



Horyzonty Polityki
2018, Vol. 9, N° 27



RODRIGO FIGUEROA-WEITZMAN

Instituto de Ciencias de la Familia
Instituto de Filosofía
Universidad de los Andes
Santiago, Chile
rfigueroaw@miuandes.cl

DOI: 10.17399/HP.2018.092702

The State of the Church according to Cardinal Newman: Opposition to the World and Opposition from the World

Abstract

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE: This article seeks to outline what may be called a 'diagnosis' of the relationship between the church and the world, according to the English blessed, John Henry Newman. In his opinion, this relationship will always be conflictive and it is destined to remain so (an account that seems to be confirmed, and perhaps even accentuated, in our time).

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHODS: The discussion, following a brief hermeneutic because of its limited extension, reflects on Newman's thesis relevant in its thought: the church-world opposition, an opposition on which this author is highly descriptive, and whose approaches do not have any ambiguity.

THE PROCESS OF ARGUMENTATION: The argumentative line of the article stops at three points consistent with each other and coherent within the British religious's exposition: 1. The customs of the church and the world differ completely. 2. Wanting to adopt the criteria of the world is always a dangerous lure for the church. 3. A dichotomous relationship with the world, a world fallen by sin, is a natural condition for the church.

RESEARCH RESULTS: The evident tension between the church and the world emerges from the analysis carried out in the investigation.

Suggested citation: Figueroa-Weitzman, R. (2018). The State of the Church according to Cardinal Newman: Opposition to the World and Opposition from the World. *Horizons of Politics*, 9(27), 25-39. DOI: 10.17399/HP.2018.092702.

CONCLUSIONS, INNOVATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

What is the usual framework of the relationship between the church and the world according to Cardinal Newman? This question, tacitly present in this article, is answered by Newman in a negative way (as it shows with well-founded reasons, in my opinion, a problematic bond which dates from the beginning of the church and that in the future will continue to be so). His thesis confirms and expresses an essential discordance between two realms of different condition: a temporal one, the world, and an eternal one, the church. From his writings on this subject, it is concluded that the mission of the church is to evangelize the world in an incessant way, although the results of it seem always a little insufficient and even infertile.

KEYWORDS:

church, world, conflict, kingdom

INTRODUCTION

The aim of my article is to account for Cardinal Newman's perspective on what we might understand as the secularization of the world and, at the same time, on the condition of the Church, which is opposed to said secularization, thus remaining in permanent and natural disagreement with the world. To assess this topic, I chose four texts written by Newman, three of them corresponding to his Anglican period and one to his catholic stage, all in which the author sustains that it is a Church's characteristic to be in conflict or disagreement with the world. For Newman, the Church is a kingdom that is in this world without being in it, just as it is perceived in Christ's plead for his apostles (St John XVII, 14-17). Therefore, while the world may be secularized, the Church is not, or at least it should not fall into this behaviour.

It is worth mentioning that for Cardinal Newman, the Church, with its extensive history, has always acted in conflict with the world, and that it "moves forward appearing to go backwards" (see quote 9 in this article). This is a significant feature considering that, as a "spiritual empire with no material weapons," its luck, its fate, its seal, is none other than persecution. This mark is perhaps "the most long-lasting of all its tests," a warning announced by Newman and supported by a quote from Saint Paul: "All those who aspire to live mercifully in Jesus Christ, will suffer from persecutions" (II Tim. 3, 12).

Thus, in the present article I intend to indicate how Newman describes this natural opposition between the world and the Church. I will briefly approach three points: 1. The Church should not imitate the world's customs. 2. The world's spirit represents a temptation for the Church. 3. Opposition to the world as normal for the Church.

