

only to help me celebrate a very “round” birthday but also to give your support to the education of young Jesuits. And so the story of this one Jesuit’s journey will be linked to that of my fellow Jesuits as well as to you, my very dear friends.

When yesterday, it seems—I entered the Society of Jesus, I was setting forth on a journey for which there were indeed words—the love of God, the service of our fellow human beings, a vowed life in the Church—but only a fairly shallow grasp of what they might mean. Yesterday, with other newly entered Jesuits, we were young, vigorous, some had great dreams, others cherished a blessed sense of duty, all sensed that somehow the life they gave to the esteemed Society of Jesus would also be found, truly, in that least Society.

And now, suddenly, I find myself . . . 80 years old. When I entered the Novitiate during the presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower, under the papacy of Pius XII, and with John Baptist Janssens as General Superior of the Society of Jesus, order was a relative constant in our experience. Soon the constant became change. In our formative years our nation was shaken, for good and ill, by the civil rights movement, the Vietnam War, Watergate. The Second Vatican Council, with roots, we learned, in the liturgical, patristic, theological and ethical scholarship of many Jesuits among others, convened in a miraculous rush of time between 1962 and 1965. New hope dawned for the Church in the world, most of us thought, just when the world seemed most to need such a beacon. Within a decade, the journey on which we had embarked seemed to have mysteriously changed—to have become, in fact, far more an adventure. We were invited to change, too, if we were really to live in the time we were being given. Many other friends had experiences somewhat similar, not least because children change everything.

THE GOD OF TIME

The time we were being given: through it all there was this constant: the patience and fidelity of God. In the Society of Jesus we wanted liturgical participation, social renewal, a newly intimate community life. Indeed, as the Society began remarkably to appropriate the aggrornamento of the Council in its General Congregations from the 31st onward, under the new and (I deeply believe) sainted leadership of Pedro Arrupe, we were called officially and authoritatively to recognize that a community of loved sinners can only be faithful if it seeks the unloved, stands with those who have been shunned, lives but also learns in solidarity with the poor.

How clumsily, how unrealistically, with what a rush we often sought our new goals and discovered that God, the Holy Mystery who is our Absolute future, was patient with our straining time, was even taking it into God’s own life. (Some of us became aware of what can only be called God’s sense of humor before the human spectacle.) The love of neighbor which had seemed like the love of God, a moral imperative and recommended pattern of behavior, proved to be far more: the discovery of and entry into God’s own life. God was not just pleased if we could be healing, or encouraging, or messengers of justice. God was there, in the care and hope and justice, taking our time into God’s own.

For if God is eternal but also offers divine life and grace to a freely created world, then that world’s time and history, our time and history, becomes God’s time and history truly, too.

We had set off on a journey to a goal—and discovered that we were already, however and even desperately unworthily, already living in it. Through the patience of the

Great Tutor we were learning that incarnation was specific to a certain time and place—but also calls all time and space to union with it.

THE GOD OF SUFFERING

Incarnation, however, means becoming fully human, and sooner or later, one learns the cost of the endeavor. There were ghastly events in political society such as the Balkans war or the Rwanda genocide. There were what many of us considered retreats from the “aggressive fidelity” of the Council. Our own nation’s struggles with racism, sexism, and the serious poverty of many Americans seemed to fail as often as they succeeded.

But there were more personal losses as well. We lost parents and friends. We struggled with alcoholism and other addictions. Cherished projects all too often failed. The social legislation we favored did not pass. The promotion we hoped for went to someone else. Anxiety became a nearer neighbor. Many fellow Jesuits, a Provincial and not a few best friends among them, left our company. The symphony’s scherzo proved to be a threnody.

But God was patient, was indeed perhaps most patient with our suffering. The cross of Christ before which we had been encouraged to ask: “What have I done for Christ? What am I doing for Christ? What shall I do for Christ?” became something not imagined but rather our immediate experience. His suffering was ours, and ours his, because he had given himself for and to us, and had claimed us to and for him.

And so, even more miraculous than life itself, there Christ is—in the illiterate village, the anguished schizophrenic, the solitary death row, all the battlegrounds of the world—the whole Christ to whom all belong and they to him, the crucified and risen one who is never a stranger but the patient one who waits for us always—and from whose love nothing, nothing, nothing can separate us.

THE GOD OF BEAUTY

If the cross of Christ seals our time and shares our suffering, revealing the patience of God, it awakens us also, in ways I scarcely could have imagined all those years ago on this Hilltop—yesterday—to the beauty of God. Darwin wrote toward the end of his life and without apparent regret that his scientific studies had led him no longer to be able to enjoy Shakespeare. Dostoevsky, on the other hand, let Prince Myshkin speak his hope: Beauty will save the world.

For many young people, “the beautiful” is a preoccupation for an elite few. But with fellow Jesuits and so many of you here today, I have learned how wonderfully various and compelling God’s world is. My Jesuit classmates included a poet, historians, literary critics, high school and college administrators, journalists and prolific authors, theologians and philosophers, spiritual directors and retreat masters, ethicists. We have served in North America, South America, Europe, Africa and Asia. And if beauty is what arrests and compels human attention, whether in the splendor of a sunset or the sorrow of a scar, a Frederick Edwin Church landscape or a character such as August Wilson’s King Hedley II, we have seen too much marvelous variety not to have become more alert to the beauty of the artisan of it all.

