

THE INTEGRATION OF SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL: CONTEMPORARY ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH-STATE THEORY

LESLIE GRIFFIN

University of Notre Dame

FOR CENTURIES, Christians have sought to discern the moral as well as the religious implications of the gospel message. While their faith in Christ has focused attention on promises of eternal life, it has also confronted them with questions about the meaning of their existence in this world. One of their most significant challenges has been to balance the claims of this world with those of eternal life. The Christian response to this challenge has been pluralistic; over the centuries, Christians have described a variety of ways of understanding and living their Christian commitment in the temporal world.¹ Nowhere, it seems, has this pluralism been more evident than in the centuries-old discussion about the meaning, nature, and limits of Christian activity in the political arena.

In the contemporary discussion of the relationship of Christianity to the world, attention has focused again on Christian political activity. Recent political episodes in countries populated by Christians have prompted debate about the proper relationship of Christians to politics; meanwhile, theological discussions (of the meaning of the secular world, e.g., or of salvation, or of the Christian commitment to justice, or to liberation, or to the poor) have caused Christians to re-examine their understandings of temporal activity in general and of political activity in particular. As in the past, theological reflection and concrete historical events have interacted: the former assisting individuals and churches to decide upon a specific course of action, the latter often inspiring new theoretical insights into Christian political events.

Within the Roman Catholic community, this same cycle of interaction between political events and theological reflection has caused renewed debate about the nature of Catholic political activity. One particular source of contention in recent years has been the question of whether or not clergy and members of religious congregations should hold political office. The list of contributions to this discussion is endless, as is the

¹ The best-known of these are the church-sect distinction of Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1911; repr. 1976) and the Christ-and-culture models of H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1951).

controversy surrounding it.² However, one source of insight into this subject can still be found in a re-examination of the 19th- and 20th-century magisterial documents. At least, some reacquaintance with the papal, conciliar, and synodal tradition from Leo XIII to the present can help to remind participants in this debate of some of the foundations of contemporary Roman Catholic formulations of Christian political activity. But it can illustrate as well the difficulties and tensions surrounding these foundations. Specifically, in this article I will argue that some of the documents' recent statements about the meaning of Christian temporal and political activity raise serious questions about traditional prohibitions of clerical and religious participation in politics.

In order to assess the magisterial tradition's depiction of Christian political activity, the examination of two subjects—soteriology and ecclesiology—is necessary. The definition assigned to salvation determines whether temporal life (and thus political activity) is viewed only as a means to another life, eternal life, or whether it is identified as valuable in its own right. The definition assigned to the Church affects the role that it and its members play in the political world. While the ecclesiology outlined in the magisterial tradition is too extensive to study in this article, three aspects of that ecclesiology are always important to the tradition's political claims, and merit close attention in this study. The first is the question of the Church's *mission* in the world, i.e., is the Church's task one of religious witness, or of temporal activity, or of some combination of the two? Would political activity jeopardize the religious mission of the Church? The second is the question of church *unity*. That is, how can the Church remain united in its proclamation of the gospel message? Would its choice of sides in political debate in some way jeopardize the universality of its message? The third is a question of church *competence* in politics. The issue is what capacity the Church possesses to make political decisions about, e.g., the best form of government, the best political party, or the best candidate for political office. Common to all three of these ecclesiological aspects is a question of individual and corporate agency. Once the Church has identified the scope of its mission, the meaning of its unity, and the range of its competence as institution, it must also decide whether the status of individuals in the Church (i.e., laity, clergy, or religious) affects the type of political activity which they are encouraged to undertake.

² A recent work which includes both theoretical analysis of political ministry as well as historical accounts of such ministry is Madonna Kolbenschlag, ed., *Between God and Caesar* (New York: Paulist, 1985). See also Peter Huizing & Knut Walf, eds., *Can Church Ministers Be Politicians?* (New York: Seabury, 1982). Debates throughout the 1984 U.S. presidential campaign were important to this discussion as well.

In order to explore the import of the soteriology and ecclesiology espoused by the documents, I will analyze three topics which illustrate the tradition's soteriological and ecclesiological concerns. First is the *Church-state* issue, i.e., the role which the documents assign to the *institutional* Church in the political life of society. Second is the *clergy-laity* issue, i.e., the role which the documents assign to *individual* church members in politics. Third is the *spiritual-temporal* issue, i.e., the question of what relationship the documents assign to the supernatural and natural spheres of human life. That third subject will point to the tensions which make the definition of contemporary Roman Catholic political activity so difficult.

CHURCH-STATE

The writings of Leo XIII remain the basis of the contemporary magisterial tradition's appraisal of the relationship between Church and state.³ This relationship was a concern of Leo's throughout his pontificate and provided the focus for a large number of his encyclicals. The most important of these are: *Diuturnum* (1881), *Nobilissima Gallorum gens* (1884), *Immortale Dei* (1885), *Officio sanctissimo* (1887), *Libertas* (1888), *Sapientiae christianae* (1890), *Au milieu des sollicitudes* (1892), *Satis cognitum* (1896), and *Graves de communi re* (1901).⁴ In these writings Leo identifies "two principal societies," Church and state. Both Church and state are autonomous, which in Leo's terminology means that each society has the freedom to pursue its own ends. The aim of civil society is the temporal and material good of the human race, while the end of the Church is to pursue spiritual well-being. In Leo's encyclical on the structure of civil society, *Immortale Dei*, he claims:

The Almighty, therefore, has given the charge of the human race to two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine, and the other over human, things. Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the

³ Leo is influenced by historical events as well as by his theoretical understanding of the relationship of the Church to the state. For a general historical background on Leo's relationship with different states, see, e.g., Georges Jarlot, *Doctrine pontificale et histoire: L'Enseignement social de Léon XIII, Pie X et Benoit XV vu dans son ambiance historique (1922-39)* (Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1964) chaps. 1-5; Roger Aubert, *The Christian Centuries 5: The Church in a Secularized Society* (New York: Paulist, 1978) chaps. 1-3. I think that the best interpreter of Leo's Church-state writings is John Courtney Murray. See, e.g., "Leo XIII on Church and State: The General Structure of the Controversy," *TS* 14 (1953) 1-30; "Leo XIII: Separation of Church and State," *TS* 14 (1953) 145-214; "Leo XIII: Two Concepts of Government," *TS* 14 (1953) 451-67.

⁴ Henceforth *Diut*, *NGG*, *ID*, *OS*, *Lib*, *SC*, *AMS*, *SatC*, and *GRC*. All of these can be found in Vol. 2 of Claudia Carlen, I.H.M., ed., *The Papal Encyclicals 1740-1981*, 5 vols. (Raleigh: McGrath, 1981).

province of each, so that there is, we may say, an orbit traced out within which the action of each is brought into play by its own native right.⁵

The Church for Leo is "*societas perfectas*," a perfect society, for it is a self-sufficient society, able to achieve its ends without external assistance.⁶

Although Leo defines the two societies as autonomous, and as characterized by separate ends, he never allows for their complete separation in human society. Instead, he always reminds his readers that the two spheres intersect in the life of the citizen, who is a member of both Church and state. Because both spheres are concerned with the human person, the relationship between them must be one of "harmony."⁷ Harmony is necessary because both societies are created by God; therefore Church and state must always work together for the well-being of the human person.

In essence, Leo entrusts the Church with the spiritual welfare of the individual; the Church's task is to proffer the means of salvation to human persons. But this spiritual welfare is never totally separated from the material world. John Courtney Murray reminds readers of Leo that Leo argued for the existence of "*res sacra in temporalibus*," i.e. "in the temporal life of man there are elements of the sacred."⁸ Because of this presence of sacred elements in the temporal world, Leo's Church was never limited to strictly "spiritual" activity. Instead, the Church could "reach, as it were, into the temporal order and lay authoritative hands upon the sacred elements therein contained."⁹ As Leo states in *Immortale Dei*, the Church extends to "whatever in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either to its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God."¹⁰

And this "reach," for Leo, gives to the Church a certain *moral* capacity, a moral authority, which enables it to judge those temporal activities which possess moral dimensions. Leo, who promoted the study of Thomas Aquinas in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, accepted a Thomistic theory of natural law. And he attributed to the Catholic Church a dual capacity—not only to be guardian of the divine revelation, but to be the interpreter

⁵ *ID*, no. 13; see also *NGG*, no. 4. Murray identifies seven major Gelasian texts in which Leo explains the relationship between Church and state ("Leo XIII: Separation" 192–200).

⁶ For a treatment of the perfect society in Catholic thought, see Patrick Granfield, "The Rise and Fall of *societas perfecta*," in Huizing and Walf, *Can Church Ministers* 3–8.

⁷ See, e.g., *Diut*, no. 26.

⁸ Murray, "Leo XIII: Separation" 207.

⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰ *ID*, no. 14.

of the natural law. "In faith and in the teaching of morality, God Himself made the Church a partaker of His divine authority, and through His heavenly gift she cannot be deceived. She is therefore the greatest and most reliable teacher of mankind, and in her swells an inviolable right to teach them."¹¹

That moral role, as interpreter of the natural law, does provide the Church, according to Leo, with a limited "political" role. As interpreter of the natural law, the Church possesses the capacity to *assess* the political authority's compliance with the natural law. The Church, therefore, can *judge* whether or not the state is undertaking moral or immoral action. There are carefully-set limits to this judgment. Leo contends that the Church does not possess a specifically political or economic expertise. For example, it does not have the technical capacity to recommend a solution for a nation's economic ills. Nor can it choose a political party as its representative. Moreover, the Church is no "respector of forms," i.e. it does not have the capacity to select any particular form of government as a moral ideal for all nations.¹² Backing a political party, or candidate, or proposing a technical solution to a political or economic problem, not only surpasses the limits of the Church's moral competence. It threatens as well to undermine church unity. As a perfect society, the Church must be characterized by unity; Leo argues that choices which would set individual Catholic against individual Catholic should be avoided.

What the Church does have the capacity to do, however, is to comment on the morality of the political and economic plans suggested by a government to see if they are in accord with the natural law, because political and economic issues which affect the commonweal are always moral issues. Leo argues against those who believe that "the *social* question is merely an *economic* one, whereas in point of fact it is, above all, a moral and religious matter, and for that reason must be settled by the principles of morality and according to the dictates of religion."¹³ The Church's task is to insure that "the respect due to religion and the

¹¹ *Lib*, no. 27. See also *ID*, no. 32.

¹² An example of this is the *ralliement* of French Catholics to the Third Republic in 1892. A large number of French Catholics were monarchists; the republic was openly anticlerical. In *AMS*, Leo urged Catholics to recognize that, as Catholics, they were free to choose any form of government, whether monarchy, republic, or empire, because in itself none was immoral. Because of this, Leo warned Catholics against working for the overthrow of a legitimate government. For full treatment of the *ralliement*, and its broad implications for French Catholicism, see Jarlot, *L'Enseignement*, chap. 5, and Anthony Rhodes, *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1983) chap. 8. See also *SC*, no. 28.

¹³ *GCR*, no. 11.

observance of good morals be upheld."¹⁴ As moral arbiter, the Church's criterion is to accept any form of government, "provided only it be just, and that it tend to the common advantage."¹⁵

Leo believes that this moral (and limited political) role of the Church in fact benefits civil society; it promotes greater stability and order and material prosperity.¹⁶ All of those who oppose the proper functioning of the two societies—the supporters of, e.g., laicism, naturalism, rationalism, socialism, Freemasonry, and separation of Church and state—harm not only the Church but also the well-being of civil society. All of those false philosophies do not allow for the harmony between Church and state essential to the well-being of the individual citizen.

In the years following Leo's papacy, his successors would appeal frequently to this description of two societies, and of the moral authority of the Church, as the foundation for their discussion of the Church's temporal activity. Pius XI, e.g., identifies the Church as the moral guide and teacher of all nations; it can judge any moral aspect of temporal life. This authority is the basis for Pius' treatment of the social question in his encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* (1931). In that encyclical he argues

that there resides in Us the right and duty to pronounce with supreme authority upon social and economic matters . . . not of course in matters of technique for which she is neither suitably equipped nor endowed by office, but *in all things that are connected with the moral law.*

Even though economics and moral science employs each its own principles in its own sphere, it is, nevertheless, *an error to say that the economic and moral orders are so distinct from and alien to each other that the former depends in no way on the latter.* . . .¹⁷

In the political sphere, the nature of the Church's moral authority meets the same limits established by Leo. The Church cannot select political parties or candidates, but it can urge governments to abide by the moral law. These limits are responsible both for Pius' co-operation with and condemnation of a variety of forms of government. For example, Pius attempted to live in harmony with a number of governments; he signed a concordat with Mussolini's Italy in 1929 and with Hitler in 1933. But his insistence on the Church's moral authority, in particular his abhorrence of the encroachments of the totalitarian state, led him to condemn both Fascist and Communist governments, especially late in

¹⁴ *SC*, no. 28. See also *ID*, no. 4; *Diut*, no. 7.

¹⁵ *Diut*, no. 7. See also *ID*, no. 4.

¹⁶ It did this, e.g., by promoting respect for legitimate authority. Among the nations pointed to as examples of this by Leo are Hungary, Portugal, France, Spain, and Italy.

¹⁷ Henceforth *QA*, in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 3, nos. 41–43, my emphasis. See also *Quas primas*, *ibid.* 3:274, no. 17; *Casti connubii*, *ibid.* 3:408, no. 103.

his pontificate.¹⁸

Even more than his predecessors Leo XIII and Pius X, who had at least at times allowed for the existence of Catholic political parties (in Italy and Germany), and for some Catholic clerical participation in politics (see below), Pius XI urged upon the Church a purely spiritual and moral role. Pius doubted the stability of transient political parties and feared to ally the Church with them. He urged the removal of the Church from any support of political activity, emphasizing the importance of its *spiritual* witness. Catholics were allowed and encouraged to participate in politics and to work for a moral political authority. But that political action should not have any official backing by the institutional Catholic Church. Pius preferred to support organizations like Catholic Action, which prohibited *direct* Catholic political involvement and encouraged a Catholic spiritual influence on society. John Courtney Murray assesses this movement of Pius' as a significant moment in the development of a Roman Catholic definition of the Church's political mission:

Pius XI's liquidation of the temporal power of the papacy, his injunctions to the clergy to retire from party politics, and his dissolution of Catholic political parties, are all indicative of a new phase in the eternal problem of the relations between spiritual and temporal. The Church has ceased to pursue her mission in the temporal order by direct immixture in its religio-social problems through the medium of the political process.¹⁹

It is this same understanding of the Church's moral authority which forms the basis of Pius XII's call for a new moral order, founded on human dignity, throughout the years of the Second World War and in the years immediately afterward.²⁰ Pius argues that the Church can, e.g.,

¹⁸ See esp. *Divini Redemptoris*, *Mit brennender Sorge*, and *Nos es muy conocida*, all in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 3. For historical studies of Pius' relationship to these states, see Georges Jarlot, *Doctrine pontificale et histoire: Pie XI: Doctrine et action (1922-39)* (Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1973), and Anthony Rhodes, *The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators 1922-1945* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973).

¹⁹ "Towards a Theology for the Layman: The Problem of Its Finality," *TS* 5 (1944) 68. Rhodes states that on Feb. 1, 1924, Pius forbade priests to belong to political parties and ordered the separation of Catholic Action from political parties. For an account of Pius' decision, see Rhodes, *The Vatican* 14-15, 31-32. Rhodes shows the relationship of that decision to the rise of the Fascist government in Italy as well. See also A. R. Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism 1820-1920* (London: S.P.C.K., 1964) 158-65, for a history of Pius' decision not to support political parties.

²⁰ See his Christmas addresses, in Vincent A. Yzermans, ed., *The Major Addresses of Pope Pius XII*, 2 vols. (St. Paul: North Central, 1961) and idem, *The Unwearied Advocate: Public Addresses of Pope Pius XII*, 2 vols. (St. Cloud, Minn.: St. Cloud, 1956). The difficult question of balancing moral and political concerns was especially problematical for Pius during the Second World War, as it was for Benedict XV during the First World War.

“decide whether the bases of a given social system are in accord with the unchangeable order which God our Creator and Redeemer has shown us through the Natural Law and Revelation.”²¹ The scope of the Church’s authority in politics, therefore, can extend as far as the range of the natural law. Like his predecessors, Pius argues that questions of individual and familial rights, of education, and of political, social, and economic aspects of the dignity of the individual, fall within the Church’s moral authority.

Pius’ distinction between two types of political activity helps to elucidate the meaning of this political role of the Church, already outlined by his predecessors. One type of political activity is that which promotes the common good, the “collaboration for the good of the State,” a good which, according to Pius, can be “understood in a very wide sense.”²² The other type of political activity is that concerned with “party politics,” which are more divisive because concerned with special interests. The Church participates in the former, but not in the latter, activity.

Pius states that there is a “reciprocal compenetration”²³ between the religious apostolate and the first type of political action, for both seek the common good. The political realm confronts humans with moral questions which force them to align themselves either with God or against God. The Church, therefore, has the right to judge political questions which are moral questions, i.e. political questions which enter into the sphere of religion. But it is always according to religious and moral norms, “*sub specie aeternitatis*,”²⁴ that it judges these questions.

This type of role, according to Pius, does not allow for the Church to remain neutral: “She cannot forget for an instant that her role of representative of God on earth does not permit her to remain indifferent, even for a single moment, between ‘good’ and ‘evil’ in human affairs.”²⁵ Even if it cannot back specific candidates or parties, or provide answers to technical questions, Pius does allow the Church to condemn ideologies which contradict the principles of Christian faith. In one address Pius himself stated, e.g., that the Church, even while remaining outside of party politics, was obligated to oppose the formation of a parliament in Italy which would “concern so directly the highest religious interests and the conditions of life of the Church herself.”²⁶ The moral authority of

²¹ Pentecost Address, in Yzermans, *Advocate* 1:212.

²² Address of Feb. 28, 1954, in Yzermans, *Addresses* 1:282.

²³ Address of Oct. 14, 1951, in Yzermans, *Advocate* 1:282.

²⁴ Christmas Message, 1951, in Yzermans, *Advocate* 1:118.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Address of March 10, 1948, in R. Kothen, ed., *Documents pontificaux de S.S. Pie XII*, 3 vols. (Paris & Louvain: Labergerie & Warney, 1948–50) 3:118, my translation.

the Church, therefore, is not as specific as the endorsement of candidates and parties, but is something more than the statement of general principles, for it allows Pius XII, as it allowed Leo and Pius XI, to criticize specific forms and actions of governments.