CHRIST'S KINGDOM – THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST IS IN THE WORLD BUT IS NOT FROM THE WORLD, AND IT SHOULD NOT IMITATE ITS CUSTOMS

In a statement from 1842, before his conversion into Catholicism, Cardinal Newman affirms that Christ made his Church a “kingdom.” For him, the fact that the Church is a kingdom does not entail that it resembles other kingdoms from this world, but it rather indicates an essential difference:

kingdoms from this world defend themselves with weapons from this world, but the kingdom of Christ, even being visible and time-bound, is present *in* this world without being from this world, and is not protected with earthly means but rather with celestial weapons (Newman, 2003, pp. 381-382).

Even though Newman's words are not clear enough, I will allow myself to make one brief commentary. The church is a kingdom, and there are also other kingdoms in the world. But the Church, being in this world, cannot be defined or categorized as a kingdom from this world. One thing is that the Church is a kingdom and that there are kingdoms in this world, but it is not possible to affirm that the Church is not another one of these kingdoms. What separates the Church from other kingdoms is not similar to the any of the distinctive features of timebound and human kingdoms which, at the end of the day, are only devoted to earthly purposes – perhaps their aim should not be otherwise-, but with no particular supernatural perspective toward men's life and fate.

What has been previously assessed about the nature of the Church is combined with a second idea worth mentioning in this article. For the Blessed Englishman, the holy writings themselves already

describe the Church; for example, in some parables in which Jesus compares the kingdom in heaven to different elements taken from daily life. Christ spoke to men from his time with examples from that time. However, in this case, Newman's emphasis is on understanding the Church as a kingdom of justice. Although this idea may surprise more than one person reading this article (a critical stance regarding the Church perfectly might object its 'justice'), there is a reason why the Londoner considers this aspect, and he expresses it through the following words:

The kingdom has, in fact, been vast and powerful, but it has not been governed according to justice and truth; in some periods it even has had truly perverse men for chiefs. Grave religious and moral corruptions have been found; and, how it has been sometimes said, there have been more horrendous crimes committed in the name of religion than for any other purpose. But all of this can be granted to adversaries without it entailing a devaluation of the description of the Church mentioned in the Holy Writing. 'The kingdom in heaven is also similar to a net which is thrown to the sea, collecting all sorts of fish' (Mt. 13, 47) (Newman, 2003, p. 382).

I shall comment on the words recently quoted. The English cardinal himself clarifies its meaning when he mentions that the spiritual kingdom that is the Church is supported by justice, not because within the institution there is injustice, but "because, from the beginning until the end, from generation to generation, it remains unalterable thanks to the justice within it" (Newman, 2003, p. 382). Therefore, from my perspective, and if I am to faithfully interpret Newman's words, the Church's kingdom preserves its justice because Christ looks after it. The Church is fair (I would say it is saint) not because of human virtue but because it is protected by the grace of God. Regardless of the vices and weaknesses of its members. Whatever God holds up man cannot tear down, that which is divine work cannot be suppressed by anything or anyone, and what human beings create behind God's back will inevitably end up knocked down. This justice or holiness is God's mark, just as faults and weaknesses from its ministers and laity account for the frailty and pettiness of human actions happening within its walls. The sacred component of the Church is its holiness, the human component is its taint of weakness. It is impossible to ignore this difference, which is experienced inside

its very centre. With regards of being integrated by men, the Church is not perfect. Regarding Christ's work, it is indestructible.

On the other hand, on his comparison between earthly kingdoms and the Church, Newman sees evident oppositions. For him, earthly kingdoms are not based on justice but quite the contrary, they are based on injustice, since they find support in violence and, thus, in the law of the strongest, and the primacy of usurpation:

They are established by the sword, by larceny, cruelty, perjury, trickery and fraud. There has never been a kingdom, besides Christ's kingdom, which has not been created and birthed, being fed and educated in sin. There has never been a nation which has not been induced to committing actions and sustaining principles of criminal nature, but whose abandon would cause its ruin (Newman, 2003, pp. 382-383).

