1133

OWNERSHIP FOR ALL

A STUDY IN THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF PIUS XII

by

Rev. C.W. MACDONALD

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of Philosophy
of the University of Ottawa, in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Université d'Ottawa
BIBLIOTHÈQUES
LIBRARIES
University of Ottawa

OTTAWA

1966

UMI Number: DC53966

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.
In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform DC53966
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION v

CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM OF PROPERTY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PIUS XII AND HIS TIMES 1

I. Statement of the Problem and its Importance in the Papal Context 1

II. Two Prerequisites for a Better Understanding of the Problem and its Solution in Pius XII ... 9

A. Exact Terminology in Reference to the Documents of Pius XII 10

B. The Situation of Property and its Distribution in the Times of Pius XII 16

CHAPTER II. THE CONCEPT OF PROPERTY IN PIUS XII 36

I. The General Right of All to the Use of the World's Material Goods 37

1. Importance 37
2. Origin 42
3. Universality 47
4. Inviolability 48

II. The Right of Private Property 52

A. Foundation and Justification 53

1. Foundation 53
2. The Basic Argument: Dignity and Freedom 57
3. The Family Argument 72
4. The Labour Argument 79

B. The Individual and Social Aspect of Private Property 89

III. Equitable Distribution: the Primary Consequence of the Property Concept 98

1. Importance 99
2. The Nature of an Equitable Distribution and its Justification 104
3. The International Phase of an Equitable Distribution of Wealth 111
   (a) The Primary Right of All Demands a Just Distribution of Wealth Between Nations 113
   (b) An Excessive Disparity in the International Distribution of Wealth is Contrary to the Natural Order 123

CHAPTER III. PIUS XII AND THE FORMS OF PROPERTY ENDANGERING ITS EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION .. 136

I. Individualist Capitalism 138

II. Excessive Nationalization 157

III. Forced and Centralized Co-partnership in the Industrial Enterprise 174

CHAPTER IV. THE ROLE OF THE ECONOMY AND OF THE FORMS OF OWNERSHIP IN THE DIFFUSION OF PROPERTY 197

I. The Ideal National Economy and the Diffusion of Property 203

A. The Goal of the Economy 204

B. The Agents of the Economy 208

II. The Forms of Property in the Ideal National Economy 213

A. Consumable Property 216

B. Small-Scale Property 222

C. Large-Scale Property 239

CHAPTER V. THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN THE DIFFUSION OF PROPERTY 255

I. The Principles 256

II. The Principles Applied 276

A. Promotion of Small-scale Property Ownership 277

B. State Participation in Systems of Social Insurance 286

C. Economic Planning for a Productive and Balanced Economy 296

CHAPTER VI. PIUS XII'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH ON PROPERTY 307

I. Primacy of the Universal Right: A New Approach 309

II. The Equitable Distribution of Private Property: New Arguments — World-wide Application 324

A. The Arguments for Private Property: Freedom and Dignity — A New Aspect 324

B. Equitable Distribution: A New Emphasis and a World-wide Application 339

III. Forms of Ownership and the Role of the State: A New Emphasis 350

A. The Forms of Property: A New Evaluation 351

B. The Role of the State: A More Specific Application 364

CONCLUSION 375

BIBLIOGRAPHY 381

APPENDIX: Major Pronouncements of Pius XII on Ownership for All 397

I. Text of June 1, 1941: La Solennità 397

II. Partial Text of Christmas 1942: Con Sempre Nuova 413

III. Text of Sept. 1944: Oggi, Al Compiersi 417

IV. Text of July 7, 1952: Dans la tradition 423

FOREWORD

Wealth, like education, bears with it more responsibilities than privileges. This is central to the Christian concept of ownership for all. The extent to which Christians have failed to make this concept meaningful, is dramatized today in the frightening contrast between living standards within nations of the world community. The basic idea of ownership for all is perhaps the most original element in the teaching of the Church.[1] Centuries ago, St. Thomas thus formulated this daring principle of riches: "Man should not consider his material possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without hesitation when others are in need."[2] Yet, it has been observed that the modern teaching of the Catholic Church on private property suffers not only from the fact that it is not widely known and understood but also from the fact that, in one particular aspect, it is positively misunderstood: its doctrine on the sacredness of private property and the inviolable nature of acquired property rights.[3]

---

1 Jacques LECLERQ, Christianity and Money, New York, Hawthorn, 1959, p. 115.

2 "[...] non debet homo habere res exteriores ut proprias, sed ut communes; ut scilicet de facili aliquis eas communicet in necessitate aliorum." (II-II, q. 66, a. 2.)

3 B.W. DEMPSEY, S.J., The Functional Economy, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1958, p. 184. For a like

More than any pope, Pius XII sought to restore the concept of property in the framework of the Christian tradition, and to apply it to the problems of his time. During his pontificate he issued 246 major statements on the social problems of his time; some 70 of these bear directly or indirectly on the question of widespread ownership.[4] The purpose of this study is to collect, analyze, appraise and to make readily available what the Holy Father taught — explicitly and implicitly — on the question of property and its equitable distribution. Pius XII never wrote a social encyclical in the manner of his predecessors and John XXIII. As a consequence, his socio-economic teaching is little known and rarely included in popular collections of pontifical documents relating to the social doctrine of the Church. It is hoped that this work will help to narrow the gap and thereby draw attention to the riches in the abundant

---

observation, see Emile GUERRY, The Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church, trans. by Miriam Hederman, New York. Alba House, [1961], p. 91.

4 Francesco VITO, Introduzione alle Encicliche e ai Messaggi sociali da Leone XIII a Giovanni XXIII, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1962, p. 3*-53*. (See section on Chronological Repertoire of Pontifical Documents.) Vito shows that Pius XII is the author of more than half (246) of the 424 social documents in existence from the time of Pius X (1848) to May 15, 1961 (the date of Mater et Magistra); Leo XIII is the author of 50; Pius XI, 36.

treasury of Pius XII's documents on socio-economic problems. The writer's interest in this subject has its origin in a long-standing association with the Antigonish Movement: A philosophy and a program of action — of world-wide influence — dedicated to the conviction that all men can be inspired to help themselves and to help one another to the end of realizing their God-given right to a share of the earth's bounty, sufficient to assure the material base necessary for the freedom to pursue the good and the abundant life.

In this study the following method has been adopted: After an introductory chapter on the problem of property in its contemporary context, the principles basic to ownership and its widespread distribution are analyzed and evaluated in the light of Pius XII's pronouncements. The third chapter presents the Holy Father's moral judgement on contemporary economic systems and proposals adversely affecting a just diffusion of private property. The next two chapters examine Pius XII's practical and positive directives designed to achieve ownership for all. The concluding chapter investigates his contribution to the Church's teaching on property as compared with that of Leo XIII, Pius XI and John XXIII. Pius XII's four major pronouncements on property, in their original sequence, are included as an appendix.

Pius XII's statements as Roman Pontiff constitute the source of this present work. Since this is a philosophical study, only natural truths and logical reasoning will be used to derive and to establish the Pope's teaching on ownership for all. To remain on the level of reason is consistent with the dominant papal approach to the investigation of socio-economic problems. "The natural law," Pius XII declared, "is the foundation on which rests the social teaching of the Church."[5] A celebrated commentator on papal social thought observes that a social encyclical cites Holy Scripture not with a view to demonstration, "but rather to stress the conformity of its logical conclusions with the teaching of the Gospel."[6] This is particularly noteworthy in Pius XII's procedure of concluding his discourses with an appeal to the evangelical Christian doctrine of human solidarity in Christ.

This dissertation has been prepared under the direction and guidance of Professor Jean-Louis Allard. The writer expresses grateful appreciation for Dr. Allard's interest, encouragement and constructive criticism given throughout an extensive period.

---

5 PIUS XII to the Congress of Humanistic Studies, Sept. 25, 1952, cited by Emile GUERRY, op. cit., p. 16.

6 O. von NELL-BREUNING, S.J., Reorganization of Social Economy, tr. B.W. Dempsey, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1937, p. 16.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF PROPERTY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PIUS XII AND HIS TIMES

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE IN THE PAPAL CONTEXT

An imbalance in the distribution of wealth has always been a threat to freedom and peace. Maritain points out that wherever such a state of affairs exists, "a revolution in the social body is inevitable".[1] World poverty and the associated question of "overpopulation" are grave problems today, because man's attitude to property has interfered with the right of all men and all nations to an equitable share of the world's material goods.

A distorted concept of private property produced the extremes of collectivism, on the one hand, and the rugged individualism of liberal economics on the other. These extremes have been the major factors, occasioning the recent papal pronouncements on property.[2] Within this general

---

1 Jacques MARITAIN, Freedom in the Modern World, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, Ltd., 1936, p. 202.

2 For example, in the first major pronouncement on property by recent Popes, Leo XIII in the encyclical Rerum Novarum, May 15, 1891, concentrated his attention on the defence of private ownership against the socialists. In the encyclical Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, Pius XI thus referred to Pope Leo's approach to the right of property: "But to come down to particular points, We shall begin with

context, the Popes have concerned themselves with presenting the Christian concept of property with a view to realizing its social function without uprooting its personal function.[3] Diversified historical conditions demanded emphasis on one or other of these aspects. This could, and it has given rise to a misinterpretation of the Popes' teaching.[4] To maintain

---

ownership or the right of property. Venerable Brethren and Beloved Children, you know that our Predecessor of happy memory strongly defended the right of property against the tenets of the Socialists of his time by showing that its abolition would result not to the advantage of the working class, but to their extreme harm." (English version in H. KOENIG (ed.), Principles for Peace, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1943, No. 962, p. 410-411; Latin original in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Romae, Typographia Vaticana, 1909- , Vol. 23 (1931), p. 191.)

3 Pius XI stresses the point that the right of property has both an individual and social function and that to deny or downgrade one or other of these functions could lead to individualism or collectivism. In Quadragesimo Anno, he emphasizes the importance as well as the difficulty of keeping a balance between the two functions: "First then, let it be considered as certain and established that neither Leo nor those theologians who have taught under the guidance and authority of the Church have ever denied or questioned the twofold character of ownership, called usually individual or social according as it regards either separate persons or the common good. [...] Accordingly, twin rocks of shipwreck must be carefully avoided. For as one is wrecked upon, or comes close to, what is known as "individualism" by denying or minimizing the social and public character of the right of property, so by rejecting or minimizing the private and individual character of this same right, one inevitably runs into "collectivism" or at least closely approaches its tenets." (KOENIG, Principles for Peace, Nos. 963, 964, p. 411; AAS, 23, p. 191, 192.)

4 For example, it is not surprising that, with the rapid strides of socialism in nineteenth century, Leo XIII would concern himself with the personal values of private ownership. For this he was criticized as a protector of the rich and his doctrine was misrepresented even by Catholics. It was on account of such misinterpretations that Pius XI expounded his teaching on the right of property. In

a balance between the two functions is the problem. There appears to be an opposition existing between two facts: (1) private property of its very nature is exclusive; (2) the goods of the earth are to serve all. The appearance of new forms of property, a change from a "do nothing state" to a "do everything state" may well intensify the opposition and further complicate the traditional problem. Hence its actual importance.

Within this frame of reference, the Pope as the spokesman of the natural law and revelation for his time, intervenes. He re-evaluates and reformulates the fixed ethical principles surrounding the traditional concept of property. He applies them anew to contemporary social and economic circumstances bearing upon the concept. He issues directives and sometimes guarded advice as to the best means of realizing the concept. Hence, for each Pope, the problem of property is ancient, yet ever new.

Quadragesimo Anno, he wrote: "Yet since there are some who calumniate the Supreme Pontiff and the Church herself, as if she had taken and were still taking the part of the rich against the non-owning workers — certainly no accusation is more unjust than that — and since Catholics are at variance with one another concerning the true and exact mind of Leo, it has seemed best to vindicate this, that is, the Catholic teaching on this matter, from calumnies and safeguard it from false interpretation." (KOENIG, Principles for Peace, No. 962, p. 411; AAS, 23, p. 191.)

For Pius XII, private property and its equitable distribution is vital to man if he is to realize his dignity as a person. It was thus that he expressed this necessity in his Christmas address of 1942:

> The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation for life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible to all.[5]

Respect for personal values is, therefore, Pius XII's criterion for judging any system of ownership or any form of private property. This is in keeping with his oft-repeated principle that the person is the foundation, the end, and the agent of social and economic life. That such was his thinking is evident from the following statement he made during the course of a Christmas address on the problem of democracy:

---

5 "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; a cui risponde l'obbligo fondamentale di accordare una proprietà privata, possibilmente a tutti." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

An English version of Pius XII's documents appearing in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis will be used in the text of the dissertation. Unless the footnotes indicate otherwise, other translations will be from The Catholic Mind, New York, American Press; The Pope Speaks, Washington, D.C.; H. KOENIG (ed.), Principles for Peace, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1943; A. YZERMANS, The Major Addresses of Pius XII, St. Paul, The North Central Publishing Co., 1961, Vols. I and II; Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1953. The Catholic Mind and The Pope Speaks are the principal sources for the English translation. Each document will be referred to under the commonly accepted English title and the official title consisting of the opening words of the original document. In English, there is no one complete collection of Pius XII's documents on social problems such as there is in German and in French.

> We direct our attention to the problem of democracy [...]; our action shows clearly that the interest and solicitude of the Church looks not so much to its external structure and organization [...] as to the individual himself who, so far from being the object and, as it were, a merely passive element in the social order, is in fact, and must be and continue to be, its subject, its foundation and end.[6]

In a previous Christmas address, the Holy Father, in a major message on the fundamental principles concerning the internal order of states and peoples, stressed this principle, that "the origin and primary scope of social life is the conservation, development and perfection of the human person."[7] Again, in an address to the workers assembled in Milan, May 1, 1956, he made it abundantly clear that every social movement must have for its fundamental principle man with his supernatural end, his natural rights and obligations, and this even if the proposed movement is directly concerned with economic and temporal goods.[8]

---

6 "Noi indirizziamo la Nostra attenzione al problema della democrazia, [...]; ciò indica chiaramente che la cura e la sollecitudine della Chiesa è rivolta non tanto alla sua struttura e organizzazione esteriore, [...] quanto all'uomo, come tale, che, lungi dall'essere l'oggetto e un elemento passivo della vita sociale, ne è invece, e deve esserne e rimanerne, il soggetto, il fondamento e il fine." (Christmas Address, Benignitas et humanitas, Dec. 24, 1944, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 12.)

7 "Origine e scopo essenziale della vita sociale vuol essere la conservazione, lo sviluppo e il perfezionamento della persona umana [...]" (PIUS XII, Christmas Address, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 12.)

8 The Christian Labour Movement, Vivo e gradito, May 1, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 289.

It is true that Pius XII stressed the importance of property and its just distribution to the extent that he could refer to it as "the cornerstone of the social order"[9] and "a central point in Catholic social thought".[10] His concern was not with material goods as such. His interest was in the person who owned or did not own. He stressed that all had the moral obligation to work for economic conditions conducive to the virtuous life for all persons. To expect a destitute man to live virtuously is to demand the heroic. There is no mistaking his words:

> The normal growth and increase of religious life presupposes a certain measure of healthy economic conditions. Who can resist a pang of emotion upon seeing how economic misery and social evils render Christian life according to the commands of God more difficult and too often demand heroic sacrifices?[11]

---

9 "[...] pietra angolare del ordine sociale [...]" (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.

10 "[...] un des objectifs principaux de la doctrine sociale catholique [...]" (Papal Directives for the Woman of Today, Vous vous présentez, Sept. 11, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 487.)

11 "Ora ben si sa che il normale accrescimento e invigoramento della vita religiosa suppone una determinata misura de sane condizioni economiche e sociali. Chi non si sente stringere il cuore al vedere quanto la miseria economica e i mali sociali rendono più difficile la vita cristiana secondo i comandamenti di Dio e troppo spesso esigono eroici sacrifici." (Catholic Action, Diletti figli, May 3, 1951, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi di Sua Santità Pio XII, Vatican Polyglot Press, Vol. 13, p. 69.

Obviously, then, this problem as the Pope sees it, is a moral one. As the guardian of morals for his time, he interprets, in terms of the ultimate, man in his relations to the material goods of the world. To be sure, the theologian, the jurist, the sociologist, all consider the goods of the world under their respective points of view.[12] The Pope considers the question in its ultimate aspect relative to the natural law and to the natural right expressed by that law. He is not concerned with vindicating existing property rights or with sanctifying the contemporary regime of property. In an address on world reconstruction, 1944, Pius XII explicitly stated the aim of the Church in discussing private property:

> In defending, therefore, the principle of private property, the Church pursues a high ethico-social purpose. She does not intend to defend absolutely and simply the present state of affairs as if she saw in it the expression of God's will [...] But the Church aims rather at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the design of God's wisdom and the disposition of Nature: an element of social order, a necessary presupposition to human initiative, an incentive to work to the advantage of life's purpose here and hereafter, and hence of the liberty and dignity of man, created in the likeness of God, who, from the beginning,

---

12 For the diverse points of view of the various sciences, on this question, especially theology, see J. TONNEAU, "Propriété", in Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique, Vol. 13, col. 757-759.

> assigned him for his benefit domination over material things.[13]

Pius XII is, therefore, concerned with humanizing property, making it the material basis for man in the fulfilment of the existential ends assigned to him by his human nature.

The Holy Father is not a teacher of economics. But economic activity, being human, is moral and, therefore, comes within his jurisdiction. Indeed, the moral aspect is primary in economic life.[14] This is the point he stressed in an

---

13 "Difendendo dunque il principio della proprietà privata, la Chiesa persegue un alto fine etico-sociale. Essa non intende già di sostenere puramente e semplicemente il presente stato di cose, come se vi vedesse la espressione della volontà divina, [...]. Ma la Chiesa mira piuttosto a far si che l'istituto della proprietà privata sia tale quale deve essere secondo i disegni della sapienza divina e le disposizioni della natura: un elemento dell'ordine sociale, un necessario presupposto delle iniziative umane, un impulso al lavoro a vantaggio dei fini temporali e transcendenti della vita, e quindi della libertà e della dignità dell'uomo creato ad immagine di Dio, che fin dal principio gli assegnò a sua utilità un dominio sulle cose materiali." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS 36 (1944), p. 253.

14 It is noteworthy that the efforts of those who would abolish or reorganize the system of private property always assume the ethical principle of justice to which they make their final appeal. For the thesis that ethical neutrality in economic life is an impossibility and that modern economic theory is moving in the opposite direction, see Richard E. MULCAHEY, S.J., "The Concept of National Income", in Richard E. MULCAHEY, S.J. (ed.), Readings in Economics, Westminster, Md., The Newman Press, 1959, p. 66-75; Cornelius E. ELLER, S.J., "Moral Judgements in Welfare Analysis", ibid., p. 285-297, and Francesco M. VITO, "Towards a Reformulation of the Subject-Matter of Economics", in R. CIRILLO (ed.), Catholic Social Thought, Malta, A.C. Aquilina and Co., 1956, p. 16-30.

address to the Italian Youth in 1948. He defined the social question as the problem of how to arouse the individual and public conscience so that they all might realize their obligation to create the public conditions that would enable all individuals and all peoples to live not as objects of social and economic life, but in dignity as the subjects and agents of that life. He pointed out that this was an economic question, but in its deeper sense it was above all a moral and a religious question.[15]

The problem having been stated, it is now a matter of putting it in a perspective which could be helpful and even necessary for understanding the doctrine of Pius XII.

II. TWO PREREQUISITES FOR A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION IN PIUS XII

The forms of property change from age to age and from place to place.[16] In the Middle Ages the modern industrial complex was unknown. Even today, the form of property in the

---

15 PIUS XII, Address to Young Men, Nel vedere, Sept. 12, 1948, in AAS, 40 (1948), p. 412.

16 For a description of these changes throughout history and the circumstances accounting for them, see Valère FALLON, S.J., Principles of Social Economy, trans. by Rev. John McNulty, New York, Benziger Bros, 1933, p. 181-190; see also Johannes MESSNER, Social Ethics, trans. from the German by J.J. Doherty, St. Louis, Herder, 1949, p. 790, 791.

under-developed countries is largely agricultural, while in the rest of the world it is largely industrial.[17] The concept of property is, therefore, dynamic. Hence the importance of knowing the traditional terminology in conjunction with the contemporary environment. Before considering the times of Pius XII, it seems logical to define and distinguish terms, vital to the state of any question.