New images for the Church emerge in the writings of Pius XII and his successors, which move the Church away from much of the "perfect society" language favored by Leo. Pius XII, e.g., refers to the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ; John XXIII uses the term Mother and Teacher, while Vatican II speaks of the People of God. After the time of Pius XII, terms which emphasize the mysterious, as well as the sacramental, nature of the Church will gain more popularity than the "two societies" or "perfect society" language. But, for the most part, these images, although important to a general ecclesiology, do not change the definition of the Church's moral authority. Instead, the magisterial tradition continues to emphasize the Church's task as interpreter of the natural law and as moral guide in the temporal arena.

John XXIII's acceptance of this traditional role of the Church as interpreter of the natural law is especially evident in his encyclical *Pacem in terris* (1963). In that letter he speaks of a "universal, absolute, and immutable" moral order, and bases his identification of an extensive list of human rights upon it. His addressing of the encyclical not only to Catholics but to "all men of good will" confirms this natural-law emphasis; the Church can speak to all persons because it interprets what all persons share, the natural law. It cannot, as in the past, make specific political judgments. Instead, according to John, when the Church intervenes in the political sphere, it urges respect for the individual and the promotion of the common good. It exhorts governments to uphold true spiritual aims, to be obedient to the divine law, and to promote the dignity of the human person.

However, when the Church authors these exhortations, John states that it has the right to do more than proclaim general principles. In *Mater et magistra* (1961) he asserts that "the Church has the right and obligation not merely to guard ethical and religious principles, but also to declare its authoritative judgment in the matter of putting these principles into practice."²⁷ And in *Pacem in terris* John recognizes the right and duty of the Church to "safeguard the principles of ethics and religion, but also to intervene authoritatively with her children in the temporal sphere when there is a question of judging the application of those principles to concrete cases."²⁸

John's writings illustrate as well a greater openness of the Church

²⁷ Henceforth *MM*; in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 5, no. 239.

²⁸ Henceforth *PT*; in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 5, no. 160.

toward the world, exemplified in John's communication with "all men of good will" and in his reading of the "signs of the times." The documents of the Second Vatican Council demonstrate this openness as well. In *Gaudium et spes* the Church is identified as the institution that can provide answers to the difficult questions facing human beings; the Council also acknowledges that the Church can learn from the world. The Church aids the world above all by proclaiming the dignity of the human person; *Gaudium et spes* argues that the Church can "anchor the dignity of human nature against all tides of opinion."²⁹ The Church can do this because of its traditional moral role, a role in which it is "bound to no particular form of human culture, nor to any political, economic, or social system."³⁰ The competence of the Church is still not specifically political; the determination of the best type of government is left to citizens and not to the Church.

Paul VI's first encyclical letter, *Ecclesiam suam* (1964), focuses on ecclesiology and continues this emphasis on openness to (or, in Paul's words, dialogue with) the world. To ensure the world's salvation, the Church possesses a mission to "enter into dialogue with the world in which it lives. It has something to say, a message to give, a communication to make."³¹ It must at the same time, Paul always warns, avoid the dangers of overadaptation to the world.

Paul accepts the understandings of the Church of his predecessors; throughout his writings he accentuates the spiritual mission of the Church. The supreme purpose of the Church is a supernatural one—the salvation of souls. However, the Church's mission is never purely religious. The Church is "deeply rooted in the world. It exists in the world and draws its members from the world. It derives from it a wealth of human culture. It shares its vicissitudes and promotes its prosperity."³² For that reason the Church must contribute to the world's temporal as well as spiritual welfare.

This inclusion of worldly tasks in the Church's spiritual mission is most evident in Paul's writings on evangelization and development, especially in *Evangelii nuntiandi* (1975), Paul's response to the 1974 Synod of Bishops. Paul identifies evangelization, a "strictly religious

²⁹ Henceforth *GS*; in Walter M. Abbott, S.J., and Joseph Gallagher, eds., *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild, 1966) no. 41.

³⁰ *GS*, no. 42.

³¹ Henceforth *ES*; in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 5, no. 65. For an analysis of the concept of dialogue with the world in *ES*, see Philip S. Land, "The Social Theology of Pope Paul VI," *America* 140, no. 18 (May 12, 1979) 392.

³² *ES*, no. 26.

activity, aimed at the preaching of God's kingdom,³³ as the "grace and vocation proper to the Church, her deepest identity."³⁴ However, Paul is careful to insist that, although evangelization's primary purpose is the conversion of hearts, it does not stop there. Instead, part of the task of evangelization, and thus of the Church's mission, is to work for human liberation, to permeate human culture, to support human rights, and above all to work for "integral development."³⁵

The Church is urging her members more and more to become involved without fear in temporal activity, to work in the service of their fellow men and for the common good. . . . The church has never entertained a disembodied, or purely spiritual, concept of religion—one which would hold Christians back from temporal responsibilities. Quite the contrary is true. She has told them that their *faith obliges them to accept social and economic responsibilities*, and to carry them out as loyal followers of Christ.³⁶

Paul retains the traditional political role assigned to the Church by his predecessors; this precludes political or economic, social or technical action. Instead, the Church functions as a moral guide to consciences. ". . . We have not, as the spokesman of the Gospel, to indicate the political ways, the concrete means the citizens must use, in such and such a precise situation, to bring about the progress of their own country."³⁷ Although the Church's participation in the political realm is confined to moral activity, that involvement is not limited to the enunciation of general principles, for Paul contends that when concrete action is indicated to the Church, it will act without hesitation. Paul, after all, calls Christians to action in the temporal world.

Instead of merely deploring or denouncing shortcomings, we think that our duty in this field is to recall and clarify principles, to encourage men to apply them faithfully and not to refuse our collaboration in solid attempts to solve the

³³ Address of June 5, 1970, in *The Teachings of Pope Paul VI*, 6 vols. (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1967-73) 3:239-40.

³⁴ *Evangelii nuntiandi* (henceforth *EN*), in Vincent P. Minelli, ed., *Social Justice* (Wilmington, N.C.: McGrath, 1978) no. 34.

³⁵ For an analysis of this idea of "integral development," see René Laurentin, *Liberation Development and Salvation* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1972) 108-14; David Hollenbach, *Claims in Conflict: Retrieving and Renewing the Catholic Human Rights Tradition* (New York: Paulist, 1979) 77-84; Richard L. Camp, *The Papal Ideology of Social Reform: A Study in Historical Development (1878-1969)* (Leiden: Brill, 1969) 44-46; International Theological Commission, "Human Development and Christian Salvation," *Origins* 7, no. 20 (Nov. 3, 1977) 305-13. For an examination of *EN*, see Donal Dorr, *Option for the Poor: A Hundred Years of Vatican Social Teaching* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1983) 190-206.

³⁶ "Avant de quitter Rome," *The Pope Speaks* (henceforth *TPS*) 12 (1967) 119, my emphasis.

³⁷ "Address to Diplomatic Corps," in *Teachings* 6:186.

problems which this application involves. We are not referring, of course, to technical aspects which are beyond our competence, but to the moral and human aspects of justice and equity, which are no less important.³⁸

One of the most important passages about the Church's moral authority occurs in Paul's apostolic letter *Octogesima adveniens* (1971). Given the different sociopolitical situations which exist throughout the world, Paul concedes that it is no longer always possible for the Church to offer universal solutions to problems.

In the face of such widely varying situations it is difficult for us to utter a unified message and to put forward a solution which has universal validity. Such is not our ambition, nor is it our mission. It is up to the Christian communities to analyze with objectivity the situation which is proper to their own country, to shed on it the light of the Gospel's unalterable words and to draw principles of reflection, norms of judgment and directives for action from the social teaching of the Church. . . . It is up to these Christian communities, with the help of the Holy Spirit, in communion with the bishops who hold responsibility and in dialogue with other Christian brethren and all men of goodwill, to discern the options and commitments which are called for in order to bring about the social, political, and economic changes seen in many cases to be urgently needed.³⁹

As well as stating the importance of the Church's authority to interpret the natural law, therefore, Paul recognizes the limits set on that authority by the difficulty of applying the natural law to specific circumstances.

John Paul II's first speech as pope announces the importance of ecclesiology to his pontificate; his first encyclical, *Redemptor hominis* (1979), continues this emphasis. *Redemptor hominis* focuses on the importance of Jesus Christ to the Church; it identifies the purpose of the Church as bringing each person to Jesus Christ (and thus to salvation).⁴⁰ If the Church wishes to bring the human being to Jesus Christ, John Paul contends, it cannot remain insensible to her welfare. Instead, it has a duty to promote human dignity, rights, and justice, especially for the poor, for whom the Church must show preference. The Church's mission in support of justice obligates it to support the work of development. The Church "does so not to serve political interests, nor to acquire power, nor to offer pretexts for violence, but to save man in his humanity and

³⁸ "Address to Diplomatic Corps," Jan. 12, 1974, *TPS* 18 (1973-74) 295-97.