In this case, Newman's words barely even need explanation. They are enough by themselves and they entail, at least for me, that nations are ruled by their power and not by kindness or by fair retribution. The world is led by the strongest, not the fairest (in most of the cases). Unfortunately, many times the law of the jungle (as it is vulgarly said) prevails, and not justice, love or good. Instead, the spiritual kingdom of the Church represents a completely different condition. Newman is very cutting about this aspect:

The kingdom of Christ is of a different nature... there is an indelible difference between him and the others, and it is because they find their purpose and life in evil, while the life of the Church does not consist of doing evil but of suffering it, not of acting but of enduring, it consists of being contempt with all that is despised by the world, as if it were more proper to destroy a kingdom than to build one; patience, simplicity, innocence, concessions, passivity, resignation (Newman, 2003, p. 383).

Therefore, according to Newman the Church receives many "insults" (I would dare to say that these insults come both from the outside and the inside), but, despite this, at the same time the Church is held up "by truth, mercy and holiness" (Newman, 2003, p. 384). To my understanding, these considerations are very important because an adequate understanding of what the Church represents, may demand

completely different criteria from what the world has about what is considered as successful. The Church is not supported by the same criteria and tools from powerful kingdoms of this world. While the world rejects and throws away suffering, the Church even “suffers” evil with holy resignation, as a means of identifying itself with the agony and martyrdom suffered by Jesus. The fate of the Church and its loyal subjects is to share the pain of their Master, since the resurrection of the Lord – his Glory – was preceded by his dramatic Passion. This does not mean that the Church exalts suffering for free, but rather that it sees its role as saviour because Christ’s redemption did not exclude pain or death, on the contrary, it made them part of the salvation he brought to the world. Because of this, without even wanting it, the Church must endure adversity and be pertinent in its spread of the gospel and of what is good (which in several occasions has brought difficulties). These reflections will be further clarified with the following extensive quote by Newman, which I cannot leave out of this article:

When the Church pours the graces that belong to it, it expands, when it makes no use of them, it wanes. ‘Return your sword to its sheath’, said our Lord to Saint Peter (Mt. 26, 52)... We carry out our conquests presenting the cheek to those who beat us, giving good in return for evil, begging for those who chase us, giving to those who ask, suffering in the name of the weak, protecting the widow and the orphan, defending the rights of the poor; we achieve our victories thanks to courage, strength, perseverance, disinterest, loyalty, moderation, greatness of soul, generosity, renunciation and self-control, because of our patience in enduring evil and perseverance in doing good. This is how the kingdom in heaven was developed in the beginning; this way, and only this way, it remains, regardless of all the unfaithful members that obstruct it. This way, there is a paradox of a holy Church which, nonetheless, embraces ‘not only gold and silver cups, but also wooden and clay cups, ones for uses of honour, and the others for vile uses’ (II Tim. 2, 20) (Newman, 2002, p. 384).

I have already mentioned the extreme length of this quote, however I still consider essential to comment on it. Which conclusions can be drawn from these words? A more personal interpretation leads me to think that, deep down, Newman shows that the direction of the Church is opposite to that of the world, it turns its back on it, since what the world approves and praises is deeply opposed to

the message proposed by the Church as treasure of life and ideal behaviour. While the Church points to sanctity, the non-Christian world does not have this same pretension. If the world understands glory as earthly successes, the Church understands it differently, as an entrance to the definitive kingdom of God's love, a kingdom in which first and last places answer to completely different parameters from those provided in the world.