It was easy enough to appreciate the harmonious, the splendid, the musical moments of our experience. Harder to recognize what distortion, darkness, dissonance reveal. But the same Spirit that establishes order can comfort tears; the Spirit that illumines can guide through the night; the Spirit that teaches song can interpret discord. The beau-

ty of God can come in the mode of fulfillment, in achieved form and luminous color and delicate balance, but also in the mode of hope, in protest against violence, in fury at injustice, in conscientious objection.

To say that the Spirit of God teaches us to see again and to hope to see wholly is not to claim completion. I find myself at 80 each year happier and more blessed to be a Jesuit priest—but journeying still. This too: beauty is always fresh, new, surprising. And if a patient God has made our time God’s own, and our suffering God’s own, then how can we not hope that in today’s liturgy indeed but one day finally and forever, God’s Spirit will teach each of us the most beautiful words of all:

Take me. I am yours.

LEO J. O’DONOVAN, S.J.

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is always good to have someone in the media with a sense of history. Walter Pincus demonstrates that time and again. His June 19 column in *The Washington Post* is a prime example and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, June 19, 2014]

DICK CHENEY WANTS TO FORGET HISTORY AND WRITE HIS OWN VERSION

(By Walter Pincus)

Why should anyone take seriously what Dick Cheney says about President Obama’s policy in Iraq?

In their *Wall Street Journal* op-ed this week, Cheney and his daughter Liz began by cherry-picking Obama quotes from over three years about the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

That warmed-over technique is what Cheney, President George W. Bush and other top aides cleverly used with intelligence reports in the fall of 2002 as they drummed up public support for their invasion of Iraq. That, of course, set the stage for today’s terrible events.

“Rarely has a U.S. president been so wrong about so much at the expense of so many,” the Cheneys chortled. “Too many times to count, Mr. Obama has told us he is ending’ the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—as though wishing made it so.”

Let’s return to a Dick Cheney speech on Aug. 27, 2002, in Nashville, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and see how many times a vice president could be “so wrong about so much at the expense of so many.”

He told his audience: “In Afghanistan, the Taliban regime and al-Qaeda terrorists have met the fate they chose for themselves. And they saw . . . the new methods and capabilities of America’s armed services.”

Here’s another applause line: “In the case of Osama bin Laden—as President Bush said recently—‘If he’s alive, we’ll get him. If he’s not alive—we already got him.’”

The Bush team never got him. Obama did.

When Cheney was speaking, bin Laden was very much alive. Al-Qaeda terrorists and the Taliban had just retreated, but they were able to regroup as the Bush team, satisfied with its “victory” in Afghanistan, had turned its attention and U.S. military forces toward Iraq.

It was in this speech that Cheney began what a former Bush chief of staff, Andrew Card, would describe as the fall 2002 public-relations plan to “educate the public” about

the so-called threat from Iraq. That effort would lead to a congressional joint resolution authorizing the president to use U.S. armed forces to “defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq” and “enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.”

Cheney told the VFW: “The Iraqi regime has in fact been very busy enhancing its capabilities in the field of chemical and biological agents. And they continue to pursue the nuclear program they began so many years ago.”

He added: “We’ve gotten this from the firsthand testimony of defectors—including Saddam’s own son-in-law, who was subsequently murdered at Saddam’s direction. Many of us are convinced that Saddam will acquire nuclear weapons fairly soon.”

A former White House deputy press secretary, Scott McClellan, would later write that a White House Iraq Group (WHIG) was “set up in the summer of 2002 to coordinate the marketing of the [Iraq] war,” and will continue “as a strategic communications group after the invasion had toppled Saddam [Hussein]’s regime.”

It was Cheney at the VFW convention who first said: “Regime change in Iraq would bring about a number of benefits to the region. When the gravest of threats are eliminated, the freedom-loving peoples of the region will have a chance to promote the values that can bring lasting peace.”

He also said: “Extremists in the region would have to rethink their strategy of Jihad. Moderates throughout the region would take heart. And our ability to advance the Israeli-Palestinian peace process would be enhanced, just as it was following the liberation of Kuwait in 1991.”

Show me a better example of “as though wishing made it so.”

The Cheneys also cavalierly forget that the status of forces agreement with Iraq that Bush signed Dec. 14, 2008, made way for the withdrawal of all U.S. combat troops by the end of 2011. That agreement protected U.S. forces on duty from prosecution by Iraqi courts. It was the Iraqis’ desire to modify this that led Obama—on the advice of his military chiefs—to not leave a residual force of military trainers.

One more sign of the Cheneys’ convenient amnesia: They said of Obama’s initiative toward involving Tehran in the effort to put down ISIS advances in Iraq, “Only a fool would believe American policy in Iraq should be ceded to Iran, the world’s largest sponsor of terror.”