A. Exact Terminology in Reference to the Documents of Pius XII.

The papal documents do not include all the formal definitions and distinctions involving the concept of property.[18] They are usually not in the form of a doctrinal synthesis, rather they are ad hoc pronouncements corresponding to circumstances of place and time. This is especially so in the case of Pius XII. A great deal of his doctrine was given on the occasion of addresses to particular groups from almost every vocation and country. A careful examination of his documents enables us to understand his use of terms and the distinctions necessary for his historical background.

---

17 Arthur McCORMACK, World Poverty and the Christian, New York, Hawthorn, 1963, p. 129.

18 For the definitions and divisions of property, see Jean VILLAIN, S.J., L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, Paris, Spes, 1953, Vol. II, p. 25-28; I.G. MORAL, S.J., Philosophia Moralis, Santander, Sal Terrae, 1952, p. 345-347.

To begin with, there is the basic distinction between the right of property and the object upon which a person exercises this right. Confusion could arise from the fact that the same words "property", "private property" are used interchangeably to signify both the right and the object of the right. Strictly speaking, in English the word "ownership" is the more proper word to describe the right, and "property" to describe the object owned. With Pius XII, where he uses the word "property", the specific context has to be examined to determine whether it is to be understood in reference to the right itself or the object of the right.

From the viewpoint of the right's object, Pius XII makes a clear distinction between material goods destined for the production of new goods and those which are consumed in their use. Obviously referring to the collectivistic threat to private property, he states that "the Christian conscience cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders impossible or nugatory in practice the natural right to property whether over consumptive goods or the means of production."[19]

---

19 "La coscienza cristiana non può ammettere come giusto un ordinamento sociale che o nega in massima o rende praticamente impossibile o vano il diritto naturale di proprietà, così sui beni di consumo come sui mezzi di produzione!" (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.)

As to the right itself, a major source of confusion is the distinction between the cluster of rights involved in the property concept. First, there is the right of every man to the world's material goods, then the right to make the latter effective by private appropriation, and finally the right as it is actualized by statutory laws. In his basic document on property, the radio message of Pentecost 1941, Pius XII clearly distinguished between the above rights, and evaluated them according as they proceed from the natural law. He states that the right of each individual to material goods, is so fundamental that it cannot be abolished by any other right over these goods. This is what distinguishes the first and fundamental right from the other rights, which are also derived from nature, namely the right to privately appropriate, the free right of exchange, and finally the right of the state to regulate and exercise control over the use of all private property rights. Here are the exact words of the Holy Father:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature, the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed, even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods. Undoubtedly the natural order, deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and

> gift, as well as the functioning of the State over both these institutions.[20]

A further precision relative to the right is the distinction between the general institution of private property as it should be according to the natural law and the institution as practically existent with its distinctive features and limitations. Pius XII frequently uses the terms: property, private property, the principle of private property — to signify the natural institution as it should be, distinct from the historical regime within which the right has found expression. The following text is indicative:

> In defending, therefore, the principle of private property, the Church [...] does not intend to defend absolutely and simply the present state of affairs as if she saw in it the expression of God's will. [...] But the Church aims rather at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the designs of God's wisdom, and the disposition of nature.[21]

---

20 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione, ha infatti dalla natura il diritto fondamentale di usare dei beni materiali della terra, pur essendo lasciato alla volontà umana e alle forme giuridiche dei popoli di regolarne più particolarmente la pratica attuazione. Tale diritto individuale non può essere in nessun modo soppresso, neppure da altri diritti certi e pacifici sui beni materiali. Senza dubbio l'ordine naturale, derivante da Dio, richiede anche la proprietà privata e il libero reciproco commercio dei beni con scambi e donazioni, come pure la funzione regolatrice del potere pubblico su entrambi questi istituti." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.

21 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253. See Italian text above, page 8, note 13.

Another source of confusion arises from the forms of property which are usually given as "private individual," "private collective" and "public." There appears to be a contradiction between the first two. But this is only apparent. Private collective property is private to the extent that its use is at the exclusive disposal of the group, the moral person being the subject of the right. It is not private in the sense that it belongs to the group and not exclusively to each member of the group. Hence, under this aspect, it is collective.

With Pius XII, private property is not necessarily individual. He extols individual property. Nevertheless, there is a place for collective property. Within the context of an address almost exclusively devoted to the necessity of a more widespread distribution of private property, he recommends collective property in the form of cooperative unions for small-scale property holders and for the large-scale business enterprise he encourages some form of co-partnership between capital and labour. In this connection he said:

> For the same purpose small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades, in commerce and industry should be guaranteed and promoted; co-operative unions should ensure for them the advantages of big business; where big business even today shows itself more productive, there should be given the possibility of tempering the labour contract with a contract of co-partnership.[22]

---

22 "Per lo stesso scopo la piccola e la media proprietà nell'agricoltura, nelle arti e nei mestieri, nel commercio

In another context, where he declared that the workers as workers in an enterprise had no strict right to co-management, it was the principle of the inviolability of private property that he invoked. He stated that this was the reason why he "declined to infer either directly or indirectly from the nature of the labour contract the right of the worker to co-ownership in the operating capital and its corollary, co-determination in the conduct of the business."[23] Obviously, therefore, in the mind of Pius XII, the corporation or the enterprise participates in the nature of private property, although distinguished from individual property.[24]

---

e nell'industria debbono essere garantite e promosse; le unioni cooperative debbono assicurare loro i vantaggi della grande azienda; dove la grande azienda ancor oggi si manifesta maggiormente produttiva, deve essere offerta la possibilità di temperare il contratto di lavoro con un contratto di società." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

23 "[...] es verneint haben, aus der Natur des Arbeitsvertrags das Miteigentumsrecht des Arbeiters am Betriebskapital und daraus folgend sein Mitbestimmungsrecht, sei es direkt, sei es indirekt, abzuleiten." (To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p.792.) It is to be noted that this exclusion refers to the workers only as bound by a certain labour contract.

24 A distinction between two categories of private property is therefore evident in Pius XII: (1) personal and family ownership, (2) the larger forms of industrial ownership. In both cases he maintained the principle of private property. But he denounced the abuses of the larger forms and called for structural reform, as will be shown in subsequent chapters.

For the thesis that, in the large industrial enterprise the concept of private property has all but disappeared,

Sufficient has been said on the problem of terminology to indicate that the knowledge of the circumstances surrounding each document is vital to the understanding of Pius XII's terms. This brings us to an examination of the general historical background of his documents on property.

B. The Situation of Property and its Distribution in the Times of Pius XII

Pius XII usually proceeds by giving a factual survey of an area in which he wishes to present his doctrine and give moral directives. As to the position of property in his time, he made his first significant observation in 1941, when he expounded to a world at war five fundamental conditions essential for international order. At least one of these conditions has become famous in the morality of international relations. It calls for an end to the selfishness of the favored nations who horde the world's resources destined for all peoples, to the detriment of the less favored.[25] In economic life he sees this disparity as a

---

see Adolphe A. BERLE (Jr.), Power Without Property, New York, Harcourt, River and Co., 1959, p. 27-58 and passim.

For the thesis that the concept of private property today is not univocal but analogical, see Gerard DION, "Property and Authority in Business Enterprise", in Relations Industrielles, Quebec, Laval University, Vol. 16, No. 1, p. 31-52. (This article appears both in English and French.)

25 Christmas Message, Nell'alba e nella luce, Dec. 24, 1941, in AAS, 34 (1942), p. 17.

perversion in the moral order. Turning away from that order designed by God, man's attention is centered on the attainment of power through the accumulation of riches, and so economic life is characterized by the "predominance of mammoth concerns and trusts".[26] In this situation he sees private property abused and diverted from its true purpose, becoming for some a means of exploitation, and for others a reason for envy, revolt and hatred:

> The right to private property became, for some, a power to be used for the exploitation of the labour of their fellowmen; in others that right enkindled a spirit of jealousy, intolerance and hatred; [...][27]

The above is apparently a blistering attack on the massive forms of productive property where the person becomes a mere thing, a slave to power and profit. What is more, he sees in this unnatural situation, the occasion for envy, war and revolution.

During the war years and immediately afterwards, it was in this manner that the Holy Father described the state of private property. In 1944, speaking to a world searching for reconstruction, he presented the arguments and issued

---

26 "Nell'economia il dominare delle grandi e gigantesche impresi e associazioni, [...]" (Christmas Message, Nell'alba, Dec. 24, 1941, in AAS, 34 (1942), p. 13.)

27 "[...] la proprietà privata devenne per gli uni un potere diretto verso lo sfruttamento dell'opera altrui; negli altri generò gelosia, insofferenza e odio; [...]" (Ibid., p. 14.)

directives for ending the disparity in property distribution. Here he saw and described the plight of the ever increasing ranks of the workers, unable to acquire private property of their own owing to its concentration and concealment under anonymous titles.[28] What is more, he saw this innumerable mass of proletarians, deprived of every direct and indirect security, exchanging their desire for freedom and the things of the spirit, for security under political tyranny.[29] Another unfortunate result of this economic dictatorship, which he observes, is the decline in the small and medium-sized property holdings for which society is all the poorer.[30]

Again, in 1945, he returned to this theme declaring to the Catholic workers of Italy that their freedom was endangered by "monopolies — that is by the economic tyranny of an anonymous conglomeration of private capital."[31] It was in this same address that Pius XII first warned of the

---

28 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid.

31 "Quanto alla democratizzazione dell'economia, essa e minacciata non meno dal monopolio, ossia dal despotismo economico di un anonimo conglomerato di capitale privato [...]" (The Future of Trade Unions, Il Nostro Predecessore, March 11, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 71.)

consequences to personal initiative, should productive property become excessively concentrated, and socialized within the public power. Socialization of property was not to be a principle of social reform, but rather permitted under certain limited and exceptional conditions.[32]

The trend of the post-war years towards an excessive nationalization of industry became for Pius XII a new threat to the institution of private property. This trend, a carry-over from the state-regulated economy demanded by war conditions, spread rapidly, especially throughout Europe. In England and France, the principal industries like coal, steel, electricity and transportation were nationalized. The feeling was abroad that the state should take a far more direct part in economic affairs. In some quarters, the claim was made that the government should directly assume control of the land and industry. In 1952 the Holy Father referred to this question as one of the problems at the heart of, what he called, the secondary phase of the social question.[33] To him, the problem was how to effectively protect the individual and the family against being absorbed by the state in a "process of excessive socialization at the end of which looms

---

32 The Future of Trade Unions, Il Nostro Predecessore, March 11, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 71.

33 To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 792.

the threatening nightmare of 'Leviathan'."[34] To prevent this indignity to the human person, he points to the effectiveness of "the right of the individual to private ownership", which the Church vigorously upholds.[35]

In 1949 Pius XII recognized another tnreat to the personal values of productive property, namely, the system proposed for a forced and centralized co-ownership and co-management on the part of the workers in the industrial enterprise. This trend assumed major proportions in Germany and Austria, and some Catholics were at the forefront.[36] To be sure, the Holy Father persistently advocated the active participation of workers at the scene of their work through co-ownership and co-management, but not of the forced variety or not through a form of remote control where the participation would be restricted to a few representatives of huge labour unions. Pius XII saw in this situation the possibility of the working class "following the mistakes of capital" and, referring to these mistakes, he went on to say that

---

34 "[...] einer Sozialisierung, an deren Ende das Schrekbild des "Leviathan" grauenvolle Wirklichkeit wäre." (To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 792.)

35 "Deshalb setzt die katholische Soziallehre sich neben anderem so bewusst ein für das Recht des Einzelmenschen auf Eigentum." (Ibid.)

36 For the historical background to this problem see Jeremiah NEWMAN, Co-Responsibility in Industry, Westminster, Md., The Newman Press, 1955.

"a socialist mentality would accommodate itself very well to such a situation."[37] The interesting point here is that he sees a parallel between remote control co-participation on the part of labour and anonymous capitalism on the one hand, and socialism on the other — all in the context of discussing co-ownership and its forms.[38] It is on this occasion that the Pope explains the mistakes of capital, and in doing so, he describes this anonymous capitalism to which he frequently referred during the earlier years of his pontificate. This is what he said in this same address to the International Congress of Social Studies:

> These mistakes [the mistakes of capital] consisted in withdrawing, particularly in very large companies, the management of the means of production from the personal responsibility of

---

37 "[...] suivre à son tour les errements du capital [...] une mentalité socialiste s'accommoderait fort bien d'une telle situation." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 486.)

38 In this connection, Franz H. MUELLER, discussing the modern social question in The Challenge of Mater et Magistra, Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1963, p. 137, asks this provocative question: "What is the essential difference, if any, between the manager of a "capitalistic" corporation, possibly owned by a persion or welfare fund and the manager of a government-controlled enterprise in Russia?" In his basic work on the subject, Power Without Property, New York, Harcourt, 1959, p. 27, Adolphe A. BERLE, Jr., makes this observation: "We assume that our economic system is based on [private property], yet most industrial property is no more private than a seat on a subway train, and indeed it is questionable whether much of it can be called property at all."

> the private owner, whether individual or company, in order to transfer this management to the responsibility of anonymous, corporate groups.[39]

The Pope's use of the term "anonymous" is highly descriptive for the large modern corporation, which the French refer to as a Société anonyme. It points to an unknown, to an indefinite factor in the elements of ownership in the large enterprise. Who owns, in the traditional sense of ownership comprising possession, management and control? Not the multitude of stockholders, surely.[40] The corporation balance sheet shows them to be its creditors. The truth is that the

---

39 "[...] les erements du capital, qui consistaient à soustraire principalement dans les très grandes entreprises, la disposition des moyens de production à la responsabilité personnelle du propriétaire privé (individu ou société) pour la transférer sous la responsabilité de formes anonymes collectives." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 486.)

40 Edward DUFF, S.J., in "The Social Significance of Wealth Distribution in the United States", in Review of Social Economy, Vol. 20, No. 1 (March, 1962), p. 57, states two reasons why it is fraudulent to contend that wealth is widely distributed in the United States from the fact of the multitude of small stockholders: (1) the average investor has neither the ability nor the interest to exercise any direct control over the corporation; (2) statistics prove that the American economy is dominated by oligopolies.

J.F. CRONIN, in his Catholic Social Principles, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1950, p. 497, makes important distinctions for the benefit of those who claim that no real problem of wealth diffusion exists due to the wide distribution of durable consumer goods, and holdings of corporate property by the small stockholder: wealth in the form of durable consumer goods does not safeguard freedom, nor does it give the relative independence which comes from productive property; in the second place, the average stockholder has no control over the policies of his corporation having the form of ownership "without one of the most substantial attributes of property, namely, the power of control".

management group, without the fact of ownership, are in complete control and wield enormous power. The question still remains: who owns in the full sense of the word? The word "anonymous" is well chosen. The Code of Social Principles shows that the economic dictatorship of capitalism in our time is noteworthy, not so much for the concentration of wealth as it is for "the accumulation of economic power in the hands of a small number of men, the trustees and managers of capital, dispensers of credit, which fulfill in the economic organism the function of blood in the human organism."[41] Specialists in the study of the modern corporation would seem to agree.

The basic study of Berle and Means in 1933 noted that the outstanding feature of the modern corporation was the fact that ownership and control were separated.[42] In his recent study of 1959 on the same subject, Adolphe A. Berle (Jr.)

---

41 THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF SOCIAL STUDIES, A Code of Social Principles, 3rd ed., trans. from the French by E. de Carson, Oxford, Catholic Social Guild, 1952, No. 179, p. 74. This is reminiscent of Pius XI's description of the economic dictatorship in his time which he so described in Quadragesimo Anno: "This dictatorship is being most forcibly exercised by those who, since they hold the money and completely control it, regulate the flow, so to speak, of the life-blood whereby the entire economic system lives, and have so firmly in their grasp the soul, as it were, of economic life that no one can breathe against their will." (KOENIG, Principles for Peace, No. 1010, p. 429.)

42 A.A. BERLE and G.C. MEANS, The Modern Corporation and Private Property, New York, Macmillan, 1933, p. 69-118.

wrote that it is no longer just a question of this separation, but "something more profound — the increasing elimination of proprietary ownership itself, and its replacement by substantially a power system."[43] In 1933, Berle and Means predicted that by 1950 half the national wealth of the United States would be under the control of the big companies.[44] The "companion study" of 1959 shows the prophecy to be more than realized. Here, Mr. Berle points out that "five hundred great corporations dominate through outright ownership, two thirds of the industry of the United States."[45] An additional factor adding to the power of trustees is "the growing size of pension trusts, mutual funds, [...] and their propensity to buy up the stock of these same five hundred companies."[46] In terms of the concentration of world productive power, it is estimated that the United States with little more than six percent of the world's population and less than

---

43 A.A. BERLE, Power Without Property, p. 164.

44 A.A. BERLE and G.C. MEANS, The Modern Corporation and Private Property, p. 40, 41.

45 A.A. BERLE, Power Without Property, p. 18.

46 Ibid. For a development of the idea, with copious statistics, that the pension trusts are gaining institutional control over private property and thus constitute an actual and far greater potential source of economic power in financial institutions, see Paul HARBRECHT, S.J., "Property in Transition", in Social Order, Vol. 8 (1958), p. 50-58.

seven percent of its land area now produce and consume well over one third of the world's goods and services and turn out nearly one half the world's factory produced goods.[47]

The foregoing analysis of the contemporary forms of productive property was one of the chief reasons why the Holy Father could say that the world society of 1952, to whom he addressed his Christmas message, was becoming "more and more anonymous and collective".[48] At the same time, a substantial part of this world was becoming ever more prosperous, and this mutual prosperity was being more equitably distributed among the rank and file of its citizens. The large productive enterprise was probably the chief reason for this betterment in the material standard of living. The Pope was aware of this change for the better, and he made the fact known to the 1950 International Congress of Social Studies as he applauded the advantages gained for the working man "during the past several decades".[49] He was, here, referring to,what he called,"the old industrial countries", where, by

---

47 Thomas T. KARSKODEN and George SORULE, U.S.A. in New Dimensions, New York, McMillan, 1957, p. 4. Cited by E. DUFF, S.J., "Social Significance of Wealth Distribution in the United States", in Review of Social Economy, Vol. 20, No. 1 (March, 1962), p. 58.

48 "[...] divenuta sempre più anonima e collettivista" (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 42.

49 "[...] voilà déjà des dizaines d'années". (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 486.

the evolution of labour laws, and by government regulation over the use of private property, the lot of the worker had substantially improved, and, as a consequence, the Church was pleased to see the solution of the social question in its first phase.[50]

In an address to Austrian Catholics in 1952, the Holy Father described the first phase of the social question as follows:

> Today the Church looks back on the first phase of the modern social dispute. It revolved around the labor question: the distress of the proletariat and the problem of lifting this class of society, defenselessly exposed to the vicissitudes of the economic situation, to a status equal to that of other classes and endowed with clearly defined rights. At least in its essentials this problem has been solved and the Catholic world has honestly and effectively contributed to the solution.[51]

Apparently, he was impressed with the achievements of labour, management and the state in effecting a better distribution of the material benefits of property in at least a part of

---

50 "[...] les vieux pays d'industrie [...]" (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, in AAS, 42, p. 486.

51 "Die Kirche schaut heute zurück auf die erste Epoche der neuzeitlichen sozialen Auseinandersetzung. In deren Mittelpunkt stand die Arbeiterfrage: die Not des Proletariats und die Aufgabe, diese den Zufälligkeiten der wirtschaftlichen Konjunktur schutzlos preisgegebene Menschenklasse, emporzuheben zu einem den anderen gleichgeachteten Stand mit klar umschriebenen Rechten. Diese Aufgabe ist, jedenfalls im Wesentlichen, gelöst, und die katholische Welt hat an ihrer Bereinigung ehrlich und wirksam mitgearbeitet." (To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 13, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 791-792.)

the world. In this affluent environment, how was the Christian concept of private property to be realized? This was the problem for Pius XII in the secondary phase of the social question. In the same address the Pope so described the second phase of the social question:

> If the signs of the times are not misleading, the second phase of the social dispute, on which it appears we already have entered, confronts us with problems and tasks of a different nature. Two of these we shall now mention:
>
> The overcoming of the class struggle by an organic coordination of employer and employee, for class struggle can never be a goal of Catholic social ethics since the Church feels itself equally beholden to all classes and strata of the people.
>
> In the second place stands the protection of the individual and the family against their absorption by the state, a process of excessive socialization at the end of which looms the threatening nightmare of "Leviathan". Against this menace the Church will fight uncompromisingly because the highest goods, human dignity and the salvation of the soul, are jeopardized.
>
> Pursuant to this aim, Catholic social teaching, in particular, deliberately and vigorously champions the right of the individual to private ownership.[52]

---

52 "Wenn die Zeichen der Zeit nicht trügen, stehen in der zweiten Epoche der sozialen Auseinandersetzung, in die wir wohl bereits eingetreten sind, an oberster Stelle andere Fragen und Aufgaben. Zwei von ihnen seien hier genannt:

Die Ueberwindung des Klassenkampfes durch ein organisches Zueinanderordnen des Arbeitgebers und Arbeitnehmers. Denn der Klassenkampf kann niemals ein Ziel der katholischen Sozialethik sein. Die Kirche weiss sich immer allen Ständen und Schichten des Volks verpflichtet.