What I have mentioned in the last paragraph, is aligned with another aspect affirmed by Newman, a perspective which is closely connected to what was lastly mentioned. The blessed Englishman mentions a "paradox" within the kingdom of Christ, which will entail further explanation. I shall quote his words first, followed by an interpretation of the excerpt:

In the gospel, the Disciples of Christ appear as poor and despised, weak and helpless; the apostles were, indeed, like this. However in the prophets, especially in Isaac, the kingdom is described as rich, flourishing, honourable, powerful and strong... They were expecting a throne almost like David's, a royal palace like Solomon's; but the kingdom of Christ is of a completely different nature; until they finally knew the truth... virtue and kindness contributed to making men powerful in this world, but those who run after power have no virtue... The same happens with the Church of Christ. It would lose its point to search for power, riches and honour. But it is not less true that they would acquire them without searching for them or, better said, provided they do not search for them... Satan offered glory for all of the kingdoms in the world to our Lord and he rejected it, but obtained it from his Father; the same happens with all of his disciples. Throughout their lives, saints wear coarse fabrics, then they are buried covered in silk and jewellery; the Church refuses the gifts of the world, but these come without it searching for them. Power, influence, credit, authority and riches are abundant in it because it does not ask for them. It owns because it does not seek to have (Newman, 2003, p. 385).

How can we understand this extensive quote by the English prelate? In my humble opinion, what Newman affirms in these lines is that the riches of the Church, its splendour, is of a spiritual nature and, thus, relies on virtue and kindness, and not on honours granted, recognized and praised by the world. If the Church were to be seduced by criteria and the goods of the world, it would lose its holiness and detract its mission. If the Church were to become mundane, it would

no longer belong to Christ. If it searched for honours, it would lose its honour. Precisely, the Church's glory and reward, the same as with its saints, occurs after suffering from humiliation, persecutions and misunderstandings. While the Church is less to the eyes of the world, perhaps it is more to the eyes of God. This is the paradox of Christ's law which, according to Newman, we can witness through the course of the history of the Church: "This kingdom belongs to the poor of spirit, to those who suffer from persecutions. It belongs to the kind and it is secured for the patient. It is conquered by suffering. It moves forward appearing to go backwards" (Newman, 2003, p. 385). In other words, the Church conquers the world while the world seems to be gaining territory at the expense of the Christian message. The world believes they succeed at the mercy of the Church, but it is the Church which will eventually overcome the world. This is, in my humble opinion, the most correct paraphrase to the idea previously mentioned.

THE SPIRIT OF THE WORLD REPRESENTS A TEMPTATION FOR THE CHURCH

In a sermon from May 31st, 1840, Cardinal Newman assesses another idea which deserves to be analysed. The key point of this speech is that the distinctive mark of the Church is persecution, a mark which is also characteristic for being the most long-lasting of all its tests. Newman defines the kingdom of God on Earth as a "spiritual empire, devoid of material weapons" (Newman, 2003, p. 386). In that sense the Church, interpreting his words, counts with no army or with the weapons the world possesses, in human terms this kingdom is weaker than the latter. The world has ways to subdue believers, and many times these latter have only faith as a way of fighting the paganism that reigns in so many places. This disproportion between the power of the world and the power of the Church, between the scopes of each, is reflected in the following words by Newman:

The world is strong. Men of this world have weapons of the world. They have swords, armies, prisons, chains, violent passions. The Church has none of this and, however, it claims the right to reign,

rule, reprehend, exhort, denunciate, condemn. It demands obedience from those with power, it fights against the proud and stubborn, which may persecute it and sack it at will. The time for martyrs has ended, in fact, more or less, but there are barely any saints who have not been in some way confessors, there is almost no one who has done good without inciting the world to harm them: 'And all those who aspire to live mercifully in Jesus Christ will suffer persecutions', says Saint Paul (II Tim. 3, 12) (Newman, 2003, p. 386).

If I understand correctly what Newman suggests in the previous paragraph, mercy, which is the behaviour that describes religious people, is not only unwanted by the world but is also harassed by it. Non-religious people often "mock" believers' demonstrations of faith (not always, of course). Those who do not believe in religious matters do not understand or can even feel bothered by a person's religiousness. However, to the eyes of the English author, it is not the world's responsibility to "scold the Church" (if I may use such an informal expression), but the other way around. We say this carefully, because it is clear that in some occasions the world is in the right and the Church in the wrong. Nonetheless, and perhaps this is the sense of Newman's words, the Church is not wrong when it answers faithfully to what God wants for men and for the world.