³⁹ Henceforth *OA*; in Joseph Gremillion, ed., *The Gospel of Peace and Justice* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1976) no. 4. Land, "Social Theology" 394, calls this passage a "dramatic departure" from church teaching; see also Dorr, *Option* 168-69, and Charles Curran, "The Changing Anthropological Bases of Catholic Social Ethics," in *Moral Theology: A Continuing Journey* (Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame, 1982) 189-91.

⁴⁰ See Gregory Baum, "The First Papal Encyclical," *Ecumenist* 17 (May-June 1979) 55-59, for an analysis of this encyclical.

in his supernatural destiny."⁴¹ The Church's task, then, is always to guard the freedom which is the condition of human dignity. The Church does all of this, of course, by means of its moral and religious authority in the temporal world.

If the church gets involved in defending or promoting human dignity, it does so *in accordance with its mission*. For even though that mission is *religious in character*, and *not social or political*, it cannot help but consider human persons in terms of their whole being . . . an indispensable part of its evangelizing mission is made up of works on behalf of justice and human promotion.⁴²

As always in the tradition, work in support of human dignity and justice is subject to the traditional limitation that the Church cannot undertake specifically political activity. "You know that the church does not have direct competence for proposing technical solutions of an economic-political nature. However, she calls for a constant revision of all systems according to the criterion of the dignity of the human person."⁴³ John Paul reminds Catholics that the Church must always work "through the means proper to her."⁴⁴ For John Paul, the means is primarily the indirect formation of consciences, and not direct participation in political action.

The Church intends, of course, to respect the functions assigned to men in public positions. She makes no claim to a place in politics nor has she any ambition to share in the handling of temporal problems. *Her specific contribution will be to strengthen the spiritual and moral foundations* by doing what she can to help each and every activity in the field of the common good to develop in ways harmonious and consistent with the criteria and the requirements of human and Christian ethics. Yet her service consists, above all, in the formation of consciences by proclaiming the moral law and its demands; by calling attention to error and to attacks on the moral law and on the dignity of the human person, on which the moral law is based; by calling and persuading.⁴⁵

By its renunciation of any claims to political, economic, or technical expertise, John Paul argues, the Church points out the limitations of all earthly kingdoms. The Church reminds people that full human liberation must transcend the purely material. It announces that salvation does not

⁴¹ "The Beatitudes," *Origins* 10, no. 39 (March 12, 1981) 616.

⁴² "Opening Address at the Puebla Conference," in John Eagleson and Philip Scharper, eds., *Puebla and Beyond: Documentation and Commentary* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979) no. III, 2, my emphasis.

⁴³ "Developing a New International Economic Order," *Origins* 12, no. 7 (July 1, 1982) 112. See also "Church and State in Poland," *Origins* 9, no. 5 (June 21, 1979) 69; *L'Agréable*, *TPS* 27 (1982) 124-26.

⁴⁴ "Chegado a esta," *TPS* 25 (1980) 80-81. See also "Na alegre," *TPS* 26 (1981) 71.

⁴⁵ "Chegado a esta" 78-79, my emphasis.

arise in a sociopolitical setting only, but rather through faith and membership in the Church. In its works, then, John Paul argues that the Church proclaims the primacy of the spiritual—but a primacy which never allows for the material neglect of the human person.

The magisterial tradition is constant, then, in proclaiming its moral authority in the political sphere, an authority based on its capacity to interpret not only the gospel but also the natural law. And it is constant in its assertion that this moral role, which allows it to “intervene” in the temporal world, proves that the Church is not indifferent to the temporal well-being of the world, but in fact contributes to that well-being. Moreover, the Church maintains its unity by avoiding divisive political disputes. Those ideas of limited moral competence and of church unity are reinforced by the documents’ description of the tasks of clergy and laity, which I shall examine next.

CLERGY-LAITY

Linked to the magisterium’s definition of a limited moral competence for the *institutional* Church is a concern about the roles of *individuals* in politics. The pontiffs urge those Catholics who are qualified to become politicians; they exhort Catholics as well to vote and to participate in political activity directed toward the common good. However, in discussing the religious and political duties of Christians, an immediate distinction is made in the tradition between the duties of priests and those of the laity.⁴⁶ Clergy and laity possess different functions in the Church; this distinction also provides them with different political roles in the world. The magisterial tradition affirms that while priests are to remove themselves from the political arena, the laity are to act therein, penetrating it with Christian principles.

There are many reasons for the tradition’s constant recognition of a difference between clergy and laity. The vocation of the priest is primarily a *spiritual* one, i.e. the priest’s first task is always the salvation of souls. Because of this, the priest is called to greater personal holiness than the layperson; his vocation is always described as a higher and a holier one. The priest’s calling, e.g., is “sublime”; he is the “salt of the earth and the light of the world”; he possesses a “providential mission.” All of this is due to his special role as representative of Christ on earth, or as mediator of the holy. As such, he is above all a witness to, or a sign of, something greater than this world. Unlike the layperson, the priest’s calling enables him to testify to the supernatural in a special way.

If they are to serve as witnesses to the eternal, priests must remind

⁴⁶ This applies to members of religious congregations as well, but in this article I will focus on the clergy.

Catholics of their religious and moral duties. The list of tasks assigned to priests by the tradition is quite lengthy. Priests must preside over the sacraments, preach, instruct Catholics in sound doctrine, serve as exemplars of the virtues, etc. In describing these and other tasks, the pontiffs, we shall see, always strike a balance between the spiritual and temporal duties of the priest. They insist that the call to holiness must not dissociate the priest from the world. He does have duties within the world, including the political world: he must vote, e.g., and he must always be concerned for the poor. But there is a constant warning that the priest must not become too worldly. If he does, he threatens to undermine his primary, spiritual task. For example, full involvement in the political sphere would contradict the witness which priests give to an otherworldly salvation. Moreover, political responsibilities for priests could undermine church unity. The entire Church possesses unity, and laypersons are frequently asked to put aside their differences on behalf of unity. But the priest is a symbol of that unity, and he cannot be this if he sides with political parties, programs, and candidates, which are by nature divisive. Only rare exceptions can permit this type of activity.

It is the laity who are to be active in the temporal world. That is their arena, the locus of their vocation. Throughout the 20th century the pontiffs acknowledge that, even if the priest is the most important worker for salvation, other workers are necessary. The priest cannot restore society to Christian values by himself, but instead depends on the laity, who are especially suited to work in the secular world, including the political world. As the tradition moves into the 20th century, the laity take on an ever-increasing importance. More and more attention is paid, e.g., to their form of "common priesthood" and to the significance of their role in the Church. But the distinctions—including the distinction in political roles—between clergy and laity are constantly maintained.

Leo, as we have seen, located the intersection of the spiritual and temporal spheres in the life of the human person, the citizen. Although in Italy Leo allowed for the *non expedit* (a prohibition against voting),⁴⁷ in general he urged Catholics to act as good and loyal citizens of their countries. Leo argues that Catholics should work politically to ensure a sound moral order. They are responsible, e.g., for voting for representa-

⁴⁷ Leo argued that there were certain exceptional cases in which Catholics should not be involved in politics. This, e.g., was the situation in Italy during Leo's papacy. The seizure of the Papal States had taken place during the papacy of Pius IX, and no settlement had been reached with the Italian government. This failure to resolve the so-called Roman Question influenced Leo's attitude toward Italian politics. He imposed a *non expedit* on Italian Catholics, i.e. he prohibited them from voting in Italian elections. For a treatment of the historical factors surrounding the *non expedit*, see Vidler, *A Century* 154-55; Aubert, *Christian Centuries*, chap. 1.

tives who uphold Catholic moral teaching, or for holding office themselves if qualified. As Leo defended the Church against charges that its activity harmed the well-being of civil society, he defends Catholics against the accusation that they are poor citizens who concern themselves only with eternal life.

One of Leo's most important perceptions about the modern world was that the Church was surrounded by enemies (atheists, Freemasons, etc.) who sought to deny the Church and its members their proper place in society. When surrounded by foes, the best Catholic response would be to *unite*. Leo's understanding of the kind of unity that can exist among Catholics corresponds to the competence which he grants to the Church in political matters. Catholics must agree on the moral principles enunciated by the Church, but individual Catholics are free to hold their own political opinions and to disagree with other Catholics over specifically political matters. "But in matters merely political, as, for instance, the best form of government, and this or that system of administration, a difference of opinion is lawful."⁴⁸ Unity is so important for Leo that it can even at times override the importance of individual expression of political opinions. In *Nobilissima Gallorum gens*, Leo's encyclical on the religious question in France, he states: "But if anyone is compelled, so that union may be preserved, to renounce his own private opinion, let him do so cheerfully, for the common good."⁴⁹

One of the most important ways in which the Church can maintain unity is through the priesthood. Leo acknowledges that the spiritual task of the priest (i.e., working for the salvation of souls) is primary. As part of that task, the priest instructs Catholics in sound doctrine, exemplifies the virtues, and presides over the sacraments; he also urges other Catholics to act as good citizens. Leo always exhorts priests to remember that their spiritual work suffers when they are too involved in the temporal world. "Assuredly it is not conduct consonant with the duties of the priesthood to give oneself up so entirely to the rivalries of parties as to

⁴⁸ *ID*, no. 48. See also *SC*, no. 29. Still, during Leo's papacy he did seem to encourage, or at least to permit, the formation of Catholic political parties, such as the Centre Party in Germany. And Catholic priests had been members of parliament in some nations. These parties were composed of Catholic members and worked to put Christian principles into effect in government and to uphold the rights of the Church. Pius X was not as supportive of these parties, but Benedict XV was. Benedict lifted the *non expedit* and encouraged the growth of the Catholic Popular Party under the leadership of the Catholic priest Dom Sturzo. Pius XI changed this (see above). See Vidler, *A Century* 127, 131-32, 161-62; Rhodes, *The Vatican* 14, 162.