Sodann der Schutz des Einzelnen und der Familie vor dem Sog, der sie in ein allumfassende Sozialisierung hineinzuziehen droht, einer Sozialisierung, an deren Ende das Schrekbild des "Leviathan" grauenvolle Wirklichkeit wäre. Die Kirche wird diesen Kampf bis zum äussersten führen, geht es hier doch um letzte Dinge, um die Menschenwürde und das Seelenheil.

Deshalb setzt die katholische Soziallehre sich neben

But in all these material conquests His Holiness saw a subtle threat to the dignity of man. He saw the individual man becoming depersonalized, largely because the essential institutions of private property, the family and the state were losing their God-given destiny to minister to the dignity of the human person. This was the burden of his profound Christmas message to the world of 1952. He deplored the impersonal character of this world where social life appeared to be constituted after the manner of a gigantic industrial machine. He wondered what was to become of private property in such "a world where the only economic form to find recognition is a vast productive system".[53] To be sure, the Pope was aware that such a system could provide more and more of the human race with enough and to spare for his material needs. But he was more aware that man does not live by bread alone, and that the human race is more than a great association of food consumers. As the spokesman for God and the moral order, he was more concerned with the moral, spiritual and cultural needs of man the maker. Hence

---

anderen so bewusst ein für das Recht des Einzelmenschen auf Eigentum." (To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 792.)

53 "[...] un mondo che riconosca se non la forma economica di un enorme organismo produttivo?" (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45, (1953), p. 37.)

his profound concern to save the institution of private property which nature designed to secure these needs. Not only must the economic organization be productive, but the individual man within it must be productive so as to better realize his distinctive personal powers. To achieve this balance within a productive system — vast and prolific — was the problem for Pius XII. "Nothing has been accomplished," he told an International Association of Businessmen in 1956, "if while assuring the improvement of economic conditions, one has neglected to deepen cultural, moral and religious values."[54] Less than a year later, even more concerned with the widespread and penetrating character of bureaucratic states and the power of a vast industrial organization, he warned another group of executives and businessmen that in this setting there must be no substitution for the values of the human person.[55]

As to the poorer nations of the world, the problem of wealth distribution had a setting much like that of the nineteenth century for the old industrial countries. They

---

54 "On n'a rien fait si, en assurant l'amélioration des conditions économiques, on a négligé d'approfondir les valeurs culturelles, morales et religieuses." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 556.)

55 Economics, The State and the Value of Man, Con vivo, March 7, 1957, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 19, p. 30.

were still deep in the heart of the first phase of the social dispute. This problem confronting Pius XII was not merely a question of man living by bread alone, but of getting bread without which he cannot live. This was not new. What was unique to the later years of his pontificate was the fact that a part of the world was living in exuberant prosperity alongside a far greater part living in extreme poverty, and the disparity appeared sharper as the world became increasingly aware of it through vast improvements in communications and transport. The rich were getting richer and the poor, poorer, and the poor countries were gaining in population much more rapidly than the rich.[56] Of this explosive situation, Pius XII was fully aware.

---

56 Arthur McCORMACK, World Poverty and the Christian, New York, Hawthorne, 1963, p. 127. For a statistical analysis of the international disparity in wealth and income distribution plus the imbalance in economic growth, see Jacques MERTENS DE WILMARS, "The Economics of Aid to Less Developed Countries", trans. from the French by R.M. Bethell in Arthur McCORMACK (ed.), Christian Responsibility and World Poverty (A Symposium), Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1963, p. 181-183. To illustrate that the gap between the rich and the poor countries is widening, he points out that for the period 1953-59 "the average rate and per capita growth in gross national product was 2.8% for the world, 3.6% for Western Europe, and only 1.8% in Africa, and 2.1% in Asia" (ibid., p. 183). As to the imbalance in wealth distribution within the poorer nations, Arthur McCORMACK in World Poverty and the Christian, p. 137, referring to a Brazilian economist, Senor Joao de Sousa, as his authority, states that of the 75 percent of Latin America's 200 million people living on the land, "a mere 6 percent of the landowners own 70 percent of the tillable land. Over three quarters of people own 5 to 10 percent of the land in use. Between 30 and 40 percent exist without [the basic essentials of life]."

In a letter addressed to the "Social Week" of France, where they were discussing how best to increase natural wealth and income, the Holy Father, fully acknowledging the advances made in some countries, at the same time, gave notice that the problem of disparity in economic well-being "since the last war [...] has become even more acute" because it "presents itself on a world-wide scale with contrasts that are still startling."[57] What is more, he stated that the problem "is further aggravated by the new yearnings which are being awakened in the minds of the masses by a more vivid realization of the economic inequalities existing between nations, between classes and even between members of the same social class."[58] A year later, he directly referred to the magnitude of the international imbalance by pinpointing "the underfed peoples who make up 70 per cent of the world's population" as the problem to occupy the attention of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations at their

---

57 "Mais cependant, ce problème a pris, à la suite de la guerre, une acuité nouvelle; il se pose désormais à l'échelle mondiale, où les oppositions sont encore saisissantes [...]" (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 620.)

58 "[...] et il s'aggrave des désirs nouveaux qu'éveille au coeur des masses un sens plus vif des inégalités de condition entre les peuples, entre les classes, jusqu'entre les membres d'une même classe." (Ibid., p. 620.)

conference.[59] Again in 1956, he was all the more concerned with this disequilibrium when he told the first Congress of the International Association of Economists that there is "a grave discord between poor nations which more and more are reaching in awareness of their great needs; and the nations which are generously supplied with necessities and superfluities."[60]

Another trend of the times which profoundly disturbed Pius XII was the imbalance in wealth and income between agriculture and the other sectors of economic life; both within the nations and between the nations. This disparity and the resulting decline of the family farm occasioned thirteen addresses from November 15, 1946 to April 16, 1958. Indicative was an address to Cardinal Siri in 1957, when he lamented that social progress among the farmers had lagged far behind other sectors of economic social life.[61] In

---

59 "[...] les populations sous-alimentées qui représentent 70% de la population mondiale [...]" (Social Aspects of the Food and Agricultural Organization, Depuis plusieurs, Dec. 6, 1953, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 15, p. 496.)

60 "[...] des discordances graves se révèlent actuellement entre les pays pauvres, qui accèdent de plus en plus à la conscience de leurs immenses besoins, et les nations largement pourvues du nécessaire et du superflu." (Economics and Man, A l'occasion, Sept. 9, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 412.)

61 Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 832-833.

another address to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, he made significant observations on the depressed state of agriculture in the world economy. He noted that in both national and international trade, the inflationary process was detrimental to the farmer in that the price of agricultural goods progressively declined since 1952, with the result that the economic status of the farmer became more dangerous — increasing the exodus from the rural areas, "thus creating a new series of social and religious problems."[62]

To summarize the times as they affected the doctrinal approach of Pius XII to the problem of property, it would seem that he was confronted with an ever increasing disequilibrium in the actual realization of the Christian concept of ownership. In general, this was the imbalance between an existing powerful productive system — collective and concentrated — on the one hand, and the Christian ideal of a widely diffused system of private productive property, on the other. Within some countries, the sheer impersonality of this system was creating an imbalance between the material and spiritual development of the person. Within nations, the wealth engendered by this system served to put in focus

---

62 "[...] provoquant une nouvelle série de problèmes sociaux et religieux." (The Farm Problem, Nous avons, Nov. 9, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 1024.)

the imbalance between the affluence of industry and the impoverishment of agriculture. Between nations, it served to make more obvious the imbalance in the international distribution of wealth and income.

Against this background, it was not surprising that Pius XII reformulated the social question to include a world-wide dimension:

> One must confront in all its fullness the obligation of giving to innumerable families, in their natural, moral, juridical and economic unity an equitable livelihood, corresponding however modestly, so long as it be sufficiently, to the exigencies of human nature.[63]

Immediately following this text from his speech to the International Congress of Social Studies, he went on to explain that the achievement of this world-embracing obligation must invoke a world-wide response from all individuals and all nations, combining unselfishly their personal and material resources for the building of a better world.[64] "There," he said, "you have the great social problem, which at the

---

63 "Il faut regarder bien en face, dans toute son ampleur, le devoir de donner à d'innombrables familles, dans leur unité naturelle, morale, juridique, économique, un juste espace vital répondant, fût-ce dans une mesure modeste, mais tout au moins suffisante, aux exigences de la dignité humaine." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 485-486.)

64 Ibid.

present time, stands at the crossroads."[65] It was within the general context of a solution to this social question of world imbalance that Pius XII presented his doctrine on property.

---

65 "Le voilà le grand problème social, celui qui se dresse à la croisée des chemins à l'heure présente." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 4, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 486.

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF PROPERTY IN PIUS XII

Reference was made in the last Chapter to the effect that Pius XII saw the provoking imbalance in the world economy as a real threat to peace. It is not surprising, therefore, that his documents give an unusual prominence to the basic right of all individuals and all peoples to use in dignity the goods God created for all men. This is not to say that he de-emphasized the right of private appropriation. Far from it. He vigorously defended the institution of private property as the natural means to realize the first and fundamental right, in a matter consonant with human dignity. As a consequence he devoted a major portion of his social teachings to the necessity of an equitable distribution of private property with special emphasis on the international phase of the question. The Holy Father did not explore all the aspects of the property-doctrine such as it is treated in the textbooks of moral philosophy. Neither did he approach the problems of property in the same manner, nor did he cover the exact same matter as his predecessors.[1]

---

1 The final Chapter shall be devoted to the doctrine of Pius XII in relation to his immediate predecessors.

For an excellent analysis of the relations between papal doctrine and the traditional teachings of the Church plus the manner in which the doctrine of one Pope supplements and complements that of another, see: Etienne GILSON, "How to

It is now a question of developing the first principle in his concept of property: the primary right of all to the use of material goods. Headings to follow in the chapter will be: the right of private property and, next, the principle of an equitable distribution of wealth as the primary consequence proceeding from the rights surrounding the property concept. The task of subsequent chapters shall be to analyze Pius XII's directives as to the forms and the factors best calculated to make his concept a reality in contemporary economic and social life.

I. THE GENERAL RIGHT OF ALL TO THE USE OF THE WORLD'S MATERIAL GOODS

1. Importance.

In the second month of his pontificate, on the occasion of an Easter homily, the Holy Father, preoccupied with the immediate threat of war, stressed that justice required a reasonable distribution of the wealth and resources created by God for all men. He said:

> Justice requires that all men acknowledge and defend the sacrosanct rights of human freedom and human dignity, and that the infinite wealth and

---

Read the Encyclicals", in Etienne GILSON (ed.), The Church Speaks to the Modern World (The Social Teachings of Leo XIII), New York, Garden City, Image Books, Doubleday, 1954, p. 21-28.

> resources with which God has endowed the whole of the earth, shall be distributed, in conformity with right reason, for the use of all his children.[2]

It is significant that in this, the first allusion to the problem of property, the principle that every human being has the right to sufficient resources is uppermost in his thoughts. Some months later, in Summi Pontificatus, his first encyclical, he stated that one of the manifestations of the unity of man was "in the unity of dwelling place, the earth of whose resources all men can, by natural right, avail themselves to sustain and develop life."[3] Less than a month later, in Sertum Laetitiae, an encyclical letter to the Bishops of the United States, the Pope issued a major statement on the social question drawing particular attention to the fact that the mutual hostility between classes and nations, as a consequence of some having exaggerated riches while others were destitute, was in sharp contrast to the purpose God had in creating for all men. He wrote:

---

2 "Justitia postulat ut sacrosancta humanae libertatis dignitatisque jura omnes agnoscant, tueantur; utque innumerae opes atque divitiae, quae Deus per universum terrarum orbem profudit, in suorum omnium utilitatem filiorum consentanea rectaque ratione distribuantur." (Easter Message of Peace, Quoniam Paschalia, April 9, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 149. English version in H. KOENIG (ed.), Principles for Peace, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1943, p. 560, No. 1323.)

3 "Unum ac tandem habitationem terrarum nempe orbem cujus opibus naturali jure omnes frui possunt, ut sese alere queant seseque ad auctiora incrementa provehere." (Encyclical letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 427.

> The fundamental point of the social question is this, that the goods created by God for all men should in the same way reach all, justice guiding and charity helping [...] God does not wish that some have exaggerated riches while others are in such straits that they lack the bare necessities of life.[4]

Following the Pope's statements on the primary right of property in chronological sequence, we now come to his most important and most celebrated document on this question and on the social question in general: the Pentecostal message of June 1, 1941.[5] Indicative of its importance is the fact that it appears in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis in eight different languages. In John XXIII's Mater et Magistra, it is singled out as Pius XII's basic document on the social question and he apparently ranks it in importance with Leo XIII's Rerum Novarum and Pius XI's Quadragesimo Anno.[6] Of all the social messages of Pius XII, it is the most doctrinal in content and, therefore, basic in analyzing his concept of property. In this document, the right of all to the use of

---

4 "Cujus praecipuum caput id exigit, ut bona, quae pro omnibus universis Deus creavit aequa ratione ad omnes affluant, justitia duce, caritate comite [...] Deus non vult alios nimis affluere copiis, alios autem in extremas angustias adduci, ita ut usibus vitae necessariis careant." (PIUS XII, Encyclical Epistle Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642.)

5 The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 195-205. The complete English text appears in the Appendix of this study.

6 JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 410-413.

material goods is the platform from which the Holy Father launches his doctrine on the social and economic order.

The Pentecostal message of 1941 begins with a strong reaffirmation of the social teachings expounded by Leo XIII and Pius XI. Following that, Pius XII then announced his method of procedure; he was going to give some further directive moral principles on three fundamental values: the use of material goods, labour and the family. He said:

> We feel we may avail ourselves of this commemoration to give some further directive moral principles on three fundamental values of social and economic life; [...] these three fundamental values which are closely connected one with the other, mutually complementary and dependent are: the use of material goods, labor and the family.[7]

Before developing his doctrine on the use of material goods, Pius XII stated that the basic idea of the principles surrounding the question of property was what he had already written to the Hierarchy of the United States in the encyclical Sertum Laetitiae: "the goods which were created by God for all men should flow equally to all, according to the principles of justice and charity."[8] With the above text as

---

7 "Noi pensiamo di servirci dell'odierna commemorazione per dare ulteriori principi direttivi morali sopra tre fondamentali valori della vita sociale ed economica [...] che s'intrecciano, si saldano e si aiutano a vicenda, sono: l'uso dei beni materiali, il lavoro, la famiglia." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 198-199.)

8 "[...] i beni da Dio creati per tutti gli uomini, equamente affluiscano a tutti, secondo i principi della giustizia e della carità." (Ibid., p. 199).

his starting point, he went on to demonstrate why the goods of nature should flow equitably to all and in what manner this distribution was to be effectively achieved:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature, the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed, even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods. Undoubtedly the natural order, deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as the functioning of the State over both these institutions.
>
> But all this remains subordinate to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope.[9]

In this statement, Pius XII obviously states that the right of all to the use of material goods is the supreme principle governing man in all his relations to the use of the material

---

9 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione, ha infatti dalla natura il diritto fondamentale di usare dei beni materiali della terra, pur essendo lasciato alla volontà umana e alle forme giuridiche dei popoli di regolarne più particolarmente la pratica attuazione. Tale diritto individuale non può essere in nessun modo soppresso, neppure da altri diritti certi e pacifici sui beni materiali. Senza dubbio l'ordine naturale, derivante da Dio, richiede anche la proprietà privata e il libero reciproco commercio dei beni con scambi e donazioni, come pure la funzione regolatrice del potere pubblico su entrambi questi istituti. Tutto ciò nondimeno rimane subordinato allo scopo naturale dei beni materiali, e non potrebbe rendersi indipendente dal diritto primo e fondamentale, che a tutti ne concede l'uso; ma piuttosto deve servire a farne possibile l'attuazione in conformità con il suo scopo." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

for the purpose of sustaining life. It is first and fundamental. Other rights including that of private property are designed to achieve its most effective implementation.

A closer observation of this basic text, reinforced by other statements from the documents of the Holy Father, will serve to analyze the concept of the primary right in terms of its origin, characteristics, and the means of achieving its realization. The latter point will be covered under the heading of Private Property.

2. Origin.

Pius XII makes it clear that the right which every man has to the use of the goods of earth originates proximately in the dignity which God the creator and supreme proprietor conferred upon man when he endowed him with reason and free will. "Every man endowed with reason", he said, has this right.[10] In a striking passage from the Christmas message of 1942, he invoked the authority of Genesis to demonstrate the basis of man's mastership over the visible world and his right to the use of it:

> When he blessed our first parents, God said: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth, and subdue it." (Gen. 1, 28). And to the first father of a family, he said later: "In the sweat of thy face

---

10 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione[...]" The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, p. 199.

> shalt thou eat bread." (Gen. 3, 19). The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation for life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth.[11]

To be sure, the implication of this text is that the ultimate basis of man's right to use and to own rests in God the absolute owner, and the proximate basis rests in the dignity of man, made to God's image and likeness.

The idea that the right to use the goods of earth endows man with the dignity and the responsibility of God's administrator was the message Pius XII communicated to the world in his Christmas address of 1949, when he stated that all the peoples of the world must assist one another in working for a "just distribution of the goods which are a treasure entrusted by God to men".[12] He made a practical application of this idea of man's stewardship under God in an address to a world congress of boards of trade when he said that every businessman must consider himself to be a

---

11 "Dio, benedicendo i nostri progenitori, disse loro: "Crescete e moltiplicatevi e riempite la terra e soggiogatela". (Gen. 1, 28). E al primo capo di famiglia diceva poi: "Nel sudore della tua fronte ti ciberai di pane". (Gen. 3,10). La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; [...]" (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

12 "[...] equa distribuzione dei beni, che sono tesoro di Dio affidato agli uomini". (Christmas Message, Non mai forse, Dec. 23, 1949, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 128.)

true servant of society and therefore he must strive "to circulate worldly goods destined by God for the advantage of all" in a manner that will serve the whole of society.[13]

More explicitly, in the encyclical letter to the Bishops of the United States, he propounded the stewardship aspect in man's use of material goods, when he wrote that "the rich, if they are upright and honest, are God's dispensers and providers of this world's goods; as ministers of divine providence they assist the indigent."[14]

The above cited texts lead to the conclusion that man's right to use and to own comes, not from society but from God, the Author of nature and of man, whom He made like unto Himself by raising him to the dignity of a human person. The dignity of man is the dignity of the image of God, said the Pope, in his 1944 Christmas message to the world.[15] The divine basis of man's dignity ultimately constitutes his right to master the goods of earth.

---

13 "[...] de faire circuler les biens de la terre, destinés par Dieu à l'avantage de tous [...]" (Vocation of Businessmen, Nous avons, April 27, 1950, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 12, p. 46.)

14 "Divites autem, si recti probique sunt, terrestrium bonorum Dei sunt dispensatores et procuratores; supernae providentiae administri egenis opitulantur [...]" (Encyclical Epistle Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642.)

15 Christmas Message, Benignitas et humanitas, Dec. 24, 1944, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 22.

To comment further on the above passages from the Holy Father, it can be concluded that man acts in keeping with his dignity, only when in his use of material things, he respects God's supreme dominion and the purpose He had in creating the goods of earth for all. This is Pius XII's answer to those who would contend that man is an absolute lord over creation and can do what he wants with that which he owns. It is also his answer to those who would degrade their dignity by an undue concern for accumulating wealth and thus allowing things to be their master. His argument that human dignity demands for all men the right to the use of material goods is equally his answer to the economic and social conditions that would make of man not the master but the slave of his environment. He made this argument most explicit in the Christmas address of 1942 when he said: "The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as the natural foundation of life the right to the use of the goods of the earth."[16]

The dignity of man was a popular theme in the social teachings of Pius XII. Indicative was his address to the

---

16 "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; [...]" (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

Congress of European-American Associations in 1955 when he appealed for the emergence of the real image of man, master over things, master over himself and aware of his individual and social responsibilities as a creature made to the image and likeness of God.[17] Conforming to that image was his ideal of all men associating themselves with the divine government in mastering and perfecting the inferior things of creation for their own welfare and that of mankind.