But Newman gives more warnings about the "poor relationships" between the Church and the world, since he asks himself the following suggestive question: "Should we not be afraid that the world may friendly join us, since we have friendly joined it? This is not a new or rare case in the history of gospel. This is not something particular to our history or our country. This is the great wrong of the Church, of all times" (Newman, 2003, p. 387). Newman's idea is connected with his judgement that, many times and more frequently than desired, a significant number of people who even defend the true interests and privileges of the Church (because they genuinely believe that the decay of the Church affects public institutions), do not adore the kingdom of saints so much, but they rather prefer "temporal prosperity" (Newman, 2003, p. 387). It is not that they love the world because they love the Church, but they love the Church because they love the world, and if there were to be oppositions between world and church, they would not have doubts in taking the former's side. They accept the

benefits that they consider the gospel brings in terms of social order, since it favours peace and other aspects that are not worth losing.

Even though it sounds painful to say it, I believe that, according to the English author's observations, if persecution is the Church's destiny as long as the world exists, then it is evident that we Christians have nothing left to do but wait for such a state. Therefore, there is no possible agreement between affirmations made by someone from the world and someone from the Church. There is an inevitable difference between the two and perhaps it is better to be clear that it is not the Church or Christians themselves the ones to modify these criteria (when these are aligned with the gospel of Jesus), but it is the world which is called to modify theirs (even though Newman is convinced that the world is constantly on the opposite side of the Church, just as he is clear that this mutual opposition will never be solved).

In a text written in 1850, when he was already a Catholic, Newman affirms that the world, and perhaps we have witnessed this more than once, lives with

the certainty that the principles that they propose represent the greater good. It wishes that society were governed only with earthly interests in mind... What is its idea of evil? The world tells itself that evil is everything that hurts, everything that obscures my glory, everything that disturbs my peace (Newman, 2003, pp. 388-389).

But evil, and this is well known by any Christian with a vision of faith and a supernatural perspective of life, has nothing to do with this but rather with everything that draws God away and that, in simple terms, can be defined as sin. Therefore, the aims of the world are not those which make and guide a Christian, since a believer in Jesus ought to abide by other kinds of ambitions and desires: to identify as faithfully as possible with their master and to always have eternal salvation in mind.

In this permanent dichotomy between world's and Church's criteria, Newman finds a new element of opposition between the two. From his perspective, the Church is not in charge of the whole but of the separate parts. What does this mean? Very simple, what the Church does is nothing more than giving prioritizing the individual instead of the nation or society. Newman's words are not ambiguous regarding this topic:

Individuals have the priority in his heart; society is left on a second place; they care for thought, motivations, intentions and will, rather than for external actions; they direct their eyes beyond the world; they discover the demon hidden behind them and declare war on him. Thus, they have an enemy, a battlefield, which the world cannot see; now, this battlefield is the man's heart, and his deadly enemy is Satan. The Church is concerned with the souls Jesus Christ died for... Its only duty is to guide the chosen ones to salvation, as many as it is possible, to remove obstacles from their path, warn them about sin... convert them, instruct them, feed them, protect them and guide them to perfection (...). The Church sacrifices all for the interests of immortal souls. For it, good and evil are not shadows and light that pass over the surface of society, but living forces that rise from the depths of the heart... it knows no other evil than sin and sin is something personal, conscious, voluntary; it knows no other good than grace and grace is also something personal, private and particular which has a space in the soul of the individual. The Church has one only aim: to purify the heart (Newman, 2003, pp. 389-390).