⁴⁹ *NGG*, no. 8.

appear more busy with the things of men than with those of God."⁵⁰ Leo argues that if priests were to side with political parties, they would detract from that spiritual unity of the Church.

Leo's successors continue his emphasis on the primacy of the spiritual task of the priest and on the importance of priestly dissociation from political life for the sake of church unity. Pius X, e.g., argues that the priest is the Church's best tool for the renewal of society. If priests become too involved in the world, they lose sight of their spiritual goals; their temporal tasks might harm the dignity of the priestly office. Pius warns that the greatest danger confronting priests is that "they may attach such importance to the material interests of the people that they will forget those *more important* duties of the sacred ministry."⁵¹ For this reason Pius X limits priestly political activity to certain specific circumstances. In his encyclical letter on Catholic Action, *Il fermo proposito* (1905), Pius provides the classic statement of that restriction.

The priest, raised above all men in order to accomplish the mission he has from God, must also remain above all human interests, all conflicts, all classes of society. His proper field of action is the Church. There, as ambassador of God, he preaches the truth, teaching along with respect for the rights of God respect also for the rights of every creature. In such a work he neither exposes himself to any opposition nor appears as a man of factions, ally to one group and adversary to others. In such a way he will not place himself in the danger of dissimulating the truth, of keeping silence in the conflict of certain tendencies, or of irritating exasperated souls by the repeated arguments. In all these cases he would fail in his real duty. It is unnecessary to add that while treating so often of material affairs he may find himself obligated to perform tasks harmful to himself and to the dignity of his office. *He may take part in these associations, therefore, only after mature deliberation, with the consent of the Bishop, and then only in those cases when his assistance will be free from every danger and will be obviously useful.*⁵²

In the papacy of Pius XI one witnesses a strengthening opposition to priestly political activity. While at least some priests had taken part in political action under Leo and Pius X, Pius XI even more vehemently opposes the participation of priests in politics.⁵³ He urges priests to undertake a purely spiritual role, giving testimony to a higher good: "He [the priest] brings home to young and old the fleeting nature of the present life; the perishableness of earthly goods, the value of spiritual goods and of the immortal soul; the severity of divine judgment; the

⁵⁰ *Cum multa*, in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 2, nos. 12 and 13. See also *Constanti Hungarorum*, *ibid.*, no. 16.

⁵¹ Henceforth *IFP*; in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 3, no. 24, my emphasis.

⁵² *IFP*, no. 25, my emphasis.

⁵³ Rhodes, *The Vatican* 15.

spotless holiness of the divine gaze that reads the hearts of all; the justice of God, which 'will render to every man according to his works.'⁵⁴ Even when priests concern themselves with the material well-being of their fellow human beings, there seems to be for Pius a spiritual reason underlying their concern: persons may ignore the message of salvation if they are preoccupied with economic and material worries.

Because of this spiritual concern, Pius "discouraged priests from belonging to political parties, from supporting candidates at elections or contributing political articles to newspapers; and he ordered a complete separation of Catholic Action . . . from the Popular Party."⁵⁵ Pius turns from Catholic political parties and politically active priests and supports in their stead Catholic Action, an organization which would pursue spiritual aims without direct political activity. This coincides, of course, with the removal of the Church from direct political activity noted earlier.

Pius' argument is not that priests should have *nothing* to do with politics. They should fulfil their own personal duties as citizens and encourage lay Catholics to do the same. However, priests' interventions in politics are limited to the proclamation of general principles of the natural law and to conclusions from that law which allow them to counter governments opposed to "the principles of religion and Christian morality." They "must remain resolutely outside of party fights, above all purely political competition."⁵⁶ Behind this, of course, is always the perception of a need for church unity in an age in which the Church is surrounded by foes.

Pius acknowledges the difficulty of this distinction. But he insists that these strictures must be met, and the emphasis is on avoiding any activity which would promote disunity.

Practically, it is true, it is not always easy to fix with precision the limits of such a distinction; it will not be easier to determine, in the variety of particular cases, in which circumstances a given action involves either the private citizen only, or the man whose task gives him a public character. In these doubtful cases, as in those in which the action of the Bishop or the priest could compromise the religious interests committed to their care, the enlightened zeal of the good shepherd of souls will not hesitate to abstain.⁵⁷

In response to the Second World War, Pius XII is even more emphatic than his predecessors in urging citizens to become politically active. Avoiding war in the future may depend upon the increased participation

⁵⁴ *Ad catholici sacerdotii*, in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 3, no. 25.

⁵⁵ Rhodes, *The Vatican* 15.

⁵⁶ "E noto," in *Actes de S.S. Pie XI: Encycliques, motu proprio, brefs, allocutions*, 4 vols. (Paris: Bonne Presse, 1927-39) 1:375-76, my translation.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

of good citizens in their nations. Pius is more accepting of democracy than his predecessors, for he thinks that people are "impatient . . . to take the reins of their destiny in their own hands"⁵⁸ after the horrors of the war. Thus, Catholics must recognize their "grave moral responsibility" to vote, especially to vote against communism and for the protection of the Church and the salvation of souls.

The major political responsibility of priests, for Pius, is that they be active and responsible citizens of their nations. But priests must not enter into the realm of political party disputes.

When it concerns questions of the temporal order (although they concern also the moral order), men of the Church leave to others, in the present circumstances, the care of examining and resolving them technically for the well-being of the nation.

When in flesh you fill the high and wholesome function of preaching the word of God, guard yourselves against descending into the mean questions of political parties, into bitter party contestations, which irritate spirits, stir up discords, freeze charity, and harm your dignity, as well as the efficacy of your sacred ministry.⁵⁹

Pius, in reference to the participation of Italian clergy in politics, supports the Concordat of 1929 with Italy, which forbids clerics "to sign up for or to fight in any political party whatsoever." The Church supports this convention, for "she does not think at all, for her part, to insert herself into purely political questions, in which she leaves Catholics, as such, full liberty of opinion and action."⁶⁰

This does not mean that priests do not have temporal responsibilities. Pius criticizes those priests who are not at all active in making the gospel known in the temporal world, for he insists that the interior formation of the priest enables and obligates him to act in the exterior world. The priest must not, e.g., ignore instances of social injustice, but must be committed to the establishment of justice in the world. In *Menti nostrae* (1950), however, Pius warns priests against getting too caught up in external action (the "heresy of action") and reminds priests that their first duty is always their own sanctification.⁶¹

John XXIII continues this discussion of priestly holiness in his encyclical on the priesthood, *Sacerdotii Nostri primordia* (1959). John's "hierarchy of values" places the sanctification of souls above all other goals. John always notes that the priest's first responsibility is to his own soul,

⁵⁸ Christmas Message, 1944, in Yzermans, *Advocate* 1:62.

⁵⁹ Address of March 10, 1948, in Kothen, *Documents* 1:119, my translation.

⁶⁰ Address of March 16, 1946, *Documentation catholique* (henceforth DC) 43 (1946) 322, my translation.

⁶¹ In Odile Liebard, ed., *Clergy and Laity* (Wilmington, N.C.: McGrath, 1978) 67.

and then to the souls of others. The duties of worship and a life of prayer take pre-eminence over any other form of apostolate. "The faithful do not like to see you engrossed in mundane affairs, as though you were trying to solve everything in the span of one generation; by the same token, they do not appreciate the priest who appears too exuberant or partial."⁶² John urges the same balance between spiritual duties and temporal commitments outlined by his predecessors.

Priests must not lose sight of the fact that their task consists above all in this: to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass with dignity; to announce the word of God; to administer the sacraments; to help the sick, and particularly the dying; to teach the faith to those who do not know it. All the rest, all which is not related to these occupations, must be put aside or must be at most tolerated.⁶³

In contrast, the laity should be involved in politics. In the final section of *Pacem in terris*, e.g., John exhorts Catholics to take part in public life. They must work to make sure that society's institutions further the human person's natural and supernatural ends. They must become competent in politics so that they can influence public policy by the application of Christian principles.

All Christians, both clergy and laity, should work for Christian unity. Catholics should seek subjects on which they can agree. Even in political matters they must always attempt to act in unison. Differences of opinion on nondoctrinal, political matters are allowed among Catholics, but John argues, as Leo did, that they must not allow these disagreements to impede their unity.

The documents of the Second Vatican Council assign great value to the task of the laity. *Lumen gentium* speaks of the people of God, e.g., and insists that all Christians, both clergy and laity, are called to holiness; all Christians share in the priesthood of Christ. Nonetheless, this and other Council documents maintain the distinction between the "ministerial" and "common" priesthood, and reaffirm the temporal and political differences that exist between them. In chapter 4 of *Lumen gentium*, the laity are at first defined negatively as "all the faithful except those in holy orders and those in a religious state sanctioned by the Church."⁶⁴ But finally, it is their secularity which distinguishes them from priests and members of religious congregations:

The laity, by their very vocation, seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God. They live in

⁶² "A quarantacinque," *TPS* 5 (1958-59) 298.

