love. And therefore he calls this Christo genesis, not just Christ, but Christo genesis, a birthing of the Christ.

Now, Teilhard discovered Scotus's primacy of Christ late in life. I am pretty sure that, had he discovered Duns Scotus's primacy of Christ, in other words, Christ is first in God's intention to love, whether or not sin ever existed, Christ would have come. Now, if Teilhard found Scotus early, he would have been Teilhard, OFM. And he would have published his writings.

So what he's saying is that this—again, this is not, we all went along, we had a major mishap, and then God had to fix the damage. It is, rather, that the whole thing is oriented out of love, in love, for love, and that fullness of growing in love is the Christ. And therefore Jesus is the Christ. Jesus is not some strange exception to an otherwise evolutionary universe. Jesus emerges by way of evolution. He is that long, you might say, flow out of this Big Bang cosmos.

But we see in Jesus, in a sense, those things which are typical of the cosmos itself, consciousness, wholeness, relationality. These, in a sense, are exemplified and come to an explicit manifestation in Jesus. We see in Jesus, you might say, a new centration. We can call him like a new Big Bang. There's something new about him. Right? Now I'm preaching to the choir here, right, but he comes on the scene, and they're like, who is this guy, right? Wasn't he the little guy who's working in a carpentry store? There's something, a new direction. He's asking people to think in a new way, to love in a new way, a power of newness that comes into the mind and heart that is creative, not just repetitive, not just juridical or legalistic.

And what we see in Jesus is that nature itself is protean. It's open to God. It's open to becoming something new. Sometimes we treat religion as something that, this is—here we are, and we just—it'll help us, patch us up, and we'll be good to go to heaven. But there's something about Jesus that's telling us about nature itself. That's what Incarnation does.

Boston College

Now, again, in an enlightened group, I would not ask this question, but I often ask, was Jesus Catholic? And people have said, well, Jesus was Catholic but his mother was Jewish. Catholic I take to be, in a sense, the Greek understanding of catholicity as whole-making, a consciousness of the whole. And I think we see in Jesus that consciousness of the whole, a consciousness of, you might say, bringing those who are left out, who are on the margins, into community through healing, through mercy, through compassion.

And isn't this what Pope Francis is asking us today? He's asking us to be catholic. He's asking us to have a consciousness of the whole. And therefore this kind of salvific love, a kind of healing love, where when we become whole we help make whole the world around us. We are divided. The world around us is divided as well. And therefore Jesus and the Gospel is so simple. We have made it so complex, but it is really quite simple. As you see, Angela of Foligno said, "as you see, so do love. And the more perfectly and purely you see, the more perfectly and purely you will love." Vision is an act of consciousness. But we see with blind eyes. And we do not love, because people and things are in our way, in our own privatized worlds.

And I think Jesus, in a sense, exemplifies, he does exemplify what God is doing in this evolutionary universe from the point of faith. He is saying that, through death, through self-gifted love, through the spending of our lives, whether even in our immediate lives, we are to come to a new level of consciousness and to act at a new level of radical love. Radical love—this is not like, gee, you think if I recycle I'm able to be doing what Pope Francis asks us? Did you make sure you turn off the lights? Radical love means this is costly love, as Dietrich Bonhoeffer said. That's the kind of love by which life emerges in a new way. I think that's what Resurrection's about, emergent new life in God in a new way, belonging in a new way to the cosmos.

Teilhard realized this. And he said we cannot be saved, except through the universe and as a continuation of the universe. This is our home. We have a hard time getting our heads around that. What God promises is a new heaven and a new earth, not a new heaven without earth. And therefore we need to realize it does make a difference how we see and how we love. We are what Teilhard called created co-creators. I know some people still have a hard time with this term, but our actions do make a difference. How we think does make a difference. And what we have to realize is that evolution has not ended with us, that we are part of an ongoing process, and it demands our commitment to it.