This long quote by Newman is worth analysing. The Church seeks salvation for people, this is its priority and interest. That is its mission and it is what explains its existence. Its apostolic intention is none other than to "purify" the heart of those who are willing, with the purpose of opening the gates of heaven for them. In this preoccupation for the souls of men, the Church only aims at fulfilling its task. As Newman affirms, the Church is

happier saving the soul of one bandit from Calabria, or of a miserable beggar from Palermo, than building hundreds of train rails all along Italy, or setting up a health reform system in every city in Sicily, unless these companies did not contribute to spiritual well-being (Newman, 2003, p. 391).

Consequently, the Church's task is none other than that of offering the gift of salvation to all those who have not closed their hearts to God's grace. As a consequence, perhaps the strongest opposition between Church and world lies in the way of appreciating what is morally good and evil. In my own words, while the Church exalts the humble and suggests behaviours aligned with the kingdom of God, the world honours those powerful to the human eyes and forgets about supernatural fate – I would dare to say – too quickly and foolishly. When the world holds an opposite position to the Church,

it sees reality in a horizontal manner, with no vertical observations about it. When this happens, which in the case of the world is almost constantly, this vision entails no transcendence but only temporality.

THE OPPOSITION OF THE WORLD AS A NORMAL STATE FOR THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST

In a document written in March the 3rd, 1836, the English author asks himself the following question:

Should we let ourselves be guided by faith or by what we see? Indeed, if suffering is not, in every sense, Christian heritage, the New Testament has only a provisional value, since all of its doctrine is built upon this foundation (Newman, 2003, p. 397).

For Newman being Christian, then, means that in this life suffering is, to a great extent, their fate (which already puts Christians very far away from someone who avoids suffering at any cost). Though it may be hard to assume this state, such is the newmanian way of seeing the mark that identifies Jesus' disciples. If one of them were to have doubts about it, if a Christian were to believe that the New Testament is obsolete, it would not come as a surprise that men in the world, secularized ones, thought that the Church can be oppressed with no consequences. Nevertheless, whoever belongs to Christ will soon realize the following:

Despite what is imagined by the world, even in our time, suffering is essentially the luck of those who offer themselves as servants to the King of sorrows... There is an inner world entered by those who get closer to Christ even though, for the rest of mortals, they appear to be the same as before. They occupy the same places in society as before; their functions, their ways, their comings and goings are identical. If they were highly ranked, they continue to be; if they led an active life, they continue to be active; if they were rich, they still own riches. They still have eminent friends, influential relationships, great resources, a reputation to the eyes of the world. However, if they have drunk from Christ's cup and have tasted the bread from his table with honesty, nothing will be the same for them. A change has been made, of which they take no notice, apart from the results (...).

They are soldiers of Christ's army, they fight against 'visible things' and they possess all 'invisible things' (Newman, 2003, pp. 399-400).

In my opinion, Cardinal Newman's words are clear in the sense that the authentic Christian also experiences a change in their relationship with the world. Everything "tastes" different, even those things in the world which they could eventually enjoy. Nothing is the same for them anymore, since a disciple of Jesus is someone who has undergone an inner transformation and, even though it is not possible to notice it on the outside, their identification with the "Master" makes them a new person, someone whose judgements are no longer those of men but those of the Church which, at the end of the day, is the kingdom of God on Earth. Events and contingency, enjoyment and pain, they live them differently. They recognize that they are not definite and that they ought to face them for their eternal salvation. In my words, the Christian man is a "dissident" to the eyes of the world, since he does not adjust to what the world declares and lives by. On the contrary, as a loyal member of the Church, the Christian is exposed to the same battles of the Church:

He fights and suffers to the extent to which he properly represents his role and if he ceases to suffer, it is because he is asleep. His doctrines and precepts are never agreeable to the world, and if the world does not chase him it is a sign that he is not preaching them. The same happens with each one of its members: they suffer in their own way, probably not the same way as the – church nor for the same reasons or the same degree, but they suffer more or less, because they live under the law of suffering established by Christ... Yes, as long as the Church exists, old Jacob's words will always be true: 'Everything is against us, except for God' (Gen 42. 36). But 'if God is with us, who is against us? (Rom. 8, 31). If He is among us, who will reject us? If Christ has died and resurrected, what kind of death awaits us, even if we have to die each day? Such pain, humiliation, suffering or test that does end like one of his, for perpetual resurrection in the new world and for a ceaseless approximation to Him! He gave his blessing to the apostles, and they spread it across the face of the earth until today. Have it here: 'peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you' (Jn. 14, 27). 'In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world' (Jn. 16, 33) (PPS. V, 20: pp. 287-299) (Newman, 2003, pp. 400-402).

What does this extensive quote by the blessed Londoner mean? Only one idea: the Church “clashes,” has “conflicts” with the world when it is loyal to what it is supposed to preach. The world’s approval of the Church would probably be harmful for the Church itself, since it would indicate that it is not faithful to its mission, it is betraying its task and it would no longer be a tool of salvation for the world itself. Even though it is not aware, it is in the world’s best interests that the Church follows its own criteria and not those that the world proposes, given that the latter ignores the treasure that the Church of Christ offers and contains. Newman is cutting in this sense:

One of the peculiar and characteristic sins of the world is that despite God wants us to live for the life to come, the world makes us live for this life. I affirm that this is the sin of the world: it lives for this life, not for the one to come. It takes as its main goal of human effort, an end that is forbidden by God, and consequently everything it is done turns into evil, because it is directed to the wrong end (Newman, 2007, pp. 219-220).

CONCLUSION

In this article I have attempted to portray the dichotomy established by Cardinal J.H. Newman between the Church and the world (between religion and secularism). Now all I have left is to conclude. Before I do so, however, allow me two more observations: 1. In different letters published in *The Times* diary in 1841 (known as *The Tamworth Reading Room*), John Henry Newman sustains that secular knowledge, unlike religious knowledge, is not a principle or medium for moral improvement or social unity. More so, without faith, it is only temptation to disbelief. 2. In light of what is presented by Cardinal Newman, it becomes notorious that the Church and the world hold an essential difference. This opposition between the two may be irreconcilable, since while the world aims at a merely time-bound reality and all it appreciates and highlights, the Church seeks to guide men to a different world, a spiritual and wholesome one. The criteria that identify the world and those that identify the Church are, thus, completely different. I would dare to mention that, under Newman’s criteria, the oppositions between the Church and

the world are essential, and their similarities point to secondary or accidental ideas and events.

It is the Church which ought to convert the world and not the other way around. The world is at a loss without the Church, and the Church succeeds when the world receives its message and listens to it. For a Catholic person, then, the best way to serve the world and mankind properly is to remain in the Church, being loyal to it, since it is the disciple of Jesus and not the follower of secular judgements, who is called to be “the salt of the earth” and “the light of the world” (St Matthew V, 13-14). And Christians do this inside and not outside the Church, because in the Church they find Christ, and in Christ, God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Newman, J.H. (2003). *El reino de Cristo está en el mundo, pero no es del mundo, y no debe imitar sus costumbres* en La Iglesia. Burgos: Editorial Montecarmelo
- Newman, J.H. (2003). *El espíritu del mundo es una tentación para la Iglesia* en La Iglesia. Burgos: Editorial Montecarmelo.
- Newman, J.H. (2003). *La Iglesia obra primeramente en el corazón del hombre: su enemigo es el pecado* en La Iglesia. Burgos: Editorial Montecarmelo.
- Newman, J.H. (2003). *La oposición del mundo condición normal para la Iglesia de Jesucristo* en La Iglesia. Burgos: Editorial Montecarmelo.
- Newman, J.H. (2007). *La fe y el mundo en Sermones Parroquiales I*. Madrid: Ediciones Encuentro.

Copyright and License



This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution – NoDerivs (CC BY- ND 4.0) License
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>