⁶³ Address of May 26, 1962, *DC* 59 (1962) 173, my translation. See also "Da quando," *TPS* 7 (1961-62) 18.

⁶⁴ Henceforth *LG*; in Abbott and Gallagher, *Documents of Vatican II*, no. 31.

the world, that is, in each and in all of the secular professions and occupations. They live in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life, from which the very web of their existence is woven.⁶⁵

For this reason they must strive to imbue "all of human activity and culture with moral values."⁶⁶ In undertaking all of these activities, they must be clear about the relationship between their actions as citizens and as Christians.

Because the very plan of salvation requires it, the faithful should learn how to distinguish carefully between those rights and duties which are theirs as members of the Church, and those which they have as members of human society. Let them strive to harmonize the two, remembering that in every temporal affair they must be guided by a Christian conscience. *For even in secular affairs there is no human activity which can be withdrawn from God's dominion.*⁶⁷

Both *Gaudium et spes* and *Apostolicam actuositatem* urge political responsibilities on citizens. They recognize political life as a worthy profession; to restore and to renew the temporal order is its special obligation. Persons who can work in politics should do so, since in doing so they promote the common good. But clergy (and religious) should not do so, because the documents of the Second Vatican Council emphasize the witness given to spiritual values by priests and religious. And their spiritual task is situated within the traditional framework of the Church's moral authority, described in *Apostolicam actuositatem*.

As regards activities and institutions in the temporal order, the role of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is to teach and authentically interpret the moral principles to be followed in temporal affairs. Furthermore, it has the right to judge, after careful consideration of all related matters and consultation with experts, whether or not such activities and institutions conform to moral principles. It also has the right to decide what is required for the protection and promotion of values of the supernatural order.⁶⁸

To the laity is left the task of applying these moral principles to concrete circumstances.

One of the documents of the 1971 Synod of Bishops, *The Ministerial Priesthood*, provides a good summation of the tradition's opposition (with rare exceptions) to priestly political activity. In a section entitled "The Priest and Temporal Matters," the synod document reminds Catholics of the teaching of Vatican II that the appropriate task of the priest is religious, not political, economic, or social. Nonetheless, the priest can

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ *LG*, no. 36.

⁶⁷ Ibid., my emphasis.

⁶⁸ In Abbott and Gallagher, *Documents of Vatican II*, no. 24.

contribute to temporal well-being. In Part 2 the bishops elaborate on this priestly task in the temporal world, by reviewing the conciliar document on priestly ministry. The priest's task is one of evangelization, of bringing persons to salvation by preaching the word of God through the sacraments. Within this task the document sets specific guidelines for priestly involvement in secular activity. It argues that "as a general rule, the priestly ministry ought to be a full-time occupation." Secular activity can be undertaken only if "those duties and activities serve the mission of the Church."

In order to remain a *valid sign of unity* and be able to preach the Gospel in its entirety, the priest may sometimes be obliged to abstain from the exercise of his own right in this field. Moreover, care must be taken lest his option appear to Christians to be the only legitimate one or become a cause of division among the faithful. Let priests be mindful of the laity's maturity, which is to be valued highly when their specific role is involved.

Leadership or active militancy on behalf of any political party is to be excluded by every priest unless in concrete and exceptional circumstances this is truly required by the good of the community and receives the consent of the bishop after consultation with the priests' council and, if circumstances call for it, with the episcopal conference.⁶⁹

Throughout Paul VI's numerous statements on the priesthood, he insists on a careful balance between the spiritual and temporal responsibilities of the priest. Priests must always be detached from the "spirit of the world," from all earthly attachments. They must at all times maintain the primacy of the supernatural in their own lives. Their first concern must always be the salvation of souls.

The first attribute of the priestly ministry consists in being delegated to represent God in Christ, and thus to save the world. All other duties of a temporal, social, contingent character are derived from this and must be placed in this setting. *Woe betide the priest who tries to be everything and do everything—the politician, sociologist, expert, consultant, organizer and so on—but fails in the specific mission that makes him a priest: the glory of God in sacrifice for his brothers, to whom he must communicate divine life in the vivifying contact with Christ.*⁷⁰

Paul opposes those "tendencies to secularize priestly service by reducing it to a mainly philanthropical social function,"⁷¹ because he believes that the laity need to see in the priest some witness to the primacy of the spiritual. Service to the world is an important part of the priest's calling, but direct political activity is not.

The laity's function is different; their distinguishing characteristic is

⁶⁹ In Liebard, *Clergy and Laity* 335–36, my emphasis.

⁷⁰ Address of June 12, 1971, *TPS* 16 (1971–72) 101, my emphasis.

⁷¹ Address of October 10, 1973, *TPS* 18 (1973–74) 227–28.

that they live a secular life in the world. They are the ones who must penetrate the world with the spirit of Jesus Christ. Paul places great emphasis on the capacity of the laity to apply Catholic social teaching in the secular world. In *Populorum progressio* (1967) he argues that it is necessary for "the laymen—without waiting passively for orders and directives, to take the initiative freely and to infuse a Christian spirit into the mentality, customs, laws and structures of the community in which they live."⁷² They can provide the Church with information about the "problems of secular life."⁷³ And Paul's recognition of the difficulty of offering solutions of universal validity in *Octogesima adveniens* places greater demands upon the laity for discernment and action. This dependence is evident in Paul's "call to action" to all Christians in that document's concluding sections.

Throughout his pontificate John Paul II has affirmed the importance of priests to the well-being of the Church. One of his major concerns about the role of clergy in the Church has been their increased involvement in politics. John Paul has opposed such activity since the beginning of his pontificate, and reasserts traditional teaching about the priesthood throughout his writings. Priests are called to preach and teach, to transmit Christian faith and morals, to communicate the truth, to guard purity of doctrine, and to become servants to God's people. Priests are called to encourage the laity in their mission and to set an example of service and love for all Christians.

John Paul reminds Catholics that the ministerial priesthood is distinct from the common priesthood of the laity. The ministerial priesthood has a special character; it is hierarchical and sacramental. Although it finds its meaning in service to the community, its authority is never derived from the community but from God. All Catholics share in the priesthood of Christ, but the ministerial priesthood is a higher calling, a special calling, and thus irreplaceable in the Church: "... your sharing in the priesthood of Jesus Christ differs from their sharing essentially and not only in degree."⁷⁴ Priests give witness to a higher life, to the life of the kingdom of God; their major task must always be the salvation of souls. Secular tasks remain the responsibility of others; to the priest belongs the job of spiritual guidance. Priests must at all times attest to their

⁷² Henceforth *PP*, in Gremillion, *The Gospel*, no. 81.

⁷³ "Noi dobbiamo," *TPS* 9 (1963-64) 364.

⁷⁴ "Letter to Priests," *Origins* 8, no. 44 (April 19, 1979) 699. John Paul not only insists upon the superiority of the priesthood but upon the superiority of celibacy to other callings. It has a "wholly singular link . . . with the Kingdom of God," and is the "supreme form of giving." See "Address to the Roman Clergy," *Origins* 8, no. 25 (Dec. 7, 1978) 400; "A Vision of the Priest's Role," *Origins* 8, no. 35 (Feb. 15, 1979) 548; "Address to Scottish Priests," *Origins* 12, no. 4 (June 10, 1982) 61.

spiritual calling; for this reason John Paul urges them to wear clerical dress.

The primacy of the priest's spiritual mission prevents his undertaking a political role in the world. This prohibition was stated most clearly at Puebla, although it has been reiterated by John Paul many times since then.

You are priests and members of religious orders. You are not social directors, political leaders or functionaries of a temporal power. So I repeat to you: Let us not pretend to serve the Gospel if we try to 'dilute' our charism through an exaggerated interest in the broad field of temporal problems. Do not forget that temporal leadership can easily become a source of division, while the priest should be a sign and factor of unity, of brotherhood. The secular functions are the proper field of action of the laity, who ought to perfect temporal matters with a Christian spirit.⁷⁵

So far, then, the position of the magisterium on the institutional and individual ecclesiological questions is quite clear. The Church's *mission* is described as a *religious* one, the salvation of souls, although that salvation always involves some concern for the material well-being of Christians and for the moral life. The Church's *competence* is a *moral* and *religious* one. The Church is the interpreter of the natural law; this competence allows it to proclaim general moral principles, but also to assess society's compliance with these principles. Finally, in order to testify to salvation or to the universality of the gospel, the Church must maintain a certain *unity*, i.e. it must avoid political choices which would detract from the harmony which should exist among all Christians. The clergy-laity distinction reinforces these claims: clergy testify to the spiritual nature of the Church and are also figures of unity who cannot be involved in political controversy. The laity's sphere of competence is the secular world, including the political arena.

SPIRITUAL-TEMPORAL

Some of the *soteriological* concerns of the documents, however, render this subject more problematical. By this soteriological concern (or what I refer to as the spiritual-temporal issue) I mean the question of what relationship the individual's life in this world has to her eternal salvation. In order to assess this relationship in full, one would have to study a number of topics, including, e.g., the definition of body and soul in the tradition, as well as its description of eternal life, its theory of virtue, its definition of human work and of vocation, its allowance of private property and the limits placed on it, etc. Here, however, I will focus on two themes which I think illustrate the relationship of spiritual to

⁷⁵ "A Vision of the Priest's Role" 548-49; see also "Address to Scottish Priests" 62.

temporal, as well as raise important questions about the nature of Catholic political involvement: natural law and the significance of human temporal activity.