In November 2001, the Bush White House, despite icy relations, approved talking directly to Iran diplomats before and during the Bonn conference called to try to establish a post-Taliban government in Afghanistan. As a result, U.S. Ambassador James Dobbins got what he described as Tehran’s “major contribution to forge a solution” among various Afghan groups, which in turn led to a unified temporary Kabul government under Hamid Karzai.

On Dec. 5, 2001, a White House spokesman described Bush as “very pleased” with the Afghan agreement. However, in his Jan. 29, 2002, State of the Union speech, Bush described Iran, Iraq and North Korea as the “axis of evil” at the same time there were meetings underway between U.S. and Iranian diplomats to see whether talks could go beyond Afghanistan.

In contrast to the Cheneys, people should listen to former secretary of state James Baker III, who in Thursday’s Wall Street Journal called on the United States to organize an international coalition of regional countries, including Iran. Recalling Iran’s cooperation on Afghanistan, Baker said to-

day’s “reality is that Iran is already the most influential external player in Iraq and so any effort without Iranian participation will likely fail.”

Baker has a successful track record and a memory. The Cheneys have neither.

NEVADA TRIBAL LANDS TRANSFER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this week the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs held a hearing to address five important pieces of legislation. Two of these bills, the Moapa Band of Paiutes Land Conveyance Act—S. 2479—and the Nevada Native Nations Land Act—S. 2480—will transfer land into trust for a total of eight Indian tribes in Nevada for heritage preservation and economic development.

Nevada’s Great Basin has always been home to the Washoe, Paiute and Western Shoshone Peoples. The First Nevadans have long been a voice for protecting our wild landscapes and enriching our State through their language and cultural heritage. I take the many obligations that the United States has to tribal nations seriously. Land is lifeblood to Native Americans and these bills provide space for housing, economic development, traditional uses and cultural protection. I would like to commend the tribes, whose immense work and collaboration made these bills possible, and I look forward to continuing to work with our First Nevadans on protecting homelands.

The Moapa Band of Paiute Indians have been in Nevada and the West since time immemorial and suffered great land losses through Federal Indian policy. When the Moapa River Reservation was established in the late 1800s, it consisted of over 2 million acres. In its lust to settle the West, Congress drastically reduced the reservation to just 1,000 acres in 1875. It wasn’t until 1980 that Congress restored 70,500 acres to the reservation. Today the reservation is approximately 71,954 acres.

The Moapa Band of Paiutes Land Conveyance Act, S. 2479, would direct the Secretary of the Interior to take more than 26,000 acres of land currently managed by the Bureau of Land Management—BLM—and the Bureau of Reclamation into trust for the Moapa People who live outside of Las Vegas, NV. This legislation would provide much needed land for the tribe’s housing, economic development and cultural preservation.

Located on I-15, the tribe runs the Moapa Paiute Travel Plaza. The tribe is the first in Indian Country to develop utility-scale solar projects on tribal lands. Since southern Nevada has critical habitat for the desert tortoise, a species listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act, the tribe works closely with Federal, State, and local partners, members of the conservation community and interested stakeholders to develop their community in an environmentally responsible manner.

The Nevada Native Nations Land Act, S. 2480, would transfer land into trust for seven northern Nevada tribes—the Elko Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe, the Duck Valley Shoshone Paiute Tribes, the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe and the South Fork Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians. As does S. 2479, the Nevada Native Nations Land Act would allow these seven tribes to build housing for their members, preserve their cultural heritage and traditions, and provide opportunities for economic development.

Since time immemorial, the Western Shoshone have been living in what is now known as southern Idaho, central Nevada, northwestern Utah, and the Death Valley region of southern California. The Elko and South Fork Bands are two of four bands that comprise the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians.

The Elko Band’s reservation, or colony, is landlocked by the growing City of Elko, where band members have been coming for mining and railroad jobs for decades. The colony needs additional lands for housing and economic development. My legislation would expand the Elko Band’s reservation by transferring 373 acres of BLM-managed land into trust for the tribe.

S. 2480 would also convey 275 acres, just west of the City of Elko, to Elko County to provide space for a BMX, motocross, off-highway vehicle, and stock car racing area.

The South Fork Reservation, home to the South Fork Band, is comprised of 13,050 acres. The Band was one of the groups of Western Shoshone that refused to move to the Duck Valley Reservation and stayed at the headwaters of the Reese River, near the present Battle Mountain Colony. Established by Executive order in 1941, the colony was originally 9,500 acres of land purchased under the Indian Reorganization Act. In addition to rugged high desert terrain near the foothills of the Ruby Mountains, the reservation has open range which is used for open cattle grazing and agricultural uses. The Nevada Native Nations Land Act would place 28,162 acres of BLM land into trust for the tribes and release the Red Spring Wilderness Study Area—WSA—from further study.

The Northern Paiutes made their homes throughout what is now known as Idaho, California, Utah and Nevada. Due to westward expansion, our government pushed some Western Shoshones and Northern Paiutes into the same tribe and onto the same reservation where their descendants remain.

The Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe now make their home along the Nevada-Oregon border. Starting as a military fort in 1865, the military reservation was turned into an Indian Agency in 1889 then established as an Indian reservation in 1936. The reservation is currently made up of 16,354