Not only does Pius XII invoke revelation to fortify his assertion that all men have the right to the use of material goods as a consequence of their dignity. He appeals to the demand arising from the unchangeable nature of man as man endowed with reason: "Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth."[18] This direct and simple statement as to the origin of the first right of property in natural law also directs particular attention to

---

17 "Ainsi peut-on espérer voir se dégager plus clairement le visage authentique de l'homme, maître non seulement des choses, mais surtout de lui-même, et conscient de sa destinée transcendante, individuelle et sociale, et de ses responsabilités de créature faite à l'image de Dieu." (Aid to Better Understanding, Des efforts, Sept. 18, 1955, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 17, p. 240.)

18 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione, ha infatti dalla natura il diritto fondamentale di usare dei beni materiali della terra [...]" (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

the universal character of man's right to the use of the world's goods. This characteristic of universality assumes considerable importance, especially in the Pentecostal address of 1941. It, therefore, requires special commentary.

3. Universality of the Right of Use.

All the texts so far introduced serve to illustrate the importance the Holy Father attached to the dictum that all things are for all men, that the purpose of the earth's bounty is to serve the whole human race. His reasoning that the dignity of human personality common to all men demanded the corresponding right of all to the use of the earth's bounty, bears magnificent testimony to the basic equality of all human beings regardless of age, race, nationality, education or any other eventuality. It follows, therefore, that any economic system which unduly restricts the benefits of creation to a privileged group goes counter to that fundamental equality based on the dignity possessed by every individual endowed with reason.

In the address of 1941, the Pope stressed that "the native right to the use of material goods" must be safeguarded in order to ensure the personal dignity of every man and thus to facilitate the fulfillment of the duties for which he is responsible to his Creator.[19] Man has in truth the entirely

19 "Il diritto originario sull'uso dei beni materiali" (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, p. 199.)

personal duty, he said, "to preserve and order to perfection his material and spiritual life, so as to secure the religious and moral scope which God has assigned to all men."[20] This statement makes it plain that every man has the duty to develop and to perfect his personality, and therefore he has the corresponding right to whatever is necessary for the achievement of that worthy purpose. It was thus that Pius XII was so insistent on giving to all individuals the opportunity to exercise their right to the use of material goods, as the necessary condition for the fulfillment of their duties in freedom and dignity. Another feature of the universal right of use requiring special comment is its inviolable character which is given particular emphasis in the Pentecostal message of 1941.

4. Inviolability of the Right of Use.

In his firm statement as to the primary and fundamental nature of this right and his assertion that it could not be in any way suppressed, the Holy Father gave to the universal right of use an absolute inviolability and a clear-cut supremacy among the hierarchy of rights in the economic

---

20 "Spetta invero all'uomo il dovere del tutto personale di conservare e ravviare a perfezionamento la sua vita materiale e spirituale, per conseguire lo scopo religioso e morale, che Dio ha assegnato a tutti gli uomini e dato loro quale norma suprema [...]" (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS 33 (1941), p. 200.)

order. "This individual right", he said, "cannot in any way be suppressed, even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods."[21] This is so because the right proceeds immediately from the nature of the human person, anterior to and independent of any historical or sociological circumstance. Assuredly, the Pope did not maintain that this right guaranteed to any particular person a definite part of God's creation. But this right did constitute the firm foundation upon which he raised the structure of private property as the natural institution to give determination to the more basic right of all to the goods of the earth.

Pius XII declared that the details of actuating the universal right of use was to be left to the disposition of man and the laws of the various states:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from Nature the fundamental right to make use of the goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right.[22]

But the Holy Father immediately added that no system of property holding or law of the state could violate this

---

21 "Tale diritto individuale non può essere in nessun modo soppresso, neppure da altri diritti certi e pacifici sui beni materiali." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

22 Ibid. See Italian text above page 41, note 9.

primary right; it takes precedence over all other recognized rights to material goods:

> Undoubtedly, the natural order deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as a functioning of the State as a control over both these institutions. But all this remains subordinated to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope. Only thus can we and must we secure that private property and the use of material goods bring to society peace and prosperity and long life, that they no longer set up precarious conditions which will give rise to struggles and jealousies, and which are left to the mercy of the blind interplay of force and weakness.[23]

This statement is a clear-cut affirmation of Pius XII's doctrine in respect to the relation which should exist between the primary right of all to use the goods of the earth and the other rights of man in the economic order.

---

23 "Senza dubbio l'ordine naturale, derivante da Dio, richiede anche la proprietà privata e il libero reciproco commercio dei beni con scambi e donazioni, come pure la funzione regolatrice del potere pubblico su entrambi questi istituti. Tutto ciò nondimeno rimane subordinato allo scopo naturale dei beni materiali, e non potrebbe rendersi indipendente dal diritto primo e fondamentale, che a tutti ne concede l'uso; ma piuttosto deve servire a farne possibile l'attuazione in conformità con il suo scopo. Così solo si potrà e si dovrà ottenere che proprietà e uso dei beni materiali portino alla società pace feconda e consistenza vitale, non già costituiscano condizioni precarie, generatrici di lotte e gelosie, e abbandonate in balla dello spietato giuoco della forza e della debolezza." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

First, he makes it clear that the right of private property, the right to dispose of goods through exchange and gifts, and the controlling power of the state over both, must not conflict with the right of all to the goods of earth. On the contrary, his statement emphasizes that it is the role of private property as well as the state in controlling its use, to implement the right of all men to attain their just share of the world's goods. Accordingly, the right of private property, in the mind of Pius XII, is subordinate to the primordial right of general use and must not be conceived independent of the natural purpose of material goods, which is to minister to the needs of all; in other words the right of private property is related to the general right of all to use the goods of the earth as a means to an end. Secondly, in the latter part of this text, Pius XII emphasizes that the proper subordination of the right of private property to the general right of use is an essential condition for preventing strife and struggle in social life, and a guarantee for social peace and prosperity.

To comment on this important text of Pius XII, it is to be noted that the doctrine it contains serves to exemplify the hierarchy of values in a moral economic order, demanding as it does the subordination of the private factor in property to the world-wide purpose of material goods in their social function of serving the needs of the whole human race.

In the ideal order envisioned by the Holy Father, the correlation of these functions involves a subordination, but no contradiction. The close relationship between the right to privately appropriate and the general right of all to use material goods must be kept in mind as we proceed to analyze Pius XII's doctrine on the specific question of private property.

II. THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mindful of the necessity to demonstrate the justification of private property, owing to its derivative natural law-character, it is not surprising that Pius XII would give extensive treatment to this subject in the development of his social doctrine. In addition, there was the necessity of defending private property against the threat of the liberal economists who would restrict property to a purely individualistic role, and against the challenge of the collectivists who would agree that all things are for all men but deny that private property is consistent with this dictum. The papal documents on the subject of private property as such are, therefore, sufficiently extensive to warrant a topical analysis under two headings: (A) Foundation and justification, (B) Individual and social function.

A. Foundation and Justification.

Upon what basis did Pius XII establish the right of private property? Was it positive law, or was it a matter of pure expediency? Or was it the natural law? The answer to these questions will provide the key to an understanding of the specific arguments he advanced for private property and its widespread diffusion.

1. Foundation.

For the answer to the basis of private property, Pius XII's document of Pentecost 1941, still remains paramount. Within the context of affirming the superiority of the first and fundamental right, the Pope simply states that private property is also a demand of the natural order deriving from God, that it must not be considered apart from the first right but linked up with it as means to end:

> Undoubtedly the natural order, deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as a functioning of the State as a control over both these institutions. But all this remains subordinated to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope.[24]

---

24 The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199. See Italian text above page 50, footnote 23.

This passage leaves no doubt as to the natural-law-origin of private property in the doctrine of Pius XII. A close observation of the context which is centered on the superiority of the first and fundamental right leads to the conclusion that the right of private property derives its natural-law-character from the fact that it is rooted in the first right as the indispensable means to make the first and basic right a reality for all men. By pursuing this point to further conclusions, it might be reasoned that the right of private property is relative in respect to the absolute character of the first right, that it does not conflict with the general destination of material goods, but rather is in complete harmony with God's design for the goods he created for the welfare of all. It is meant to serve each and at the same time serve all. It is the natural means to make explicit what is implicit in the first and fundamental right, and therefore has a solid philosophical foundation in the dignity of the human person which demands that all have the right to the use of the goods of earth, as he so declared in 1942:

> The dignity of the human person, thus, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all.[25]

---

25 "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; a cui risponde l'obbligo

Situated as such, intrinsically linked with the first and fundamental right, Pius XII establishes the basis of private property on the nature of man and in the relations of man to material things. Presuming that it maintains this link, it is as inviolable as the first right of use. In other words, when it is governed by the primary right, as its supreme regulative norm, the right of private property participates in the validity and legitimacy of that primary right.

It was, therefore, not surprising that the Holy Father made the distinction between the institution of private property as it should be in the natural order, and as it is in its historical forms. In his 1944 address on world reconstruction, he made this distinction by defending private property not necessarily in its present state, but rather as an institution with a moral and social purpose:

> In defending, therefore, the principle of private property, the Church pursues a high ethico-social purpose. She does not intend to defend absolutely and simply the present state of affairs, as if she saw in it the expression of God's will, nor to defend as a matter of principle the rich and the plutocrat against the poor and the indigent.[26]

---

fondamentale di accordare una proprietà privata, possibilmente a tutti." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

26 "Difendendo dunque il principio della proprietà privata, la Chiesa persegue un alto fine etico-sociale. Essa non intende già di sostenere puramente e semplicemente il presente stato di cose, come se vi vedesse la espressione della volontà divina, nè di proteggere per principio il ricco et il plutocrate contro il povero e non abbiente." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p.253.)

When Pius XII, in the 1941 address, spoke of private property as emanating from the natural order, he was referring to it as a natural institution destined to actuate the first and fundamental right. He was not referring to the concrete historical forms of the institution, as determined and legitimized by state laws. It would be, thus, foreign to the teaching of the Holy Father to transfer, absolutely, the inviolability of private property to existent institutional forms or to property rights invested in various individuals. But, on the contrary, his doctrine implies that, whatever form this institution assumes in the course of history, it must remain subservient to the primary norm of property for all, and when it departs from this norm it must be overhauled and brought in line with the social purpose of material goods.

In establishing its foundation in man's natural dominion over material things, Pius XII gives to the arguments for private property an intrinsic or metaphysical value. He does not rely on the frequently stated arguments of a utilitarian nature, justifying private property because of its conduciveness to human welfare. The essence of this argument is that without private property, there would be lacking a sufficient incentive to work, people would not live peacefully together, and what belonged to the community would not be cared for as if it belonged to the individual.

Certainly, these are desirable results, which should follow from private ownership adequately understood and applied. But as arguments, they lack depth because they are based on the observed results of private as compared with communal ownership, and not on some permanent value. When the prevailing system of private property leads to dissension and revolution, the above arguments could be used to abolish any system of private ownership. Indeed a distorted concept of private ownership accounted in good measure for the large scale unemployment, revolution and wars which characterized the pontificate of Pius XII.

The arguments based on utility and expediency are not central in the Holy Father's approach to the justification of private property. On the contrary he rests his case on the true dignity and freedom of every human person. Whenever the person is the father of a family or a worker, the argument from dignity and freedom becomes more forceful. To verify the above assertions relative to the specific arguments for private property in Pius XII, it now becomes our task to make a detailed analysis of an extensive array of texts from his documents.

2. <u>The Basic Argument: Dignity and Freedom</u>.

Emphasizing tranquillity as an essential ingredient for the attainment of peace in social life, the Holy Father in the Christmas address of 1942, laid down the principle of

Certainly, these are desirable results, which should follow from private ownership adequately understood and applied. But as arguments, they lack depth because they are based on the observed results of private as compared with communal ownership, and not on some permanent value. When the prevailing system of private property leads to dissension and revolution, the above arguments could be used to abolish any system of private ownership. Indeed a distorted concept of private ownership accounted in good measure for the large scale unemployment, revolution and wars which characterized the pontificate of Pius XII.

The arguments based on utility and expediency are not central in the Holy Father's approach to the justification of private property. On the contrary he rests his case on the true dignity and freedom of every human person. Whenever the person is the father of a family or a worker, the argument from dignity and freedom becomes more forceful. To verify the above assertions relative to the specific arguments for private property in Pius XII, it now becomes our task to make a detailed analysis of an extensive array of texts from his documents.

2. <u>The Basic Argument: Dignity and Freedom</u>.

Emphasizing tranquillity as an essential ingredient for the attainment of peace in social life, the Holy Father in the Christmas address of 1942, laid down the principle of

a widely diffused system of private property as an obligation rooted in the dignity of every human person:

> The dignity of the human person, thus, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all.[27]

Immediately following this statement of basic principle, he pointed out that it was a grave obligation of positive legislation to prevent the conditions which make of the worker a slave either to the exploitation of private capital or to the power of the state, a situation which he described as irreconcilable with his rights as a person. He said:

> Positive legislation regulating private ownership may change and more or less restrict its use. But if legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community it must prevent the worker, who is or will be the father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person. Whether this slavery arises from the exploitation of private capital or from the power of the State the result is the same.[28]

---

27 "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; a cui risponde l'obbligo fondamentale di accordare una proprietà privata, possibilmente a tutti." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

28 "Le norme giuridiche positive, regolanti la proprietà privata, possono mutare e accordare un uso più o meno circoscritto; ma se vogliono contribuire alla pacificazione della comunità, dovranno impedire che l'operaio, che è o sarà padre di famiglia, venga condannato ad una dipendenza e servitù economica, inconciliabile con i suoi diritti di persona. Che questa servitù derivi dal prepotere del capitale privato o dal potere dello Stato, l'effetto non muta." (Ibid.)

This statement is an unequivocal indictment of a system of concentrated capital that would have the effect of enslaving the worker. It is equally condemnatory of a state in which power is so concentrated that the worker is unable to exercise the rights to ensure his dignity and freedom. That one of these rights is private property is obvious from the fact that Pius XII considers its widespread diffusion an obligation arising from human dignity.

> The dignity of the human person, thus, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all.[29]

It is in connection with this obligation that he enjoins upon the state the duty of preventing those conditions that would prevent the worker from exercising his right to private property as a guarantee of his freedom and dignity. A system which would deny the exercise of this right would degrade the dignity of man and reduce him to the status of slavery.

In the Pentecost address of 1941, Pius XII was more explicit in affirming that private property, in harmony with the general right of all and regulated by the state constituted the material basis for man to fulfill his moral duties,

---

29 Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17. See Italian text above page 58, footnote 27.

"with reasonable liberty".[30] He, therefore, saw in private property the external sign of internal freedom. For him, it constituted the initial equipment without which a man cannot go forward to the fulfillment of his God-given destiny. It was the surest way by which all men could exercise their primary right of use in a manner worth of their dignity.

It is to be noted that the liberty which private property guarantees, Pius XII called "reasonable" (in giusta libertà). This expression calls for special comment. Obviously he has in mind the liberty which is indispensable to a person in the exercise of his rights and the discharge of his individual and social duties. "Reasonable" liberty is opposed to the doctrine of historic liberalism which gives to the individual the right to ignore the common good and the demands of social justice in the exercise of his property rights, thus resulting in the anarchy of individualism. Reasonable liberty demands discipline and social direction. Such liberty is also opposed to the lodging of all property in the hands of the state thus giving to the government the power to ignore and deny personal rights.

In an address on world reconstruction, September 1st, 1944, Pius XII made his most extensive pronouncement on

---

30 "[...] in giusta libertà [...]" (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.)

private ownership emphasizing in particular its role in sustaining true liberty.[31] He reaffirmed the teaching of Leo XIII that private property must be the basic foundation "for every legitimate economic and social order".[32] He was profoundly disturbed at the countless number of workers with no property of their own and therefore in such desperate conditions that they were ready to fall prey to those who would promise bread and security, even at the cost of their genuine liberty:

> In fact, We see the ever increasing ranks of the workers frequently confronted with this excessive concentration of economic goods which, often hidden under anonymous titles, are successfully withdrawn from contributing, as they should, to the social order and place the worker in a situation where it is virtually impossible for him to effectively acquire private property of his own.
>
> .....
>
> On the one side, We see immense riches dominating public and private economic life and often even civil life; on the other, the countless number of those who, deprived of every direct or indirect security of their own livelihood, take no further interest in the true and higher values of the spirit, abandon their aspiration to genuine freedom and throw

---

31 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 249-258. In the Acta Apostolicae Sedis, this radio message to the whole world contains four parts: (1) The Defence of Christian Civilization, (2) Some Aspects of the Economic and Social Question, (3) Thoughts on Charity, (4) Thoughts on Peace. Private property is the central issue in Part Two (p. 252-255). This part is to be found in Appendix III of this dissertation.

32 "[...] per ogni retto ordine economico e sociale" (Ibid., p. 252.)

> themselves at the feet of any political party, slaves to whoever promises them in some way bread and security.[33]

It would seem that another disturbing factor was that communism, fresh from its victories over nazism, was so popular that its doctrine might more readily be accepted by the mass of workers. In view of such conditions, adversely affecting the mass of workers, it is not surprising that Pius XII vigorously defended private ownership, with the accent on liberty and dignity as the basic argument. He apparently wanted the freedom and dignity of man to be guaranteed by a structure of society, based on a widely diffused system of private ownership. He saw in private property the natural fruit of the personal activity and the ambition of a man to provide for himself and his family a sound basis for all his freedoms. He said:

---

33 "Noi vediamo infatti la sempre crescente schiera dei lavoratori trovarsi sovente di fronte a quegli eccessivi concentramenti di beni economici, che, nascosti spesso sotto forme anonime, riescono a sottrarsi ai loro doveri sociali e quasi mettono l'operaio nella impossibilità di formarsi una sua proprietà effettiva. [...]

Vediamo, da un lato, le ingenti ricchezze dominare l'economia privata e pubblica, e spesso anche l'attività civile; dall'altro, la innumerevole moltitudine di coloro che, privi di ogni diretta o indiretta sicurezza della propria vita, non prendono più interesse ai veri ed alti valori dello spirito, si chiudono alle aspirazioni verso una genuina libertà, si gettano al servigio di qualsiasi partito politico, schiavi di chiunque prometta loro in qualche modo pane e tranquillità." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.)

> Private property is in a special manner the natural fruit of labour, the product of an intense activity on the part of the man who acquires it through his energetic will to ensure and improve, by his own forces, his own living conditions and those of his family, to create for himself and those dear to him a field in which they may rightly enjoy, not only economic freedom, but political, cultural and religious freedom as well.[34]

This ideal of property, constituting the material basis for all freedoms, was in sharp contrast to the property situation of his time, wherein he saw "immense riches dominating public and private economic life and often even civil life."[35] In such concentrations of power, he saw the seeds of tyranny degrading the dignity of man by suppressing his ability to implement his fundamental rights. To break these power structures enslaving man in the economic order, he held aloft the social doctrine of the Church which, he said, has always been "the defender of the oppressed against the tyranny of the powerful and has always sponsored the just

---

34 "[...] proprietà privata è in particolar modo il frutto naturale del lavoro, il prodotto di una intensa attività dell'uomo, che l'acquista grazie alla sua energica volontà di assicurare e sviluppare con le sue forze l'esistenza propria e quella della sua famiglia, di creare a sè e ai suoi un campo di giusta libertà, non solo economica, ma anche politica, culturale e religiosa." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.)

35 "Vediamo [...] le ingenti ricchezze dominare l'economia privata e pubblica, e spesso anche l'attività civile; [...]" (Ibid., p. 253.)

claims of all classes of workers against every injustice."[36] The aim of the Church, he pointed out, was not simply to defend the status quo, but rather to see to it that the institution of private property becomes what God meant it to be — a force promoting social order, a prerequisite for the development of man's personal initiative, a stimulus for man to more readily attain his existential ends, and therefore a guarantee for that liberty and dignity with which God endowed man when He made him the master over material things. It was with such sentiments that Pius XII succinctly presented the case for private property:

> But the Church aims rather at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the designs of God's wisdom and the disposition of nature: an element of social order, a necessary presupposition to human initiative, an incentive to work to the advantages of life's purpose here and hereafter, and hence of the liberty and dignity of man, created in the likeness of God, Who from the beginning assigned him for his benefit domination over material things.[37]

---

36 "[...] la tutrice del debole oppresso contro la tirannia dei potenti e ha patrocinato sempre le giuste rivendicazioni di tutti i ceti dei lavoratori contro ogni iniquità." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.)