An analysis of these two themes over the duration of this magisterial tradition demonstrates, I think, that some shift has occurred in the understanding of spiritual and temporal. That shift is not a radical one, but it is nuanced; it is not a move, for instance, from a rejection of the temporal world and toward an acceptance of it. The tradition has always attached importance to the temporal dimensions of human life; natural law, after all, was always possible because of some innate human capacity to discern the good, while human action on earth was always valuable and important. But over the years of the tradition, I think the spiritual and temporal aspects of human life have moved closer to one another, become more interrelated, more interdependent. The two themes I have chosen to outline here should demonstrate what I mean by the transition that has occurred between spiritual and temporal. They will illustrate as well why the assignment of different political roles to clergy and laity has become a source of contention in contemporary discussions of political ministry.

Natural Law

We have seen that the Church's competence in the political arena includes its capacity to interpret the natural law. In describing this moral authority, Leo XIII in general appropriates the natural-law theory of Thomas Aquinas. His fullest treatment of the natural law occurs in the encyclical letter *Libertas*. Humans possess liberty because they are endowed with reason; reason guides them in pursuing good and avoiding evil. But human liberty needs law to direct it toward the good; human reason prescribes to the will what it should seek and what it should shun, commands the right and forbids sin, commands the natural law. However, the authority of this natural law comes not from the human person but from God. The law of nature is God's eternal law implanted in rational creatures. The existence of the natural law depends on God, a God who through grace can strengthen the will and enlighten the intellect of the human person. For Leo, this is not the natural law of the naturalists or the rationalists, who argue for the independence of a human reason devoid of eternal foundation, and thus for an independent morality. Any form of morality based on such a denial of God is misguided, for "once ascribe to human reason the only authority to decide which is true and what is good, and the real distinction between good and evil is destroyed."⁷⁶

⁷⁶ *Lib.*, no. 16.

Leo describes, then, a positive interpretation of the natural elements of human life, but only if their dependence on the supernatural is recognized. That is, he provides us with a theory which defends the goodness of the temporal sphere, while at the same time asserting its subordination to a higher plane, the supernatural.

Throughout the tradition this concept of natural law is affirmed as the root of the Church's moral authority. But we have seen that this concept, as the pontiffs acknowledge, offers at least some difficulty when applied to the political sphere. The natural law certainly includes general principles of morality, which the magisterium must announce. But it must also include more than general principles, or its annunciation would be vacuous. That is, the pontiffs must be able to apply the natural law to certain concrete situations, and assert their right to do so. And yet they do not claim the authority to use the natural law in specifically political decision-making. The balance is at times a difficult one, as the pontiffs admit. And that difficulty also poses a problem for the "sign of unity," the priest, who must struggle to achieve that same equilibrium between acting morally and avoiding the divisive political choosing of sides.

But the development within the tradition's treatment of the natural law makes the range of this authority even more uncertain. With the papacy of John XXIII the tradition begins to display a greater openness to the world, a greater insistence on the need for Catholics to read the "signs of the times" and to learn from the world. A number of scholars have described this period, from the time of John XXIII onwards, as the locus of a methodological shift in the documents, a shift which lessens the tradition's reliance on the natural law. For example, M.-D. Chenu describes this methodological shift as a move from a "deductive" to an "inductive" method.⁷⁷ David Hollenbach argues that John moves away from a strictly natural-law conception of justice to a "*Christian* theory of justice." Hollenbach attributes this to a growing "epistemological humility" in the tradition, to a decreased confidence in rational natural-law perspectives on the human person and an increased reliance on theological arguments.⁷⁸ Charles Curran notes a "shift away from a strict natural law approach and methodology" in *Gaudium et spes*; Jesus Christ, human sinfulness, and human experience receive more emphasis than in the past. Curran argues that this demonstrates that "there is not a dichotomy

⁷⁷ Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La "doctrine sociale" de l'église comme idéologie* (Paris: Cerf, 1979) chap. 7.

⁷⁸ See David Hollenbach, "Modern Catholic Teachings concerning Justice," in *The Faith That Does Justice*, John C. Haughey, ed. (New York: Paulist, 1977) 224, 216, and "The Right to Procreate and Its Social Limitations: A Systematic Study of Value Conflict," Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1975.

between gospel and human experience as there was between gospel and natural law. Human experience is not restricted merely to the natural."⁷⁹ Both Chenu and Curran argue that Paul's writings continue this rejection of a strict reliance on the natural law. Chenu cites the passage from *Octogesima adveniens* which we have already examined as an example of this; Curran notes that "*Populorum progressio* uses the term natural law only once and then in a citation taken from Leo XIII." Curran argues that this alteration in methodology demonstrates that "the area of the natural no longer appears as merely extrinsically juxtaposed to the supernatural . . . the Christian and the truly human are the same."⁸⁰ Finally, John Paul's Christological concerns reinforce this notion of a shift from a strict natural-law methodology (see below).

What does this mean for our initial *soteriological* question? I think the developing treatment of the natural law in these documents points to the difficulty in drawing clearly established boundaries between the moral and religious areas of life, or between the temporal and spiritual. As more emphasis is placed on the need for Christians to learn from the world itself, it is less possible for Christians to appeal to a "separate" moral and religious authority. As the laity become more and more necessary as interpreters and appliers of the natural law and as providers of secular knowledge to church authorities (because of the limits of the natural law itself), it becomes more problematical to separate their moral function from that of clergy and hierarchy.

As the line between spheres of competence becomes harder to draw, one can begin to raise questions about the assignment of distinct roles to clergy and laity in politics. But even this is not the clearest evidence of a growing interdependence between spiritual and temporal in the documents. I think the tradition's attitude toward our second topic, the meaning of human temporal activity, demonstrates the spiritual/temporal shift even more clearly.

Human Temporal Activity

We have seen that Leo identified the existence of sacred elements in the temporal, and placed sacred over temporal goods. John Courtney Murray refers to this ordering as Leo's "doctrine of the primacy of the spiritual": "not all the things contained within the temporal order of

⁷⁹ Charles E. Curran, "Dialogue with Social Ethics: Roman Catholic Social Ethics—Past, Present and Future," in *Catholic Moral Theology in Dialogue* (Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame, 1976) 116–17, 128.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 130.

human life are of equal rank."⁸¹ Because for Leo eternal life is more valuable than temporal life, those activities which place persons into relationship with God are the most important duties. Temporal work and prosperity must be kept in perspective; religious duties, especially the duty to pray, must always be primary in the life of the Christian. However, the performance of religious duties is not of itself sufficient for humans to attain salvation. While religious duties are the "chief duty" of humans, Leo also argues that "a well-spent life is the only way to heaven."⁸² But all of this activity seems to take its value from its relationship to eternal life. Temporal purposes and goods can never serve as the final end of human life, and their pursuit must be subordinated to the individual's quest for life with God. The "highest good of all" is always the "eternal salvation of mankind"; the "salvation of souls" is the "only end to be sought for."⁸³

Leo's treatment of the virtue of charity illustrates this priority. Charity, for Leo, means that one must be concerned first with the spiritual well-being of the neighbor; her material well-being is only secondary. Issues of material justice are never as decisive as one's eternal well-being.

Leo's immediate successors agree that temporal life is important, but that it is always subordinate to the spiritual. Pius XI urges Catholics to the duties of prayer and penance. Pius' emphasis on spiritual pre-eminence is most evident in his description of the restoration that needs to take place in human society. He argues that societal evils (such as war and dissension) are rooted in spiritual evils. Social justice and social charity are necessary to combat these evils, and Pius' introduction of the concept of social justice to the tradition is evidence of the magisterium's assertion that temporal activity is important. However, even when talking of social justice, Pius finally does return to Leo's concept of the primacy of the spiritual. Actions of justice and charity are required of Christians, but what is most significant is their eternal salvation. Pius even at times urges Catholic Action adherents to undertake social work as "means of approaching the multitudes."⁸⁴ That is, it seems that at least at times Pius may value the material well-being of human persons as a way of saving souls.

Pius XII continues this approach with his opposition to "materialism" and the "technological spirit," with his dismissal both of a "purely spiritual Christianity" and the "heresy of action." John's theme of a

⁸¹ Murray, "Leo XIII: Separation" 206-7. For Leo's texts which describe the relationship of spiritual to temporal, see, e.g., *ID*, no. 6; *OS*, nos. 12 and 13; *SC*, nos. 1 and 3; *Rerum novarum*, nos. 20 and 21.

⁸² *ID*, no. 32.

⁸³ *Exeunte iam anno*, in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 2, no. 5.

⁸⁴ *Nos*, no. 13. See also *OA*, no. 36; Dorr, *Option* 58.

“hierarchy of values” reiterates this same thinking. In general, work is valued because it leads humans to God. By directing their temporal activities toward God, Christians transform acts of this world into acts of the next world.