Jesus said it well in the Gospels, "new wine, new wineskins." But no, no, we're really quite sure we can get that new wine into the old wineskins. We'll just patch them up. We'll do something, but we're going to get it in there. It doesn't work. Bonaventure, in the 13th century—I have to throw him in here—Bonaventure had a beautiful statement, "you truly exist where you love and not merely where you live." Love is the fullness of our being. Love is the fullness of life. We can be in prison. But if we love, we will truly exist. Or we can be in a McMansion with everything around us, without love, and we are empty of life. Love and consciousness do go together.

And that's why we have to ask, how did we get here? How did we get to the point where our minds are in another world and our bodies are in this physical location? And I think the problem is deeply religious and it's deeply cosmological. Now, I don't know if you've seen the movie *Her*. Well, we don't have to go there, really. But it is what happens when we don't have a consciousness of intrinsic relationality. It is what happens when we long for a relationship and we cannot find it on the human level.

Sherry Turkle, in that wonderful, insightful book, *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*, because technology makes it easy to relate and communicate at will. Right? You want to be a friend, Facebook on. I don't like you, Facebook off. She says once we remove ourselves from the flow of physical, messy, untidy life, and increasingly so, we become less willing to get out there and take a chance. We are in some ways becoming more controlling of our lives and less in the flow of the spontaneity of life. One pop song says, "if you think I'm not the one, log off, log off, and we'll be done." You don't even have to say you're sorry anymore. You can just text it.

Boston College

So what some say is we're in a new form of cyber-Platonism, that there's something out there for me that's better than here. And as Margaret Wertheim says, "we are in a process of making one another disappear by living more of our lives apart from other humans and in the company of machines." I've worked with people that they won't even talk to, they'll—I'll e-mail you; I'll text you. Young people, those, you have children, the phone is now in the American Museum of History. No one uses a phone. You text, Twitter, tweet, or Instagram or whatever, you Snapchat.

But here it is, we are wired to be active players in evolution. It makes a difference where our minds are, and it makes a difference where our hearts are. I do think we need a new consciousness of catholicity. And this is where I think Pope Francis is calling us to. And in fact, a lot of what I'm talking about here is in *Laudato Si* in its own way. He talks about technology creating vast internal deserts. All of our lives now are lived outside us. And so we need a new space for inner reality, for involution. No evolution without involution. And that means solitude, cyber-Sabbaths. Maybe some of you have practices in your classroom, put your cell phones outside the door. It's hard for younger generations. It's hard for me, actually. I'm like, oh my God. One kid said to me, "if I lose my phone, I lose my self." That's how self-extended we are.

So we need, in a sense, to renew a spirit of prayer, interiority. The Jesuit spiritual discernment could not be more apt than in this moment. What Teilhard said is we need to harness the energies of love, to harness, to gather those energies within ourselves, among ourselves for the forward movement of life.

Etty Hillesum, that wonderful, insightful young Dutch woman writing from a concentration camp, not religious, begins to pray. And she realizes this, and she says, "each of us moves things along in the direction of war every time we fail in love." That is a powerful insight. When we look at today's world, what she is saying is that the war out there is our failure to love here. She says all disasters stem from us. Why is there war? Because perhaps now and then I might be inclined to snap at my neighbor, because I and my neighbor, and everyone else, do not have enough love. She is writing this in a concentration camp. Yet there is love bound up inside us. And if we could release it into the world a little each day, we would be fighting war and everything that comes with it. The power of love to heal the world should not be underestimated.

Sin, we might say, is living in the exile of unrelatedness, the inability to be involved. In other words, not just brokenness, it is the inability or the—not just the inability, the refusal—it's the refusal to love. And it shows up usually in the form of selfishness, which in some ways technology affords us today.

So I do think that wonderful Jesuit, Pedro Arrupe, summed it up beautifully when he said, "what you are in love with, what seizes your imagination, will affect everything. It will decide what will get you out of bed in the morning, what you do with your evenings, what breaks your heart, and what amazes you. Fall in love, stay in love, and it will decide everything."

Thomas Merton said the same thing, "our lives are the sum of our loves." What do we love, and how do we love? John of the Cross maybe said it best, "in the evening of life, we shall be judged on love alone." And Teilhard would say, even now, "love will bring us to the threshold of a new universe." In this moment, in this world, a world wracked by war and sorrow and suffering, we have only one duty, and that is to love. Thank you.