37 "Ma la Chiesa mira piuttosto a far si che l'istituto della proprietà privata sia tale quale deve essere secondo i disegni della sapienza divina e le disposizioni della natura: un elemento dell'ordine sociale, un necessario presupposto delle iniziative umane, un impulso al lavoro a vantaggio dei fini temporali e trascendenti della vita, e quindi della libertà e della dignità dell'uomo creato ad immagine di Dio, che fin dal principio gli assegnò a sua utilità un dominio sulle cose materiali." (Ibid.)

Such was his vision for private property. It was to be the means of spreading power instead of concentrating it in the hands of a few. This diffusion of power through the diffusion of ownership would enable all to live in dignity and freedom.

In the address of 1941, the Pope stated that an abundance of wealth in the national economy, even although statistically impressive, was of no avail unless it contributed to the personal development of all its citizens. He said:

> From this, beloved children, it will be easy for you to conclude that the economic riches of a people do not properly consist in the abundance of goods, measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members.[38]

In 1948, speaking to the International Institute for the Unification of Private Right, the Holy Father once again underlined the fundamental role of private property as a guarantee for the dignity of the human person:

---

38 "Dal che, diletti figli, vi tornerà agevole scorgere che la ricchezza economica di un popolo non consiste propriamente nell'abbondanza dei beni, misurata secondo un computo puro e pretto materiale del loro valore, bensì in ciò che tale abbondanza rappresenti e porga realmente ed efficacemente la base materiale bastevole al debito sviluppo personale dei suoi membri." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.) (Emphasis added.)

> The recognition of this right [private property] harmonizes with the dignity of the human personality, with the recognition of inviolable rights and duties inseparably inherent in the free personality received from God.[39]

Immediately following this statement, he admitted the possibility of attaining security under socialism or some other form of statism, but it would be at the expense of personal freedom:

> Only those who deny to men the dignity of free persons can admit the possibility of substituting for the right of private property (and consequently the very institution of private property) some system of insurance and protection by public law.[40]

Again in his 1942 address to the Austrian Katholikentag, when he affirmed that the worker had not the strict right to co-ownership and co-management in the enterprise, he declared private property to be intimately associated with the dignity of the human person and had its basis in the very nature of human personality.[41]

---

39 "La reconnaissance de ce droit tient ferme ou croule avec la reconnaissance des droits et des devoirs imperceptibles, inséparablement inhérents à la personnalité libre, qu'il a reçue de Dieu." (Fundamentals of Private Law, Soyez les bienvenus, May 20, 1948, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 10, p. 92.)

40 "Celui-là seulement qui refuse à l'homme cette dignité de personne libre peut admettre la possibilité de substituer au droit à la propriété privée (et par conséquent à la propriété privée elle-même) on ne sait quel système d'assurances ou garanties légales de droit public." (Ibid.)

41 To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 792.

In the Christmas address of 1952, Pius XII again stressed the link God established between the institution of private property and personal dignity. On the occasion of calling attention to the impersonal character of social life dominated by the gigantic enterprises of modern industry, he lamented that this impersonal system was in conflict with the plan of God because it threatened to undermine the institutions of private property, the family, and the state. He pointed out that these institutions were given to humanity by God for the purpose of ministering to human dignity by providing the occasion for personal and social development. In respect to this whole problem, he said:

> Unquestionably, modern industrial enterprise, too, has had its beneficial results; but the problem which presents itself today is this: "will a world in which the only economic form to find recognition is a vast productive system, be equally capable of exerting a happy influence upon social life in general and upon the three above-mentioned fundamental institutions in particular?" [the family, the state, and private property]
>
> We must answer that the impersonal character of such a world is in contrast with the wholly personal inclination of those institutions which the Creator has given to human society. In fact, marriage and the family, the state and private property tend of their very nature to form and to develop man as a person, to protect him and to render him capable of contributing, through his own voluntary collaboration and personal responsibility, to the likewise personal maintenance and the development of social life. The creative wisdom of God remains, therefore, alien to that system of impersonal unity which outrages the human person, the origin and very purpose of social life, and in its innermost essence the very image of God.[42]

---

42 "Senza dubbio anche la moderna impresa industriale

The above texts indicate that it was, above all, to enhance the dignity of the human person that Pius XII invoked the principle of private property. This is not surprising for the reason that he saw grave threats to the dignity of man as a result of the contemporary tendency to reduce man to the status of an inanimate object in the organization of social and economic life. "In many of the most important activities of life", he declared, "he has been reduced to a mere object of society."[43] "In so many cases", he said, on another occasion, "he has been lowered to the level of a piece of raw material."[44] As a consequence of this anomaly, Pius XII made frequent reference to the principle that man

---

ha avuto benefici effetti; ma il problema, che oggi si presenta, è questo: Sarà egualmente valido ad esercitare un felice influsso sulla vita sociale in genere, e su quelle tre istituzioni fondamentali in specie, un mondo che non riconosca se non la forma economica di un enorme organismo produttivo? Dobbiamo rispondere che il carattere impersonale di un tale mondo contrasta con la tendenza del tutto personale di quelle istituzioni, che il Creatore ha date alla umana società. Infatti il matrimonio e la famiglia, lo Stato, la proprietà privata, tendono per natura loro a formare e a sviluppare l'uomo come persona, a proteggerlo e a renderlo capace di contribuire, con la sua volontaria collaborazione e personale responsabilità, al mantenimento e allo sviluppo, altresì personale, della vita sociale. La sapienza creatrice di Dio resta dunque estranea a quel sistema di unità impersonale, che attenta alla persona umana, fonte e scopo della vita sociale, immagine di Dio nel suo più intimo essere." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 37.)

43 "In molte delle più importante attività della vita è stato ridotto a puro oggetto della società" (Ibid., p. 38.)

44 "Abbassato in tanti casi al grado di un articolo di sfruttamento" (Christian Principles of International Trade, Il desidero, March 1, 1948, in Discorsi e Radiomessagi, 10, p13

is not an object but a subject by right and that this calls for the practical recognition of the majesty of the human person in social and economic life as well as before the law. Indicative is this statement from his Christmas message, 1950:

> [Men should be] considered and treated not as chattels but as persons with human dignity especially in matters regarding the state and the national economy.[45]

The foregoing texts from the papal documents bear witness to the importance of freedom and dignity on the basic argument for private property. To summarize and further comment on the import of the above cited texts: to be observed, first of all, is the firmness with which Pius XII insists on the right of every man to the use of material goods to provide for his physical needs, and to procure the material basis for his spiritual and cultural needs. To provide for his spiritual and cultural needs, and thus to develop his distinctive adornments of intellect and will, he should have the opportunity to plan and to choose in the very act of implementing his right to the use of the material. This means that he should have the choice to

---

45 "[...] considerati e trattati non come oggetti, ma come soggetti della vita sociale, sopratutto nello Stato e nella economia nazionale." (Christmas Message, Un anno, Dec. 23, 1950, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 55.

master himself by mastering things and so to be his own providence as God meant him to be. For a reason, therefore, that is profoundly metaphysical, the natural order demands that all men exercise their right to use material things in a manner that enhances personality and guarantees man's mastership over things, under the supreme mastery of God. The social doctrine of Pius XII, certainly implies that the very nature of man demands not a mere temporary use of material things, but a use that is permanent and exclusive, involving man as man, with his ability to relate means to end, to plan, to make choices and to provide for the future with a degree of independence. Such a use is possible only through private appropriation. Thus, the dignity of the human person normally requires private property. Hence Pius XII's strong defence of private property as an indispensable means for the fulfillment of man in his essential nature and as a guarantee for his freedom to develop himself.

The Holy Father's argument, furthermore, implies that the dignity of man is inconceivable without the freedom necessary to master his own economic destiny. If a man must depend upon others to provide him with the necessities of life, how can he truly be free? Pius XII did not hesitate to point out that private property provides the basis not only for economic freedom, but for political, spiritual and cultural freedom as well. To be sure, the implication is

that, if a man must depend upon the state or others for the things necessary for life, he is practically at their mercy in all departments of life. He is most liable to submit to a subhuman dependence upon others.

Another important point worthy of notice in Pius XII's argument for property as the basis of freedom is the fact that he saw the personal possession of material goods as the instrumental means to free man from matter itself, to make him independent of matter, and to give him command over it. Ever aware of the effects of an exaggerated acquisitive instinct, in respect to private ownership, he rejected the utilitarian philosophy that made an end out of an instrument by exalting property rights above personal rights, thus reducing the owner to the indignity of a slave to the material. In his Christmas message of 1943 to a world at war, Pius XII pointed to the poverty of Jesus as an example of the command man should exercise over material things in the sense that they are to serve and not to dominate his moral, cultural and religious needs:

> But that poverty of the Lord and Creator of the world [...] signifies and portrays the command and the dominance he had over material things. And thus it shows with striking efficacy the natural and essential subjection of material goods to the life of the spirit and to a higher cultural, moral and religious perfection which is necessary for man endowed with reason.[46]

---

46 "Ma quella povertà del Signore e Creatore del mondo [...] significa e manifesta quelle padronanza e

In the same message he repudiated those who would make of their wealth an end in place of a means to serve the higher aspirations of the soul:

> Those who looked for the salvation of society from the machinery of the world economic market have remained thus disillusioned because they had become not the lords and masters, but the slaves of material wealth, which they served without reference to the higher end of man, making it an end in itself.[47]

3. The Family Argument.

If the dignity of the human person demands possession and control of material goods, so much more is this the case when the person becomes the head of the family, when his needs — physical, spiritual, and cultural — are no longer private to himself. The needs of his wife and children become his needs, and he has the responsibility for procuring them in dignity and freedom. Thus private property, as essential in ministering to human dignity, assumes greater

---

superiorità Egli avesse sulle cose il naturale ed essenziale ordinamento dei beni terreni alla vita dello spirito e ad una più alta perfezione culturale, morale e religiosa, necessaria all'uomo ragionevole." (Christmas Message, Ancora una quinta, Dec. 24, 1943, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 14.)

47 "Coloro, aspettavano la salute della società dal meccanismo del mercato economico mondiale, sono rimasti così delusi, perchè erano divenuti non e signori e i padroni, ma gli schiavi delle ricchezze materiali, alle quali avevano servito, svincolandole dal fine superiore dell'uomo e facendole fine a se stesso." (Ibid.)

urgency for the father of a family. It was along these lines that Pius XII pleaded the case for family property, thus reinforcing his justification for private ownership. He considered it to be another facet of the argument based on personal dignity and freedom.

The texts previously cited to justify private property explicitly mention the benefits accruing to the head of the family in the way of safeguarding his freedom and personal responsibility in that capacity. In the 1944 address, when he defended private property as the necessary condition for the flourishing of the freedoms, he explicitly mentioned these benefits not only for the individual himself but also for the members of his family:

> Private property is in a special manner the natural fruit of labor, the product of an intense activity on the part of a man who acquires it through his energetic will to ensure and improve, by his own forces, his own living condition and those of his family, to create for himself and those dear to him a field in which they may rightly enjoy, not only economic freedom, but political, cultural, and religious freedom as well.[48]

In his appeal to the state to promote a fairer distribution of wealth, it was the liberation of the worker, as the father of a family, that he specifically mentioned:

---

48 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252. See Italian text above page 63, footnote 34. Emphasis added.

> Positive legislation regulating private ownership may change and more or less restrict its use. But if legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community it must prevent the worker, who is or will be the father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his right as a person. Whether this slavery arises from the exploitation of private capital or from the power of the State the result is the same.[49]

Both the right of the individual and of the family to private property are linked in the dignity of the human person, so he stated in the well known address to the Austrian Katholikentag in 1956:

> The right of the individual and the family to private property stems immediately from the nature of human personality and is connected with the dignity of the human person.[50]

In 1943 he challenged the Italian worker subjected to communistic propaganda "not to abolish private property, the foundation of family stability" but rather to defend it and promote its diffusion.[51] That every man has the right to found a family was the solemn declaration proclaimed by Pius XII in his Christmas message of 1942:

---

49 Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17. See Italian text above page 58, note 27.

50 "Das Recht des Einzelnen und der Familie auf Eigentum ist ein unmittelbarer Ausfluss des Personseins, ein Recht der persönlichen Würde, [...]" (To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p.792.)

51 "[...] non abolire la proprietà privata, fondamento della stabilità della famiglia [...]" (The Church and Labour. La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943,in AAS, 35, p. 175.)

> He would have the star of peace shine out and stand over society [...] should uphold respect for, and the practical realization of the following personal rights: [...] the right to marry and to achieve the aim of married life; the right to conjugal and domestic society.[52]

From this, he went on to point out that, in order to assure the indissolubility of marriage, the family must have access to the material things conducive to the fulfillment of its mission to educate children and "to preserve, fortify, and reconstitute according to its powers, its proper economic, spiritual and moral unity."[53] The Holy Father, thus, makes it clear that the family must have at its disposal the necessary means to assure its stability, cohesion, unity and independence. This implies possession and control over the resources necessary to provide for the needs of the family. It implies that a situation of complete dependence upon outside sources for the attainment of such needs would not be in keeping with the freedom and dignity of the family.

What must be thought of the dependence of the family upon the state in respect to the provision of its economic

---

52 "Che vuole che la stella della pace spunti e si fermi sulla società [...] sostenta il rispetto e la pratica attuazione dei seguenti fondamentali diritti della persona [...] il diritto, in massima, al matrimonio e al conseguimento del suo scopo, il diritto alla società coniugale e domestica." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 19.)

53 "Conservi, fortifichi o ricostituisca, secondo le sue forze la propria unità economica, spirituale, morale e giuridica." (Ibid., p. 20.)

needs? That the family is a society in itself, prior to the state and independent of it, was the unequivocal teaching of Pius XII. "Man and his family," he declared, in his first major encyclical, "are by nature anterior to the state, and the Creator has given to both of them powers and rights and has assigned them a mission and a charge that corresponds to natural requirements."[54] These postulates of family dignity would, therefore, demand that man himself be the responsible agent in implementing the duties he has towards his children. This does not mean that the state has no obligation in contributing to the socio-economic conditions that would enable the family breadwinner to perform his duties in a manner that would make him the true father of the family. On the contrary, Pius XII pointed out that the state had this obligation. In an address to the women delegates of the Christian Societies of Italy he declared that the state had "precisely the office of securing for the families of every social class those conditions which are necessary for them to evolve as economic, juridical, and moral units."[55] This

---

54 "Itemque ut oblivioni detur homines eorumque familias suapte natura civitatem antecedens, ac divinum Creatorem peculiaria utrisque dedisse jura facultatesque, iisdemque destinasse munus, quod naturalibus ac certis necessitatibus respondeat." (Encyclical Letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 434.)

55 "Lo Stato e la politica hanno infatti propriamente l'ufficio di assicurare alle famiglie di ogni ceto le condizioni necessarie, affinchè possano esistere e svilupparsi come unità economiche, giuridiche, e morali." (Woman's Duties in Social and Political Life, Questa grande, AAS, 37, p. 294.)

text makes it clear that it is the duty of the state not to substitute for the father of a family but to aid him in the performance of his personal duties.

In the Christmas message of 1952, Pius XII was profoundly disturbed with the destitute conditions surrounding families throughout the world. He saw a vast number of families living in destitution, without sufficient food, work or shelter.

> But the most desolate picture is seen when it is a question of families who have simply nothing. These are the families in utter wretchedness: the father is without work, the mother watches her children waste away, absolutely impotent to help them. They find themselves each day without bread; they continually lack the means whereby to clothe themselves, and woe to the whole family when sickness settles upon that cave, now become a human habitation.[56]

He went on to describe the consequences of this dreadful state of poverty: violence, crime and moral depravity.

The above conditions describing the wretchedness of dispossessed families were a far cry from the very special link between private property and the existence and development of the family, which subject constituted a major portion

---

56 "Ma lo spettacolo più desolante si presenta allo sguardo, quando si tratta di famiglie, alle quali manca tutto. Famiglie in "miseria nera": il babbo non lavora; la mamma vede languire i suoi bambini nell'assoluta impossibilità di soccorrerli; ogni giorno manca il pane, ogni giorno manca di che ricoprirsi, e guai a tutti quando la malattia viene ad annidarsi in quella caverna trasformata in abitazione umana." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 44.)

of Pius XII's Pentecost address of 1941. Herein he stated that nature itself demands that the father of a family have access to private property without which he would lack the freedom to fulfill all his duties towards the members of the family. To this end, he warned the state not to go counter to the natural order and destroy private property by an exaggerated direct interference or by excessive taxation. But, on the contrary, he called upon the state to promote and to perfect the institution of private property in its superior role of ministering to the true welfare of the family. This is his complete statement in connection with family property:

> According to the teaching of Rerum Novarum, nature itself has closely joined private property with the existence of human society and its true civilization, and in a very special manner with the existence and development of the family. Such a link appears more than obvious. Should not private property secure for the father of a family, the healthy liberty he needs in order to fulfill the duties assigned to him by the Creator regarding the physical, spiritual and religious welfare of the family? In the family the nation finds the natural and fecund tools of its greatness and power. If private property has to conduce to the good of the family, all public standards, and especially those of the State which regulate its possession, must not only make possible and preserve such a function — a function in the natural order under certain aspects superior to all others — but must also perfect it ever more. A so-called civil progress would, in fact, be unnatural, which — either through the excessive burdens imposed, or through exaggerated direct interference — were to render private property void of significance, practically taking from the family and its head the freedom to follow the scope

set by God for the perfection of family life.[57]

The above texts, especially the immediately preceding one of Pentecost 1941, provide ample evidence that private property, as a postulate for the freedom and dignity of the family, assumes an important place in the social doctrine of Pius XII. It adds to the force of his basic argument, founded on the dignity of the person.

4. The Labour Argument.

With Pius XII, the dignity of labour was a familiar theme. Moreover, he indicated that this dignity required for its completion the possession of private property. It shall

---

57 "Secondo la dottrina della Rerum novarum, la natura stessa ha intimamente congiunto la proprietà privata con l'esistenza dell'umana società e con la sua vera civiltà, e in grado eminente con l'esistenza e con lo sviluppo della famiglia. Un tal vincolo appare più che apertamente. Non deve forse la proprietà privata assicurare al padre di famiglia la sana libertà, di cui ha bisogno, per poter adempiere i doveri assegnatigli dal Creatore, concernenti il benessere fisico, spirituale e religioso della famiglia.

Nella famiglia la Nazione trova la radice naturale e feconda della sua grandezza e potenza. Se la proprietà privata ha da condurre al bene della famiglia, tutte le norme pubbliche, anzi tutte quelle dello Stato che ne regolano il possesso, devono non solo rendere possibile e conservare tale funzione — funzione nell'ordine naturale sotto certi rapporti superiore a ogni altra —, ma ancora perfezionarla sempre più. Sarebbe infatti innaturale un vantato progresso civile il quale — o per la sovrabbondanza di carichi o per soverchie ingerenze immediate — rendesse vuota di senso la proprietà privata, togliendo praticamente alla famiglia e al suo capo la libertà di perseguire lo scopo da Dio assegnato al perfezionamento della vita familiare." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 202.)

be our purpose to verify from his documents both of these assertions.

As to the first, the dignity of work in itself, the Holy Father, in the Pentecost address of 1941, made a significant reference to the twofold character of work:

> Rerum novarum teaches that there are two essential characteristics of labour: it is personal and it is necessary. It is personal because it is achieved through the exercise of man's particular forces.[58]

He goes on to elaborate somewhat on this point, stating that work is a personal duty given to man by nature and not by the state, that it is the necessary means for a man and his family to live decently, and that it is the duty of the state to safeguard the personal values of work whenever they are endangered.[59] The Pope, therefore, ascribes to the concept of work all the dignity of a human act because it involves man in the particular forces of a man — his intelligence, initiative and energy. It is a true expression of the human person. To reduce work to the indignity of a piece of merchandise would be in direct opposition to this concept.

---

58 "La Rerum novarum insegna che due sono le proprietà del lavoro umano: esso è personale ed è necessario. È personale, perchè si compie con l'esercizio delle particolari forze dell'uomo; [...]" (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 201.)

59 Ibid.

To maintain that the dignity of work is derived from its productivity in the service of the state is likewise contrary to this concept.

In the Easter homily of 1939, the Holy Father made explicit reference to the dignity of work. Confronting a world-wide unemployment problem, he pleaded for measures to stimulate employment not only because work is necessary for a decent livelihood but it is also "the means through which all those manifold powers and faculties with which nature, training and art have endowed the dignity of the human person, find their necessary expression and this with a certain natural comeliness."[60] "It lies in the very nature of labour [...] to draw men together in a genuine and intimate union," the Pope wrote in a letter to the Semaines Sociales of France in 1946.[61] It was thus that Pius XII added to the dignity of work by ascribing to it a social and a high moral value. Speaking of labour to a congress of Italian farmers

---

60 "Quomodo habeatur, dicimus, si tot hominibus ad centena millia bene multa, laboris opera desit, ex qua non modo singuli cives honesti vivere queant, sed multiplices etiam eorum vires facultatesque, quibus natura, studium et ars humanae personae dignitatem honestaverint, necessitate quadam ingenuoque decore exerceri possint?" (Easter Message of Peace, Quoniam Paschalia, April 9, 1939, in AAS 31 (1939), p. 147.)