John’s expansion of the sphere of justice through his identification of an enlarged list of rights and duties begins the movement of bringing spiritual and temporal closer together.⁸⁵ But it is in the documents of the Second Vatican Council and of the 1971 Synod of Bishops that the shift is most emphatic. *Gaudium et spes* argues that religious faith is inseparably linked to action in the temporal sphere. Religion is more than acts of worship, for “faith needs to prove its fruitfulness by penetrating the believer’s entire life, including its worldly dimensions, and by activating him toward justice and love, especially regarding the needy.”⁸⁶ *Gaudium et spes* insists that love for God and neighbor cannot be separated, and that “the Christian who neglects his temporal duties neglects his duties toward his neighbor and even God, and jeopardizes his eternal salvation.”⁸⁷ It emphasizes that humans receive a mandate from God to subject the earth to themselves; by their daily activity humans participate in God’s plan. There does not seem to be an emphasis on the subordination of human temporal work to religious aims. Rather, the temporal can serve as a sign of the religious. “Hence it is clear that men are not deterred by the Christian message from building up the world, or impelled to neglect the welfare of their fellows. They are, rather, more stringently bound to do these very things.”⁸⁸ Instead of threatening the independence of the temporal order, Christianity strengthens concern for the temporal world.

Therefore, while we are warned that it profits a man nothing if he gain the whole world and lose himself, the expectation of a new earth must not weaken but rather stimulate our concern for cultivating this one. For here grows the body of a new human family, a body which even now is able to give some kind of foreshadowing of the new age. Earthly progress must be carefully distinguished from the growth of Christ’s kingdom. Nevertheless, to the extent that the former can contribute to the better ordering of human society, it is of vital concern to the kingdom of God.⁸⁹

This interrelationship between spiritual values and temporal activity is stated forcefully in *Justice in the World*, promulgated by the 1971 Synod of Bishops. This document affirms that “action on behalf of justice

⁸⁵ See *PT*. See Hollenbach, *Claims*, for an analysis of this human-rights tradition.

⁸⁶ *GS*, no. 21.

⁸⁷ *GS*, no. 26.

⁸⁸ *GS*, no. 34. See also no. 57.

⁸⁹ *GS*, no. 39.

and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a *constitutive dimension* of the preaching of the Gospel, or, in other words, of the Church's mission for the redemption of the human race, and its liberation from every oppressive situation."⁹⁰ No longer is human temporal activity simply a means to eternal life. Instead, the spiritual aims of Christianity are inseparable from work for justice and development.

Paul's interpretation of spiritual and temporal is most evident in his description of the relationship between evangelization, a "strictly religious activity, aimed at the preaching of God's kingdom," and development, the "human civil temporal promotion of peoples who are stepping out on the road to prosperity."⁹¹ In *Populorum progressio* Paul announces that Christians are obliged to become active in the material work of development, helping those who live in hunger, misery, disease, and ignorance. But Paul is careful to insist that "development cannot be limited to mere economic growth. In order to be authentic, it must be complete: *integral*, that is, it has to promote the good of every man and of the whole man."⁹² Humans must develop themselves by pursuing their earthly vocation and by orienting themselves to God, as well as by working for their material prosperity. But humans can never be concerned only with their own welfare. Social by nature, they have obligations toward all and must work for the well-being, material and spiritual, of the whole human race.

Thus, integral development obligates human persons to recognize Paul's scale of values. This prevents development from becoming a preoccupation with material goods only. Instead, humans must search for a development which incorporates values like love and friendship, prayer and contemplation. Here, then, is the definition of Paul's integral, authentic development. It is the "transition from less human conditions to those which are more human." This transition includes *both* "the passage from misery toward the possession of necessities" and the "acknowledgment by man of supreme values, and of God their source and their finality."⁹³

In *Evangelii nuntiandi* Paul argues that the proclamation of an otherworldly salvation is not sufficient for the task of evangelization. Instead, the pursuit of justice by means of development is an essential part of that task. Evangelization promotes human social and personal life by

⁹⁰ In Minelli, *Social Justice* 285, my emphasis.

⁹¹ Address of June 5, 1970, in *Teachings* 3:239-40.

⁹² *PP*, no. 14. For a treatment of the relationship between integral development and human dignity, see Camp, *Papal Ideology* 44-46, and Hollenbach, *Claims* 77-84.

⁹³ *PP*, nos. 20 and 21. See also nos. 33-35.

supporting human dignity and rights and by advancing human liberation. Paul demands:

... how in fact can one proclaim the new commandment without promoting in justice and in peace the true, authentic advancement of man? We ourselves have taken care to point this out, by recalling that it is impossible to accept 'that in evangelization one could or should ignore the importance of the problems so much discussed today, concerning justice, liberation, development and peace in the world.'⁹⁴

Development, then, for Paul, includes material goods, but it can never be purely material, for human beings, after all, are always spiritual and material beings. Thus, their spiritual, cultural, and social needs must be included in development. Here we see how interrelated the spiritual and temporal aspects of life have become, in contrast to the earlier tradition.

John Paul's writings warn that the kingdom of God is never merely temporal, because the human person is more than a material and political being. Temporal justice is insufficient without spiritual liberation. John Paul insists upon the primacy of the moral and of the spiritual; there is no human liberation without this.

But John Paul also asserts that the works which foster spiritual and material welfare are inseparable. In *Redemptor hominis* John Paul affirms the "primacy of the spiritual," but it is a primacy which incorporates material elements: "there is but a single goal to which is directed the deepest aspiration of the human spirit as expressed in its quest for God and also in its quest, through its tending toward God, for the full dimension of its humanity, or in other words for the full meaning of human life."⁹⁵ We have already noted John Paul's Christological focus; because Jesus Christ has linked himself to every individual, Christians can never neglect the human being. *Redemptor hominis*, through its emphasis on Christ in the Incarnation, demonstrates the close link between spiritual and temporal; no longer are there two separate realms.

This interdependence of spiritual and temporal is evident as well in John Paul's treatment of work throughout *Laborem exercens* (1981). One instance of this is the spirituality of work he provides in the closing section of that encyclical. It is through their work that persons come closer to God and participate in God's plan of salvation; it is in work that spiritual and temporal realms are combined.⁹⁶

In these later writings, then, human work, human temporal life, is no

⁹⁴ *EN*, no. 31.

⁹⁵ In Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals* 5, no. 29. For this theme see Baum, "The First" 55.

⁹⁶ For an analysis of this encyclical, see Gregory Baum, *The Priority of Labor: A Commentary on Laborem exercens, Encyclical Letter of Pope John Paul II* (New York: Paulist, 1980).

longer simply a means to the human person's truer life, her eternal life; temporal life is no longer viewed as a steppingstone to heaven. Duties of piety are no longer considered the pre-eminent activities of Christians. Instead, the focus has shifted to actions of development, of liberation, of justice, as constitutive and essential elements of the Christian life, as part of Christian spirituality.

What of the political realm? Is it in fact included in this growing significance of the temporal arena? Do the documents praise the increased importance of the temporal sphere but de-emphasize the importance of politics? In fact the opposite is true—the political world expands in importance in the eyes of the magisterium. This growth is evident, e.g., in John XXIII's recognition of the importance of a principle of socialization (allowing state intervention) as well as the traditional principle of subsidiarity (limiting such intervention). It is also present in Paul's assertion in *Octogesima adveniens* that, due to the predominance of politics in contemporary life, it is time for Christians to "pass from economics to politics"⁹⁷ in order to promote integral development. The political world is not excluded, therefore, from the tradition's growing concern with the temporal.

Again, it seems to me that, as in the case of the natural law, this shift has implications for our *ecclesiological* concerns. That is, as the distinction between spiritual and temporal becomes harder to define, so too, I think, does the distinction between clergy and laity. As more and more emphasis is placed on the need for *all* Christians to work within the temporal world, for justice, for liberation, and for development, it becomes difficult to separate the realms of clerical and lay responsibility. As political activity becomes more important for the promotion of justice and liberation, it seems that the prohibition against clerical participation in politics becomes increasingly problematical. At any rate, the growing importance assigned to the temporal realm does, I think, undermine arguments against political participation by clergy which are based on the identification of their *spiritual* task as opposed to the *temporal* task of the laity.

Present in the magisterial tradition from Leo XIII to John Paul II, then, are clear prohibitions against priests' holding of political office. Among the reasons for this prohibition is the argument that, as the

⁹⁷ OA, no. 46. See also Land, "Social Theology" 392, and Dorr, *Option* 162-76. For a discussion of socialization, see Dorr, *Option* 102-5, who includes a discussion about the controversy over the use of that word; Hollenbach, *Claims* 62-69; Donald R. Campion, "Mater et magistra and Its Commentators," *TS* 24 (1963) 8-15; Pierre Bigo, *La doctrine sociale de l'église: Recherche et dialogue* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965) 143-60; *MM*, no. 59.

Church promotes the supernatural ends of the human person, so must the priest care for the *spiritual* well-being of the laity. Political office might involve the priest too much in the temporal; it might undermine his witness to the spiritual, to the eternal. But, if arguments about the spiritual and the temporal undergird the exclusion of clergy from politics, then changing conceptions of the spiritual and the temporal call this standard into question. The shift in interpretation of these realms—evident, e.g., in the magisterial tradition's treatment of the natural law and of the significance of human temporal activity—suggests that the arguments against such participation require some reconsideration, or reformulation, more consistent with the *integration* of spiritual and temporal.