61 "[...] le travail est capable, en raison de sa nature même, d'unir les hommes véritablement et intimement" (Letter to Semaines Sociales, July 19, 1947, in AAS 39 (1947), p. 445.)

he made this statement: "thus men are brought together to work for the needs of the people and perfect themselves by their united efforts to the honor of the Creator and the Redeemer."[62] In the Christmas message of 1943 he said that the worker unites himself with God, serves Him, and hence his labour assumes a moral value that is eternal: "work is a service of God, a gift of God, the vigor and fullness of human life, the gage of eternal rest."[63]

The above texts, with the accent on the social and moral values of work, imply that the division of labour is meant to effectively provide for the needs of all. Each worker contributes to the prosperity of all and therefore labour assumes a social import; it becomes a unifying factor, serving man and drawing him closer to God.

A magnificent passage in the Christmas address of 1945 reduces to a compact summary the chief factor accounting for the dignity of labour:

---

62 "Esse unisce gli uomini in un servizio commune per i bisogni del popolo, in un medesimo sforzo per il proprio perfezionamento a onore del loro Creatore e Redentore." (The Life of the Farmer, Con particolare, Nov. 15, 1946, in AAS, 38 (1946), p. 436.)

63 "Il lavoro è servizio di Dio, dono di Dio, vigore e pienezza della vita umana, merito di riposo eterno." (Christmas Message, Ancora una quinta, Dec. 24, 1943, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 16.)

> Human labour is also a profound moral force, and the human race of workers a society which not only produces objects but also glorifies God. Man can consider his work as a true instrument of his sanctification because by working, he makes perfect in himself the image of God, fulfills his duty and the right to gain for himself and his dependents the necessary sustenance, and makes himself a useful unit of society.[64]

This and the preceding passages bear ample testimony as to the high esteem Pius XII attributes to the concept of work. To what extent does this dignity call for the personal possession of material goods? At least two texts from the documents of Pius XII point to the connection between the two.

In the Christmas message of 1942, the Pontiff once again extolled the dignity of work and established the link between it and private property, giving to the latter a foremost place in ministering to this dignity:

> As an indispensable means, towards gaining over the world that mastery which God wishes for His glory, all work has an inherent dignity and at the same time a close connection with the perfection of the person [...] the Church does not hesitate to draw the practical conclusions which are derived from

---

64 "Cosi consolidato, anche il lavoro umano e un alto valore morale, e la umanità lavoratrice una società, che non soltanto produce oggetti, ma glorifica Dio. L'uomo può considerare il suo lavoro come un vero strumento della propria santificazione perche lavorando perfeziona in se l'immagine di Dio, adempie il dovere e il diritto di procurare a se e ai suoi il necessario sostentamento e si rende elemento utile alla societa." (Christmas Message, Col cuore aperto, Dec. 24, 1955, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 36-37.)

> the moral nobility of work [...] these exigencies include besides a just wage, which covers the needs of the worker and his family, the conservation and perfection of a social order which will make possible an assured, even if modest, private property for all classes of citizens.[65]

To restore and to enhance the dignity of the worker, by the widest possible application of the principle of private property, was a theme of Pius XII's address of 1944 on the subject of world reconstruction.[66] This was his basic approach to solving the problem posed by the vast multitude of propertyless workers, exposed, on the one hand, to a theory that would destroy private property and, on the other, to a practice that would reduce it to the privilege of a few.[67] To justify this position in terms that would appeal to the worker, he declared that private property was the natural fruit of a man's personal activities in the process of his work:

---

65 "Come mezzo indispensabile al dominio del mondo, voluto da Dio per la sua gloria ogni lavoro possiede una dignità inalienabile, e in pari tempo un intimo legame col perfezionamento della persona [...] la Chiesa non esita a dedurre le conseguenze pratiche, derivanti dalla nobilità morale del lavoro. [...] queste esigenze comprendono, oltre ad un salario giusto, sufficente alla necessita dell'operaio e della famiglia, la conservazione ed il perfezionamento di un ordine sociale, che renda possibile una sicura, se pur modesta, proprietà privata a tutti i ceti del popolo." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 20.)

66 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252-255.

67 Ibid., p. 253.

> Private property is in a special manner the natural fruit of labour, the product of an intense activity on the part of the man who acquires it through his energetic will to ensure and improve, by his own forces, his own living conditions and those of his family, to create for himself and those dear to him a field in which they may rightly enjoy, not only economic freedom, but political, cultural, and religious freedom as well.[68]

Later on in the same address he stated that the prospect of some personal property for the worker is the natural incentive to guarantee the fruitfulness of his work and to enhance its dignity:

> [The institution of private property is] a necessary presupposition to human initiative, an incentive to work to the advantages of life's purpose here and hereafter [...] Take away from the worker the hope of acquiring some goods as personal property and what other natural incentive can you offer him to make him work hard, to save and to live soberly when not a few men and peoples today have lost all and have nothing left but their capacity to work.[69]

---

68 "[...] proprietà privata è in particolar modo il frutto naturale del lavoro, il prodotto di una intensa attività dell'uomo, che l'acquista grazie alla sua energica volontà di assicurare e sviluppare con le sue forze l'esistenza propria e quella della sua famiglia, di creare a sè e ai suoi un campo di giusta libertà, non solo economica, ma anche politica, culturale e religiosa." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.)

69 "[...] un necessario presupposto delle iniziative umane, un impulso al lavoro a vantaggio dei fini temporali e trascendenti della vita, [...].

Togliete al lavoratore la speranza di acquistare qualche bene in proprietà personale; quale altro stimolo naturale potreste voi offirgli per incitarlo a un lavoro intenso, al risparmio, alla sobrietà, mentre oggi non pochi uomini e popoli, avendo tutto perduto, nulla più hanno se non la loro capacità di lavoro?" (Ibid., p. 253.)

The above texts serve to demonstrate that the conservation of private property as the fundamental institution of the economic order and the diffusion of property holdings among the workers was for Pius XII the natural means to assure the fruitfulness of work and to complete its dignity. He thus gave to the personal-dignity-argument a new dimension and an additional importance. He saw work as the primary instrument by which man exercises his God-given mastery over things, thus perfecting in himself the Divine image. It was the means by which a man could transcend himself and matter by uniting with others in making God's world more adaptable to the needs of all mankind. He thus attributed to work that social value which the fulfillment of personality demands; moreover, a man's work in its social import, enabled him to participate in God's communicative love. His exalted evaluation of work implies that the total environment surrounding the worker must be conducive to realizing the noble vocation of labour. Whatever makes the high values of work more discernible must be conserved and promoted. Hence it was that he saw in private property the natural means to implement the concept of work in its personal, social and moral values.

The close bond which Pius XII saw between property and work points to the importance and the esteem he gave to work as a title for ownership. In the context of the

economic conditions that confronted him, it was of great importance and dignity and, therefore, commanded his undivided attention. This is not to say that all labour constitutes a title to ownership or that he denied or downgraded the primordial title of occupation and the derived titles of contract, inheritance and prescription. As such, he did not discuss the titles to ownership. He simply ratified the doctrine of his predecessors.[70]

---

70 In the address of Sept. 1, 1944 (AAS, 36, p. 252), Pius XII prefaced his statement on labour, as a title to ownership, by affirming that the Church has always recognized "the natural right to property and of the hereditary transmission of one's own goods" (Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno): "Se è vero che la Chiesa ha sempre reconosciuto il diritto naturale di proprietà e di trasmissione ereditaria di propri beni." It is to be noted that he does not make the error of stating that labour alone is the basis of ownership. This was the argument of Henry George which created a major controversy in the latter nineteenth and early twentieth century. In Progress and Poverty (New York, The Modern Library, [n.d.], p. 335-336), George denies the right of private ownership in land, and contends that apart from man's right to himself and the fruit of his own labour, there can be no rightful title to property. For an account of this controversy involving Leo XIII, Henry George and John A. Ryan, the celebrated American pioneer in Catholic social doctrine, see Frank GRACE, The Concept of Property in Modern Christian Thought, University of Illinois Press, 1953 (Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-2).

In Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931 (AAS, 23, p. 194-195), Pius XI stated the doctrine of the Church respecting the titles of acquiring ownership, when he refuted two false theories of would-be reformers: (1) occupancy must be accompanied by labour to constitute a just title to property; (2) labour is the only just title to property, to the exclusion of capital. As to the first error Pius XI simply stated that both occupancy and labour are the original titles to ownership:

"That ownership is originally acquired both by occupancy of a thing not owned by anyone and by labor, or as is

To sum up Pius XII's justification for private property: (1) The right of private property is derived from the natural law, because it is rooted in the first and fundamental right to the use of material goods which nature grants to all men for the fulfillment of their dignity as persons. (2) Private property is the natural and indispensable means to realize the first right in keeping with the demands of human dignity and is therefore intrinsically linked with the right of all men to the world's goods. (3) Private property, as a natural institution, is not necessarily identified with the forms in which this institution has found expression; nor is it necessarily identified with existing property rights. (4) The fundamental and paramount argument for private property is the dignity of the human person, which dignity demands personal and exclusive possession as the material base to assure the freedom necessary for the development of the whole man. (5) The dignity of man, the father of a family and man the worker

---

said by specification, the tradition of all ages as well as the teaching of our Predecessor, Leo, clearly testify." (English version in H. KOENIG (ed.), Principles for Peace, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1943, No. 969, p. 414.)

As to the second error, Pius XI refuted the false idea that labour always and under all circumstances constitutes a title to ownership: first, it must be exercised by a man "in his own name", secondly, it must add a new form of being or value to the object: "Only that labour which a man performs in his own name and by virtue of which a new form or increase has been given to a thing grants him title to these fruits." (Ibid.)

adds to the strength of the basic argument; the ability of the family to live in dignity and freedom demands the personal possession of property; the prospect of acquiring property of one's own is a necessary condition for the fruitfulness and efficiency of human labor; the nobility of work requires for its completion a social order which will assure, in some measure, property for all classes of citizens.

B. The Individual and Social Aspect of Private Property.

Pius XII's basic argument for private property as a prerequisite for human dignity definitely gives to it a personal end. A closer observation of the Pope's documents reveals the essential social function and the manner in which it combines with the personal to constitute the concept of private property in its deepest meaning. In the Pentecost address of 1941 he defined this essential social function, when he emphasized that private property must not serve to frustrate the universal destination of material goods; but, on the contrary, its essential role is to see to it that the goods of all serve all:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature, the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed, even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods.

> Undoubtedly, the natural order deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as the functioning of the State over both these institutions.
>
> But all this remains subordinate to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope.[71]

With this statement, Pius XII proclaims the preeminence of the universal right of all as compared with the personal right of each in the use of the world's material goods. There is no conflict between the two. On the contrary, he clearly indicates that a system of personal possession is designed by nature to make the goods of earth more readily available to all. This relationship, embedded as it is in the very nature of private ownership, is the essence of Pius XII's concept of property in its essential social

---

71 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione, ha infatti dalla natura il diritto fondamentale di usare dei beni materiali della terra, pur essendo lasciato alla volontà umana e alle forme giuridiche dei popoli di regolarne più particolarmente la pratica attuazione. Tale diritto individuale non può essere in nessun modo soppresso, neppure da altri diritti certi e pacifici sui beni materiali. Senza dubbio l'ordine naturale, derivante da Dio, richiede anche la proprietà privata e il libero reciproco commercio dei beni con scambi e donazioni, come pure la funzione regolatrice del potere pubblico su entrambi questi istituti. Tutto ciò nondimeno rimane subordinato allo scopo naturale dei beni materiali, e non potrebbe rendersi indipendente dal diritto primo e fondamentale, che a tutti ne concede l'uso; ma piuttosto deve servire a farne possibile l'attuazione in conformità con il suo scopo." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum La solennità. June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

function. This social function is not therefore a mere condition pertaining to the use of goods. It belongs to the very essence of private ownership to make secure the right of all to the world's material goods. The social function is prior to all concrete limitations on private property which may be imposed by the civil law.

Another observation to be made in regard to the wording of this text is that the Holy Father is referring to the social role of private property in its institutional framework. Certainly, the social function of property becomes a reality for the individual when he disposes of his property — especially that which is superfluous — in keeping with the social obligations arising from that which he owns. This is an important phase of the social aspect with Pius XII, as will be presently shown; but it is not the prime consideration in the above cited text where the emphasis is on the subordinate role of private property as a social institution, ministering to the common good of all. This principle affects not only the individual property holder in the distribution of his surplus goods, but the whole regime of property, and therefore, has an important bearing on all the factors involved in the distribution of material goods.

A further feature of the foregoing passage from Pentecost 1941, is the manner in which it articulates the

necessity of keeping unified the personal and social aspect in the concept of private property. In the 1944 address on world reconstruction, the Holy Father made this point still more explicit when he called for a linking together of both functions in the manner of an indissoluble union — a synthesis designed to realize in the most effective way, the universal destination of material goods in keeping with personal dignity.[72] In the context of an appeal for private property as a social institution best calculated to secure the economic well-being of all, he had this to say:

> The social and economic policy of the future, the controlling powers of the State, of local bodies, of professional institutions cannot permanently secure their end, which is the genuine productivity of social life and the normal returns on the national economy except by respecting and safeguarding the vital function of private property in its personal and social values.[73]

In this statement, the Pope joins together both the social and personal so as to constitute one single function of private ownership. He indicates that the civil authorities,

---

72 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253-254.

73 "La politica sociale ed economica dell'avvenire, l'attività ordinatrice dello Stato, dei Comuni, degl'istituti professionali, non potranno conseguire durevolmente il loro alto fine, che è la vera fecondità della vita sociale e il normale rendimento della economia nazionale, se non rispettando e tutelando la funzione vitale della proprietà privata nel suo valore personale e sociale." (Ibid., p. 254.) Emphasis added.

employer and employee associations would be acting contrary to their purpose if their policies should result in separating the social function of property from its personal function; production for the welfare of all would not be realized and the productivity of the national economy would suffer. The danger of disassociating the personal from the social element in private ownership was a real one for Pius XII. He saw in this separation the error of those who would contend that the worker has the strict right, from the nature of the labour contract, to co-ownership and co-determination in the enterprise. Thus it was, that in his 1952 address to the Austrian Katholikentag, stressing the sacredness of private ownership, he said that "it [the right of private property] is not merely a social function, but a personal right, though to be sure, burdened with social responsibilities."[74]

Both the personal and social aims were linked together in the text from the Pope's address of 1944, wherein he sums up his defence of private property:

---

74 "[...] ein Recht der persönlichen Würde, freilich ein mit sozialen Verpflichtungen behaftetes Recht; es ist aber nicht lediglich eine soziale Funktion." (To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 792.)

> In defending, therefore, the principle of private property, the Church pursues a high ethico-social purpose [...] the Church aims at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the designs of God's wisdom and the dispositions of nature: an element of social order, a necessary presupposition to human initiative, an incentive to work.[75]

The above text, along with the others cited on this question, demonstrates that Pius XII is primarily concerned with the social role of private property as an institution of the natural order. It shall now be our purpose to show that he was also concerned with a narrower sense of the social function, namely, the social obligations of the individual property holder, regardless of the existing regime of ownership.

Calling upon all to uphold human dignity by respecting the fundamental personal rights of all, the Holy Father in the Christmas message of 1942 included in the listing of these rights, "the right to the use of material goods in keeping with his duties and social limitations."[76] An immediate deduction from this statement is that, correlative

---

75 "Difendendo dunque il principio della proprietà privata, la Chiesa persegue un alto fine etico-sociale. [...] la Chiesa mira piuttosto a far si che l'istituto della proprietà privata sia tale quale deve essere secondo i disegni della sapienza divina e le disposizioni della natura: un elemento dell'ordine sociale, un necessario presupposto delle iniziative umane, un impulso al lavoro [...]" (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.)

76 "[...] il diritto ad un uso dei beni materiali consciente dei suoi doveri e delle limitazioni sociali." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, AAS, 35, p. 19.

to the right of the property holder, there is the duty to use what he owns in keeping with his social nature which demands that he respect these same rights in others. Speaking more specifically to Italian workers in 1956, the Pope stated that the social obligation of property owners were founded on justice:

> We remind employees that while the Church condemns every unjust violation of the right of ownership, it warns that this right is neither unlimited nor absolute; that it carries with it clear social obligations. If employers fail to recognize this, they will be acting against justice.[77]

In the encyclical letter of 1939 to the Bishops of the United States, Pius XII reminded the rich that they were the "ministers of divine providence", and their duty was to "assist the indigent, through whom they often receive gifts for the soul and whose hand — so they may hope — will lead them into the eternal tabernacles."[78] In the Christmas address of 1952, he intimates that the social obligations attached to the accumulation of wealth could be dispensed

---

77 "Ai datori di lavoro recordiamo che, mentre la Chiesa condanna ogni ingiusta violazione del diritto di proprietà, ammonisce però che esso non è illimitato ne assoluto perchè ha precisi obblighi sociali." (Christ's Kingdom and the World of Labour, Nel darvi, Oct. 28, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 823.)

78 "Supernae Providentiae administri egenis opitulantur, per quorum manus saepe dona quae ad animos spectant percipiunt, quorum ductu sperant se vitam assecuturos sempiternam." (Encyclical Epistle Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642.)

with by investments, which would contribute to the common good by maintaining and creating jobs, and that failure to do so could be a matter of conscience.

> Wherefore, let those who are in a position to invest their capital productivity consider in the light of the common good and with due regard for the opportunities of the moment and the limits of their financial ability, whether they can feel justified in conscience either to withhold such investments or to withdraw them because of exaggerated caution.[79]

To conclude and to offer some further comment on the aforementioned texts in this section, it must be noted, first of all, that Pius XII attached great importance to the necessity of keeping unified the personal and social in his concept of private property. It may well be considered his solution to the problem of property in its modern historical context, wherein one or other of these functions is denied. It is the answer to the collectivists, who reject private property because they see a contradiction between the personal and the social in the use of material goods destined

---

79 "Perciò, coloro, che sono capaci d'investire capitali, considerino in vista del bene commune, se esse possano conciliare con la loro conscienza di non fare, nei limiti delle possibilità economiche, nelle proporzioni e al momento opportuno, simili investimenti e di retrarsi con vana cautela in disparte." (Christmas Address, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 40.)

See also Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 285: "Mais il s'ensuit que la prospérité matérielle de tous les membres des peuples [...] lui [au propriétaire des moyens de production] impose [...] l'obligation de contribuer par épargne à l'accroissement du capital national."

for the use of all. It is also the answer to the individualists who practically deny the social aspect by reducing it to a mere by-product of private ownership. On the contrary, Pius XII established a harmonious synthesis between the personal and social in private ownership, and thus steered a middle course between individualism and collectivism. He indicated that such harmony was necessary in order to ensure that the goods of the earth attain their end of serving all and at the same time provide for the development of the human person. Not only was it the duty of individuals to maintain this harmony in the disposal of their property, but above all he insisted on the obligation of organizing the institution of private property in such a way as to ensure the unity between the personal and the social in one vital function.

For Pius XII the unity between the personal and social aspect was the criterion for evaluating the forms of property and for judging its existing distribution. If such a distribution went counter to the concept of property in its harmonious blend between the personal and the social, then the state could intervene even to the point of expropriation, with indemnity, when no other solution was available:

> When the distribution of property is an obstacle to this end [the genuine productivity of social life by respecting the vital function of private property

> in its personal and social values] the State may, in the public interest, intervene by regulating its use or even, if it cannot equitably meet the situation, in any other way, by decreeing the expropriation of property, given a suitable indemnity.[80]

All this points to the importance the Holy Father attributed to the distribution of property, which becomes the subject of the section immediately following.

III. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION: THE PRIMARY CONSEQUENCE OF THE PROPERTY CONCEPT

For Pius XII, the problem of property was essentially the problem of effecting a just distribution of the world's resources. His doctrine involved, firstly, the discernment of nature's plan and God's intention, and secondly the pronouncement of directives as to the ways and means of best realizing the divine plan. Our concern here is with the first aspect of the question. The second shall constitute the subject matter of subsequent chapters. In the documents of the Holy Father on the social question, the importance, the meaning and the international aspect of an equitable distribution of wealth, occupy a prominent place.

---

80 "Quando la distribuzione della proprietà è un ostacolo a questo fine — ciò che non necessariamente nè sempre è originato dalla estensione del patrimonio privato — lo Stato può nell'interesse comune intervenire per regolarne l'uso, od anche, se non si può equamente provvedere in altro modo, decretare la espropriazione, dando una conveniente indennità." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

1. Importance.

"God who provides for all," wrote the Pope to the Hierarchy of the United States in 1939, "does not wish that some have exaggerated riches while others are in such dire straits that they lack the bare necessities of life."[81] Pius XII saw in this grave disparity the exact opposite to God's design for man, when he formulated, in this same letter, what he considered to be the basic point in solving the social question: "The fundamental point of the social question is this, that the goods created by God for all men, should, in the same way reach all, justice guiding, charity helping."[82] In the address of Pentecost 1941, he repeated the above statement and declared that it was the basic issue in all the rights involving man in his relations with material goods: the general right of all to use the material, the right of each to privately appropriate, the right of the state to regulate property rights, the right to work in order to live becomingly and the right of the family to exist and develop as the basic cell of society:

---

81 "Deus, rerum provisor optimus [...] non vult alios nimiis affluere copiis alios autem in extremas angustias adduci, ita ut usibus vitae necessariis careant." (Encyclical Epistle Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642.)

82 "[...] cujus praecipuum caput id exigit, ut bona, quae pro omnibus universis Deus creavit, aequa ratione ad omnes affluant, justitia duce, caritate comite." (Ibid.)

> In Our Encyclical Sertum Laetitiae directed to the Bishops of the United States of America, we called the attention of all to the basic idea of these principles [principles involving property and man's sustenance] which consists as We said in the assertion of the unquestionable need that the goods which were created by God for all men, should flow equally to all according to the principles of justice and charity.[83]

With this principle as the point of departure, the 1941 address proceeds to unfold nature's plan for the realization of God's intention that His goods reach all in equitable measure.[84]

In the Christmas address of 1942, the Holy Father made his most explicit pronouncement on the importance of extending private property to as many as possible in order to solve the problem of the worker. He was deeply disturbed at the proletarian condition of the workingman, jeopardized on the one hand by "the various forms of Marxist socialism", and on the other, "opposed by a machinery which is not only not in accordance with nature, but is at variance with God's

---

83 "Sopra il loro punto fondamentale Noi stessi abbiamo richiamata l'attenzione comune nella Nostra Enciclica Sertum laetitiae, diretta ai Vescovi degli Stati Uniti dell'America del Nord: punto fondamentale, che consiste, come dicemmo, nell'affermazione della inderogabile esigenza 'che i beni, da Dio creati per tutti gli uomini, equamente affluiscano a tutti, secondo i principi della giustizia e della carità'." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

84 Ibid., p. 199-203.

plan and with the purpose he had in creating the goods of earth."[85] To counteract the evil effects of these extremes, he proclaimed the immediate urgency for the widest possible diffusion of private property:

> The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all.[86]

In a passage which follows, he called for "the conservation and perfection of a social order, which will make possible, or assured, even if modest, private property for all classes of society."[87] To this same theme, he reverted in an address to the workers of Italy in 1943. Fearing that they would be carried away by the revolutionary policy of Marxist communism which would destroy private property and substitute state capitalism, he challenged them to fulfill their just aspirations and, therefore, they were "not to abolish private

---

85 "[...] i vari sistemi del socialismo marxista [...] sicurate contro qualche congegno, che, lungi dall'essere conforme alla natura contrasta con l'ordine di Dio e con lo scopo, che Egli ha assegnato per i beni terreni." (Christmas Address, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 16.)

86 "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; a cui risponde l'obbligo fondamentale di accordare una proprietà privata, possibilmente a tutti." (Ibid., p. 17.)

87 "[...] la conservazione ed il perfezionamento di un ordine sociale, che renda possibile una sicura, se pur modesta proprietà privata a tutti i ceti del popolo."(Ibid., 20)

property [...] but to work for its extension," and thus help to eliminate the conditions conducive to violent revolution.[88]

In the 1944 address which featured the necessity of private property as basic in the program for world reconstruction, the Pontiff rejected, as contrary to nature, any socio-economic system that would unjustly restrict the diffusion of property ownership:

> The Christian conscience cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders impossible or nugatory in practice the natural right to property whether over consumptive goods or productive goods.[89]

He immediately went on to say that the evil effects of a social order affirming an unlimited right over property without concern for the common good, were discernible in this that they "place the worker in a situation where it is virtually impossible for him effectively to acquire private property as his own."[90]

---

88 "[...] non abolire la proprietà privata, [...] ma promuoverne la diffusione [...]" (The Church and Labour, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 175.)

89 "La coscienza cristiana non può ammettere come giusto un ordinamento sociale che o nega in massima o rende praticamente impossibile o vano il diritto naturale di proprietà, così sui beni di consumo come sui mezzi di produzione." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.)

90 "[...] mettono l'operaio nella impossibilità di formarsi una sua proprietà effettiva." (Ibid., p. 253.)

Indicative of the importance Pius XII attached to the diffusion of property was the question he asked in the address of 1944: "Why should it [technical progress] not yield also to the necessity of maintaining and ensuring private property for all, that cornerstone of the social order?"[91] To an international convention of Catholic women in 1947, he said: "[...] a more just distribution of wealth is a high social aim worthy of your efforts [...] what you can and ought to strive for, is a more just distribution of wealth. This is and remains a central point in Catholic social doctrine."[92] To the Spanish employers and workers, in 1951, he was equally insistent on a just division of goods: "a just salary and a better distribution of natural wealth constitute two of the most important demands in the social program of the Church."[93]

---

91 "[...] perchè dunque non si piegherebbe anche dinanzi alla necessità di mantenere e di assicurare la proprietà privata di tutti, pietra angolare dell'ordine sociale?" (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

92 "Et celle, en particulier, que vous-mêmes, chères filles, articulez expressément dans votre programme: une plus équitable répartition des richesses a toujours été et reste toujours un des objectifs principaux de la doctrine sociale catholique." (Papal Directives for the Woman of Today, Vous vous présentez, Sept. 12, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947) p. 487.)

93 "[...] el justo salario y una mejor distribución de los bienes naturales constituyen dos de las exigencias más apremiantes en el programa social de la Iglesia." (The Church's Concern for Economic Life, Amadísimo hijos, March 11, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 215.)

2. The Nature of an Equitable Distribution and its Justification.

The Holy Father's insistence on an extensive diffusion of private property does not mean that he favors a completely equal distribution of material goods determined with mathematical precision. His encyclical letter of 1939 indicates that it is not at all unnatural that there be inequality in possessions: "The history of every age teaches that there were always rich and poor; that it will always be so, we may gather from the unchanging tenor of human destinies."[94] "There will always be economic inequalities", he told the Catholic employers and workers of Spain in 1951; "but all those who in any way are able to influence the progress of society must aim to obtain a situation which permits people who do the best they can not only to live but to save."[95] That there should be, within certain limits, "an unequal distribution of the goods of the world" is "neither economically nor socially abnormal", so the Pope declared to the

---

94 "Pauperes et divites semper fuisse cunctarum memoria aetatum docet, eodem semper fore inflexibilis humanarum rerum condicio portendit." (Encyclical Letter Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642.)

95 "Siempre habra disigualdes economicas. Pero, todos los que de algun modo pueden influir en la marcha de la sociedad, deben tender siempre a conseguir una situación tal, que permita a cuantos hacen lo que está en su mano, no sólo el vivir, sino aun el ahorrar." (The Church's Concern for Economic Life, Amadísimo hijos, March 11, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 214-215.)

Italian men of Catholic Action in 1947; but he quickly added: "the Church is opposed to the accumulation of these goods in the hands of a relatively small and exceedingly rich group, while vast masses of people are condemned to pauperism and to an economic condition, unworthy of human beings."[96]

In the above cited passages there is a clear distinction between just and unjust economic inequality. The latter, which results from a wrongful distribution of wealth, the Pope categorically condemns. A just inequality, he apparently recognizes as something permanent, arising from the different functions people perform in society. Such inequality he does not consider to be a detriment to the harmony of society. He made this point quite explicit in the Christmas message of 1944 when he said:

> In a people, worthy of the name, all inequalities based not on whim, but on the nature of things, inequalities of culture, possessions, social standing — without of course prejudice to justice and mutual charity — do not constitute an obstacle to the existence and the prevalence of a true spirit of union and brotherhood.[97]

---

96 "Senza dubbio il naturale corso delle cose porta con sè — e non è nè economicamente nè socialmente anormale — che i beni della terra siano, entro certi limiti disugualmente divini, ma la Chiesa si oppone all'accumulamento di quei beni nelle mani di relativamente pochi straricchi mentre vasti ceti del popolo sono condannati a un pauperismo e ad una condizione economica indegna di esseri umani." (Now is the Time for Action, Conforto, letizia, Sept. 7, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 428.)

97 "In un popolo degno di tal nome, tutte le ineguaglianze, derivante non dall'arbitrio, ma dalla natura stessa delle cose, ineguaglianze di cultura, di averi, di posizione

Referring to the fact that certain inequalities, being natural in origin, are not inconsistent with the unity of social life, but on the contrary are consistent with the divine intention and the well-being of society, the Pope in the Christmas message of 1942 spoke thus:

> When we hold fast to God, the Supreme Controller of all that relates to man, then the similitudes no less than the differences find their alloted place in the fixed order of being, of values, and hence also of morality.[98]

Sufficient has been said, therefore, to demonstrate that the Utopian dream of a quantitatively equal distribution of wealth is not the distribution envisioned by Pius XII. His doctrine on the social nature of man and the diversified functions he performs in his own interests as well as for the common good, implies that every man is entitled to as much wealth as befits his social standing. But this is not to deny his doctrine on the fundamental equality of man, rooted in the dignity common to every human person.

---

sociale — senza pregiudizio, ben inteso, della giustizia e della mutua carità — non sono affato un ostacolo a l'esistenza ed al predominio di un autentico spirito di comunità e di fratellanza." (Christmas Message, Benignitas et humanitas, Dec. 24, 1944, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 14.)

98 "Ma quando si tiene fermo al supremo regolatore di tutto ciò che riguarda l'uomo, Dio, le somiglianze non meno che le differenze degli uomini trovano il posto conveniente nell'ordine assoluto dell'essere, dei valori, e quindi anche della moralità." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 12.)

It is this dignity that demands the right of all to the use of material goods, to which corresponds the necessity of extending private property to the greatest possible number.[99] For Pius XII, therefore, an equitable distribution of wealth means that measure of material goods sufficient to enable each person to meet with the demands of human dignity. In the address of Pentecost 1941, he pointed out that it was of the essence of the right to the use of material goods to provide all men with the initial equipment necessary for their spiritual, cultural and moral development.[100] "Wherever this is secured in a permanent way", said the Pope, "a people will be in a true sense, economically rich because the general well-being, and consequently the personal right of all to the use of world goods is thus actuated in conformity with the purpose willed by the Creator."[101] From this he concludes that the ideal distribution of goods among a people is to be determined not by a

---

99 Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.

100 The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199-200.

101 "Dove ciò, e in modo duraturo, si ottenga, un popolo sarà, a vero dire, economicamente ricco, perchè il benessere generale e, per conseguenza, il diritto personale di tutti all'uso dei beni terreni viene in tal modo attuato conformemente all'intento voluto dal Creatore." (Ibid., p. 200.)

statistical evaluation of their abundance, but rather according to the extent to which that abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members. He said:

> From this, beloved children, it will be easy for you to conclude that the economic riches of a people do not properly consist in the abundance of goods, measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members.[102]

It is thus that the equitable distribution, which Pius XII calls for, must be such as to provide the material foundation for the proper personal development of each and every man. It normally demands the permanent personal possession for which the institution of private property is essential. For the Holy Father, an equitable distribution in its deepest meaning is not merely a question of distributing to those in need the minimum material necessities for human living. Important as these necessities are, they do

---

102 "Dal che, diletti figli, vi tornerà agevole scorgere che la ricchezza economica di un popolo non consiste propriamente nell'abbondanza dei beni, misurata secondo un computo puro e pretto materiale del loro valore, bensì in ciò che tale abbondanza rappresenti e porga realmente ed efficacemente la base materiale bastevole al debito sviluppo personale dei suoi membri." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.)

not exhaust the requirements of human dignity. His concept of the total organization of economic and social life is to have man at its center: "the individual himself who so far from being the object and, as it were, a merely passive element in the social order, is in fact, and must be and continue to be, its foundation and end."[103] This must be the primary principle to inspire any movement for social reform, he warned the Catholic association of small and medium sized businesses in 1956:

> Your present Congress was given to examining how small and medium-sized business interests help to inject man into society and the economy. That is a subject of primary importance, from which all reforms, all attempts to introduce greater harmony and stability into modern society, should derive their inspiration.[104]

To this association Pius XII issued what might be called his finest statement on the problem of an equitable distribution of wealth in its deepest meaning:

---

103 "[...] quanto all'uomo, come tale, che, lungi dall'essere l'oggetto e un elemento passivo della vita sociale, ne è invece, e deve esserne e rimanerne, il soggetto, il fondamento e il fine." (Christmas Message, Benignitas et humanitas, Dec. 24, 1944, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 12.)

104 "Votre présent Congrès examinait comment les petites et moyennes entreprises contribuent à l'insertion de la personne humaine dans la société et l'économie. C'est là un thème d'importance primordiale, dont doivent s'inspirer les réformes, toutes les tentatives visant à introduire dans la société moderne plus d'harmonie et de stabilité." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 553-554.)

> How can each member of the social body be granted the opportunity to live fully as a man, to have at his disposal the means of assuring himself — through an equitable subsistence — access to culture, to play a role in proportion to his ability and devotion to the functioning and organization of society and to participate finally in the decisions upon which his political, economic and social fate are dependent?[105]

A distribution of wealth that would merely satisfy the material needs of man was, therefore, far from the ideal envisioned by Pius XII. He feared a distribution that would compromise human dignity, restrict or weaken a man's freedom of action, and dull his sense of initiative and responsibility. It is not surprising, then, that he so vigorously defended private property as the guarantee that man would be the center of the economic and social process. It was for him the natural means to achieve an equitable distribution in a manner that would benefit all and, at the same time, minister to the demands of personal development.

As for Pius XII's arguments for an equitable distribution of private property, little need be said for the reason that the latter was justified as a demand originating

---

105 "Comment donner à chacun des membres du corps social la possibilité de vivre pleinement en homme, de disposer des moyens de s'assurer, avec une subsistance honnête, l'accès à la culture, de jouer un rôle proportionné à ses capacités et à son dévouement dans le fonctionnement et l'organisation de la société, de participer enfin aux décisions dont dépend son sort sur le plan politique, économique et social?" (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 554.)

in the dignity common to all mankind. Hence the arguments for private property are equally valid for its widest possible diffusion. The benefits of freedom and dignity for which private property is to be the guarantee are, obviously in the mind of the Holy Father, benefits desirable to extend to the largest possible number of individuals.

3. The International Phase of an Equitable Distribution of Wealth.

Undoubtedly, Pius XII's concept of a just diffusion of property included within it an equitable distribution of the earth's material goods among the member states of the world community. But apparently, he was not satisfied with the mere implication of this truth; not only did he imply the just distribution of property on an international scale, but he made it an explicit part of his social doctrine. He, therefore, did not confine himself to the distribution of property within nations, but extended it to the human race as such and to the property-relations between the nations of the world society. In a letter to the Semaines Sociales of France, he noted that there was a change for the better in the disparity of wealth within national economics, but "since the last war," he wrote, "this problem has become even more acute. It now presents itself on a world-wide scale with contrasts which are still startling; and the problem is further aggravated by the new yearnings which are

being awakened in the minds of the masses by a more vivid realization of the economic inequalities existing between nations."[106] He, therefore, urged the members of the Social Week Conference "to come to grips realistically with a problem of such gravity, and to study both on the economic and social as well as on the national and international levels, its possible and prudent solutions in the light of the doctrine of the Church."[107]

In the light of the conditions he described, with the features peculiar to his time, it is not surprising to find a notable portion of Pius XII's social doctrine taken up with the problem of a grave disequilibrium in the international distribution of wealth. To understand and to appreciate the principles he proposes as to the solution of this problem, it seems necessary to consider two aspects of the question, to each of which he devoted particular

---

106 "Mais cependant ce problème a pris, à la suite de la guerre, une acuité nouvelle: il se pose désormais à l'échelle mondiale, où les oppositions sont encore saisissantes, et il s'aggrave des désirs nouveaux qu'éveille au coeur des masses un sens plus vif des inégalités de condition entre les peuples, entre les classes, jusqu'entre les membres d'une même classe." (The Problem of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 620.)

107 "[...] à se pencher avec réalisme sur un si grave problème et à en étudier, sur les plans économique et social, national et international, les solutions possibles et prudentes à la lumière de la doctrine de l'Eglise." (Ibid.)

attention: (a) the primacy of the right of all to the use of material goods as the basic principle governing a just distribution between the nations of the world community; (b) an excessive disparity in the international distribution of wealth as contrary to justice, charity and prudence.

(a) The Primary Right of All Demands a Just Distribution of Wealth Between Nations.

It is to be recalled that the primacy of this right was the theme of the Pentecostal address of 1941. No other right relative to material goods — including the rights of private property and the right of the state — could emancipate itself from that first and fundamental right which granted to all men the use of the world's goods. On the contrary, the right of private property and the right of the state respecting it were to make actual the world-wide character of the first and fundamental right. To repeat again the celebrated text:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature, the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed, even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods. Undoubtedly, the natural order deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as the functioning of the State over both these institutions.
>
> But all this remains subordinate to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes

> their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope.[108]

It is therefore clear that the Holy Father attributed to the rights of property respecting both the individual and the state a basic world-wide social function, irrespective of state divisions or boundaries. In other words, the use of property, whether owned by an individual or controlled by the state, is limited ultimately by the common welfare of all mankind.[109]

---

108 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione, ha infatti dalla natura il diritto fondamentale di usare dei beni materiali della terra, pur essendo lasciato alla volontà umana e alle forme giuridiche dei popoli di regolarne più particolarmente la pratica attuazione. Tale diritto individuale non può essere in nessun modo soppresso, neppure da altri diritti certi e pacifici sui beni materiali. Senza dubbio l'ordine naturale, derivante da Dio, richiede anche la proprietà privata e il libero reciproco commercio dei beni con scambi e donazioni, come pure la funzione regolatrice del potere pubblico su entrambi questi istituti. Tutto ciò nondimeno rimane subordinato allo scopo naturale dei beni materiali, e non potrebbe rendersi indipendente dal diritto primo e fondamentale, che a tutti ne concede l'uso; ma piuttosto deve servire a farne possibile l'attuazione in conformità con il suo scopo." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

109 Guido GONELLA, in his commentary on the international doctrine of Pius XII, A World to Reconstruct (trans. by T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., Milwaukee, Bruce, 1944, p. 128-129), writes that man fulfills the social obligation of his private property directly and indirectly — directly by the bond which unites him to all other members of the human society;— indirectly by the bond which unites him to all others through the mediation of the state which belongs to the community of nations.

In proclaiming the primacy of the right of universal use, it is to be noted that Pius XII in the 1941 address does not confine himself to a justification and an evaluation of property-rights within a national economy; he uses terms that are universal, indicating that the property-rights of each individual and state are subordinate to the right of all individuals, no matter what portion of the globe they occupy. From this it would surely follow that the riches found in one country are not exclusively for the people of that country and that no political boundaries can justifiably interrupt an equitable flow of God's bountiful nature to all men wherever they may dwell. Furthermore, the Pope's emphatic statement of the principle that all the members of the human race have the right to use in dignity all the wealth of the world serves to put in focus the injustice of any nation or group of nations that would make inoperable this basic principle.

On the question that no state can deprive any man of the primary right to the use of material goods, regardless of the country in which he lives, Pius XII was most emphatic and specific in a letter addressed December 24, 1948 to Archbishop T. McNicholas, O.P., of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

> The Creator of the universe has provided all his good gifts primarily for the good of all; consequently the sovereignty of individual states,

> however much this is to be respected, ought not to be carried so far that access to the earth's bounty, which is everywhere adequate to support human beings, should be denied to needy but worthy persons who have been born elsewhere.[110]

In this important statement, the Pope makes a clear-cut application of the primacy of the right of common use to the economic relations between nations. He makes it evident that not even a foreign state, under the pretext of its sovereignty, can deprive of efficacy the right to economic well-being for worthy and needy citizens born elsewhere. He upholds state sovereignty, but condemns its abuse when it conflicts with man's anterior right to have access to the bounty of the earth. To judge the morality of the trade and immigration policies of any nation would be a practical application of this principle. Such policies would have to be judged in the light of the extent to which they impede or make accessible the primary right of all to a sufficiency of material goods. To be sure, any policy, dictated by an erroneous concept of state sovereignty, that would deprive

---

110 "Rerum enim universarum Creator praecipue in bonum omnium bona omnia condidit: itaque singularum civitatum dominium, quantumvis verendum, non debet adeo produci, ut, cum copiam multos alendi ubivis praebeat tellus, per haud sufficientes et aequas causas recusetur accessus egenis alibi natis honestisque moribus praeditis, quandoque hoc publicae utilitati, vera libra ponderandae, non officiat." (Letter to Archbishop McNicholas, Dec. 24, 1948, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 69-70.)

the needy of other states from their livelihood, would stand out in sharp contrast to Pius XII's ideal of a just world-wide distribution of wealth, based upon the principle that the goods of the earth are for the use of all men — an ideal which he proclaimed to the whole human family in his Christmas message of 1949, opening the Holy Year of 1950:

> We expect from the Holy Year finally the return of international society to the plan mapped out by God.
>
> According to this plan, all peoples, in peace and not in war, in collaboration and not in isolation, in justice and not in national selfishness — are meant to make up a great human family bent on the advancement of common interests, through mutual aid and a fair distribution of this world's goods, which are a treasure entrusted to men by God.[111]

In the pronouncement from the address of Pentecost 1941, Pius XII mentioned, in a general way, that it was the role of the state to make actual the right of all to the world's material goods. But, in subsequent statements on other occasions, he was more specific, insisting that each state is duty-bound to assist the individual in realizing his right to the goods of earth. From his insistence that

---

111 "Attendiamo infine per questo anno Santo il ritorno della società internazionale ai disegni di Dio, secondo i quali tutti i popoli nella pace e non nella guerra, nella collaborazione e non nell'isolamento, nella giustizia e non nell'egoismo nazionale, sono destinati a formare la grande famiglia umana, avviata alla comune perfezione, nel reciproco aiuto e nella equa distribuzione dei beni, che sono tesoro di Dio affidato agli uomini." (Christmas Message, Non mai forse, Dec. 23, 1949, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 128.)

every state has the prime duty to care for and to secure within its competence the material well-being of all its citizens, it is but a simple deduction to conclude that each state, in turn, has the right to control a just allotment of the world's resources. In his encyclical Summi Pontificatus, the Pope declared that the general function and privilege of the state was "to control, aid and direct the private and individual activities of national life that they converge harmoniously towards the common good."[112] Speaking more specifically as to the duties of the state in the area of the economic, the Holy Father, in the Christmas message of 1942, reminded public officials of their duty to provide supplementary assistance and emergency aid, when workers are unable to implement their right to the use of material goods:

> But if legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community, it must prevent the worker, who is or will be the father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person.[113]

---

112 "[...] ut, in nationis vita, privata singulorum incepta et opera recognoscat, temperet atque promoveat; eaque ad commune omnium bonum convenienter dirigat." (Encyclical Letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 433.)

113 "Le norme giuridiche positive, [...] se vogliono contribuire alla pacificazione della comunità, dovranno impedire che l'operaio, che è o sarà padre di famiglia, venga condannato ad una dipendenza e servitù economica, inconciliabile con i suoi diritti di persona." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

But the Pope called for more than subsidiary aid in times of emergency. Indeed, he made it clear that the state had the positive duty to create the conditions that would make for a reasonable level of prosperity in the nation. "The purpose of economic and social organization," he said, "is to obtain for its members and their families all the goods which the resources of nature and industry, as well as a social organization of economic life are capable of obtaining for them."[114] He immediately went on to say, quoting Pius XI's Quadragesimo Anno, that these goods should be sufficiently abundant to provide for the citizens a degree of comfort that would greatly facilitate the exercise of virtue:

> As the Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno" states in this matter, "these goods ought to be abundant enough both to satisfy the demands of a decent subsistence and to raise people to that degree of the comforts of life which, provided it be wisely employed, is no hindrance to virtue, but, on the contrary, greatly facilitates its exercise."[115]

---

114 "La fin de l'organisme économique et social, à laquelle il faut ici se référer, est de procurer à ses membres et à leurs familles tous les biens que les ressources de la nature et de l'industrie, ainsi qu'une organisation sociale de la vie économique, ont le moyen de leur procurer." (The Problem of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 621.)

115 "Et précise l'Encyclique Quadragesimo Anno, ces biens doivent être assez abondants pour satisfaire aux besoins d'une honnête subsistance et pour élever les hommes à ce degré d'aisance qui, pourvu qu'on en use sagement, ne met pas d'obstacle à la vertu mais en facilite au contraire grandement l'exercice (Quadragesimo Anno, AAS 23, 202)." (Ibid.)

Within the context of articulating the necessity of safeguarding the right and the duty of all men to the use of material goods as the basis for personal development, the Pope, in the Pentecostal address of 1941, stated that it was the essential duty of every public authority "to safeguard the inviolable sphere of the rights of the human person and to facilitate the fulfillment of his duties."[116] In like manner he said that the national economy, which is a national unity because it is the product of men who cooperate within the community of the state, "has no other end than to secure without interruption the material conditions in which the industrial life of the citizens may fully develop."[117] If this end is permanently attained for a nation, he went on to say, then, God's design for material goods to minister to the needs of all and each will be realized:

> Where this is secured in a permanent way, a people will be, in a true sense, economically rich because the general well-being, and consequently the personal right of all to the use of worldly goods,

---

116 "Tutelare l'intangibile campo dei diritti della persona umana e renderle agevole il compimento dei suoi doveri vuol essere ufficio essenziale di ogni pubblico potere." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.)

117 "Anche l'economia nazionale, com'è frutto dell'attività di uomini che lavorano uniti nella comunità statale, così ad altro non mira che ad assicurare senza interrompimento le condizioni materiali in cui possa svilupparsi pienamente la vita individuale dei cittadini." (Ibid.)

> is thus actuated in conformity with the purpose willed by the Creator."[118]

The passages cited above, defining the role and the duties of the state and the national economy in providing for the material welfare of its citizenry, imply that every state has the corresponding right to possess or control in some way a sufficiency of the world's resources to comply with its obligations.[119] On several occasions, the Pope was more explicit by directly referring to the right of every state to have access to a fair share of vital resources. In the Christmas address of 1941, he made it perfectly clear that it was the duty of the more powerful states to respect

---

118 "Dove ciò, e in modo duraturo, si ottenga, un popolo sarà, a vero dire, economicamente ricco, perchè il benessere generale e, per conseguenza, il diritto personale di tutti all'uso dei beni terreni viene in tal modo attuato conformemente all'intento voluto dal Creatore." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.)

119 For a philosophical justification of the principle that every state has the right to all the means necessary to furnish its citizens with a full human life, see Leo S. SCHUMACHER, The Philosophy of the Equitable Distribution of Wealth, Washington, The Catholic University of America Press, 1949, p. 33-38, 70-74. Citing for his authority D'Azeglio TAPARELLI, S.J., Essai théorique de droit naturel, Tournai, Casterman, 1957, p. 21-22, Schumacher (op. cit., p. 33) writes: "A state can possess wealth in two ways: first, as private property; secondly, as political property. All the private property of its citizens make up the political property of the State, and over this property the state exercises a dominion, not of private ownership, but of jurisdiction. Consequently, the material wealth of a state can be considered to be the total sum of the private property of its citizens plus whatever property the State itself directly owns."

the rights of smaller states to political freedom and to economic development:

> [...] it is, nevertheless, indispensable that in the interests of the common good they, [the powerful states] as all others, respect the rights of those smaller states to political freedom, to economic development and to the adequate protection, in the case of conflicts between nations, of that neutrality which is theirs according to the natural as well as international law.[120]

Again in his Christmas address of 1942 he stated that it was indispensable for every single nation to be economically strong in order to provide for necessary social and economic reforms.[121]

On the occasion of a homily during a mass for peace in 1940, Pius XII made his strongest plea for a world order based on a justice that would guarantee each people freedom, security and living space:

> An order which would tend to give to every people in tranquillity, in liberty, and in security, that portion which belongs to each of the earthly sources of prosperity and power, so as to make possible the

---

120 "[...] è nondimeno incontestabile — come per tutti nell'ambito dell'interesse generale — il diritto di queste al rispetto della loro libertà nel campo politico, alla efficace custodia di quella neutralità nelle contesse fra gli stati, che loro spetta secondo il gius naturale e della genti, alla tutela del loro sviluppo economico [...]" (Christmas Message, Nell'alba e nella luce, Dec. 24, 1941, in AAS, 34 (1942), p. 17.)

121 Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 20-2.

> fulfillment of the words of the Creator: Increase and multiply and fill the earth (Genesis 9,1).[122]

This text serves to crystallize Pius XII's thought on the right of each state to control or use without obstruction enough material wealth so as to effectively discharge its duty towards the common temporal good of its citizens. It is a most courageous statement, indicating, as it does, that each people has the right to a definite portion of the world's natural resources.

(b) An Excessive Disparity in the International Distribution of Wealth is Contrary to the Natural Order.

The intensity and the urgency which characterized Pius XII's frequent reference to the excessive disequilibrium in the international distribution of wealth serves to illustrate his ardent desire that the goods of the earth reach all nations in keeping with justice, charity and prudence. In the Christmas message of 1940, he stated that the unbalanced state of the world economy had within it the seeds of conflict and "hence the need of progressive action, balanced

---

122 "Un ordine che tenda ad attribuire a tutti i popoli, nella tranquilità, nella libertà e nella sicurezza, la parte, ad ognuno di essi in questa terra spettante, delle fonti della prosperità e della potenza, affine di rendere loro possibile l'adempimento della parola del Creatore: Crescite et multiplicamini, et replete terram (Gen. 9, 1)." Appeal for a Just Peace, Grazie, Venerabili, Dec. 24, 1940, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 553.) Emphasis added.

with corresponding guarantees, in order to arrive at an arrangement which will give to every state the means of securing for its citizens of every class a decent standard of life."[123] In the Christmas message of 1941, he explicitly pointed out that any nation violates justice and charity when it selfishly hoards the economic resources of the world — destined for common use — to the extent that other nations are frustrated in realizing their right to a just share of such resources.

> Within the limits of a new order founded upon moral principles, there is no place for that cold and calculating egoism which tends to hoard economic resources and materials destined for the use of all to such an extent that the nations less favored by nature are not permitted access to them.[124]

The rich and the poor among the nations, he continued, must recognize that they all have an equitable right to the bounty of the earth; otherwise there will remain the elements of jealousy and dissension engendering new conflicts on the international scene.[125]

---

123 "[...] quindi un'azione progressiva, equilibrata da correspondenti garanzie, per giungere ad un assetto, il quale dia a tutti gli stati i mezzi per assicurare ai propri cittadini di ogni ceto un conveniente tenore di vita." (Christmas Message, Grazie, Venerabili, Dec. 24, 1940, in AAS, vol. 33 (1941), p. 13.)

124 "Nel campo di un nuovo ordinamento fondato sui principi morali, non vi è posto per i ristretti calcoli egoistici, tendenti ad accaparrarsi le fonti economiche e le materie di uso comune, in maniera che le Nazioni, meno favorite dalla natura, ne restino escluse." (Christmas Message, Nell'alba e nella luce, Dec. 24, 1941, in AAS, 34 (1942), p. 17.)

125 Ibid.

The above cited text of Christmas 1941 is perhaps the most celebrated of Pius XII's statements on a just order in international economic relations.[126] It, therefore, calls for some special comment. First of all, there is obviously an application of the ethical principles of property and its use to the area of international economic relations. There is a warning that all nations as well as individuals must recognize that the property over which they have control is primarily destined for the common use of all mankind. This property has, therefore, a social as well as an individual function or what has been called an international as well as a national function.[127] To pursue this point to a further

---

126 Among the authorities on international and social economic life extensively quoting and commenting upon this text of the Christmas 1941 Message are: Guido GONELLA, A World to Reconstruct, trans. T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., Milwaukee, Bruce, 1944, p. 124-149; John F. CRONIN, Social Principles and Economic Life, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1959, p. 299-317. Another commentary on the more general question of international order in Pius XII is: Mgr. Emile GUERRY, L'Eglise et la Communauté des peuples, Paris, Bonne Presse, 1958, 347 p. Two useful anthologies featuring Pius XII pronouncements on the general question of international order are: Francis J. POWERS (ed.), Papal Pronouncements on the Political Order, Westminster, Md., Newman Press, 1952; see p. 58-92 for Pius XII on international economic order; Alba ZIZZAMIA, "Catholics and Internationalism, A Papal Anthology", in Thought, Vol. 28 (1953-1954), p. 485-527.

127 THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF SOCIAL STUDIES, A Code of International Ethics, trans. from French by J. Epstein, Westminster, Md., Newman Press, 1953, p. 81, makes the observation that just as property has a twofold aspect — individual and social — "in the same way a double aspect, national and international, may be observed in the right which a nation exercises over the riches and resources of its soil." Likewise Guido GONELLA, commenting on the 1941 Christmas

conclusion, it could be said that a nation would be acting contrary to the order ordained by God, if through monopolistic practices and unjust legislation, it would bar other nations from their natural right to control sufficient property for the welfare of their citizens. From this it is but a simple deduction to say that such an injustice would have the indirect effect of depriving the individual citizens from their primary and fundamental right to the use of material goods. Such "calculating egoism" would also be contrary to the unity of the human race which charity demands.

In the Christmas message of 1942, the Pontiff reminded the world that without mutual charity between the strong and the weak nations it would be impossible to preserve world peace:

> It is only through an intelligent and generous sharing of forces between the strong and the weak that it will be possible to effect a universal pacification in such wise as not to leave behind centers of conflagration and infection from which new disasters may come.[128]

---

message in his work, A World to Reconstruct (p. 127), states that there is an analogy between the national and international aspect of a nation's economy, on the one hand, and the personal and social aspect of private property, on the other.

128 "Solo con uno scambio di forze, intelligente e generoso, tra forti e deboli sarà possibile a compilarsi una pacificazione universale in maniera che non restono focolai di incendio e di infezione, da cui potrebbero originarsi nuove sciagure." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 20-21.)

Addressing some members of the United States Congress in 1945, he warned that an exceedingly unequal opportunity for some nations to have access to God's bountiful providence, would create a most serious obstacle to peace.[129] This same idea he communicated to the world in the Christmas message of 1948 when he made specific reference to the lack of resources in some nations, as an occasion increasing the danger of future world conflicts.[130]

Not only did Pius XII see these provoking inequalities as a violation of the order of prudence, but, above all, they were violative of the mutual charity and brotherly love which should exist in the order of international relations. This mutual solidarity, in the name of brotherly love and reciprocal advantage, was a theme of his great Christmas message in 1952. "Let every nation", he said, "develop its own potentialities with regard to living standards and employment and let it contribute to the corresponding progress of less fortunate nations."[131] Although

---

129 Victories Which Statesmen Must Win, Even Here, Aug. 27, 1945, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 7, p. 161.

130 Christmas Message, Gravi ed ad, Dec. 24, 1948, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 12.

131 "Che ogni popolo, in ciò che concerne il tenore di vita e l'assunzione al lavoro, sviluppi le sue possibilità e contribuisca al progresso corrispondente di altri popoli meno dotati." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 40.)

this did not mean absolute equality among the nations, he continued, nevertheless it was more than ever imperative in the present unreasonable imbalance that "solidarity among nations demands the cessation of the glaring inequalities in living standards and likewise in financial investments and in the degree of the productivity of human labour."[132] A mechanical arrangement, he went on to say, that would submerge human personality and the individuating characteristics of nations would not achieve this result; these factors, he said, must be considered as central in all efforts to attain the end of the public economy in every nation, which end is to provide for its citizens a standard of living consonant with human dignity:

> Human society is not a machine, and must not be made such, not even in the economic field. Rather one must always employ the human personality and the individuating characteristics of nations as the natural and the basic fulcrum around which all efforts must revolve in striving to attain the end of the public economy, which end is to ensure a stable sufficiency of goods and of material services directed in turn towards improving moral, cultural and religious conditions.[133]

---

132 "La solidarietà dei popoli esige la cessazione delle ingenti disproporzioni nel tenore di vita, e con ciò negli investimenti e nel grado di produttività del lavoro umano." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 40.)

133 "La Società umana non è una macchina e non si deve rendere tale, nemmeno nel campo economico. Al contrario, si deve far levi incessantemente sull'apporto della persona umana e della individualità dei popoli, come sul fulcro naturale e primordiale, dal quale si dovrà sempre partire per tendere al fine della pubblica economica, volo

He immediately went on to say that solidarity and proportionate development in national living standards should be brought about in various geographical regions — extensive as they may be — where the nature and the history of the peoples furnish a common basis for the achievement of this goal.[134] On this point he was more specific in the Christmas message of 1954 when he urged the free nations to mutually assist one another and above all to avoid an excessive imbalance which would result in a resentment and rivalry that would weaken the whole group:

> On the other hand, the economic factor might place serious obstacles in the way of peace — particularly of a cold peace, in the sense of an equilibrium between groups — if employing erroneous systems, it were to weaken one of the groups. This could occur if, among other eventualities, individual people of one group were to engage, without consideration of regard for others, in a ceaseless increase of production, and a constant raising of their own living standard. In such a case, an upsurge of resentment and rivalry on the part of neighboring peoples would be inevitable and consequently also the weakening of the entire group.[135]

---

a dire per assicurare il permanente, saddisfacimento in bene e servizi materiali, diretti alla lor volta all'incremento delle condizioni morali, culturali e religiose." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 40.)

134 Ibid.

135 "D'altra parte, il fattore economico potrebbe frapporre a questo seri ostaculi, particolarmente alla pace fredda, intese come equilibrio di gruppi, se indebolisce con errati sistemi una delle parti. Ciò avverrebbe, tra l'altro, ove singoli popoli di un gruppo si abbandonassero senza discernamento nè reguardi verso gli altri, all'incessante aumento della produttività e ad innalzare constantemente il

In the message of the privious Christmas, 1953, His Holiness appealed for a deeper sense of international solidarity and mutual sharing of natural resources with a view to realizing the spiritual and moral ends common to all mankind; he declared it obligatory for the nations to agree in opposing the cause of discrepancies in national standards of living and of productivity.[136]

It is not surprising that Pius XII spoke so frequently on the unjust disparity of economic well-being between nations, and that he gave to this problem top priority in the solution of the social question. It was so opposed to his concept of the unity and interdependence which he envisioned for the family of nations. The general principles underlying that concept, the Holy Father propounded in the following passage from the Encyclical Summi Pontificatus:

> A disposition, in fact, of the divinely sanctioned natural order divides the human race into social groups, nations or states which are mutually independent in organization and in the direction of their internal life. But for all that, the human race is bound together by reciprocal ties, moral and juridical, into a great commonwealth, directed to the good of all nations and ruled by special laws which

---

proprio tenore di vita. Sarebbe inevitabile, in questo caso, l'insorgere di risentimenti e di rivalità nei popoli contigui, e per conseguenza l'Indebolimento di tutto il gruppo." (Christmas Message, Ecce ego, Dec. 24, 1954, in AAS, 47 (1955), p. 21.)

136 Christmas Message, Il popolo, Dec. 24, 1953, in AAS, 46 (1954), p. 14.

> protect its unity and promote its prosperity. Now, no one can fail to see how the claim to absolute autonomy for the state stands in open opposition to the natural law that is inherent in man — nay denies it utterly — and therefore leaves the stability of international relations at the mercy of the will of rulers, while it destroys the possibility of true union and fruitful collaboration directed to the general good.[137]

In subsequent addresses, he repeated these principles, applied them to international economic relations, and spelled out what they meant for the individual and the state. Typical was the Christmas message of 1948, wherein he stated that no convinced Christian can isolate himself when he is aware of social injustice in all its forms especially "the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the separate nations together and imposing on each one of them many and

---

137 "Etenim hominum genus quamquam ex naturalis ordinis a Deo statuta lege in civium classes naturales disponitur, itemque in nationes civitatesque, quae ad suum quod attinet interni regiminis temperationem, aliae ab aliis non pendent, mutuis tamen in juridicali ac morali re vinculis obstringitur, et in universam magnamque coalescit populorum conjugationem, quae ad assequendum omnium gentium bonum destinatur, ac peculiaribus regitur normis, quae et unitatem tueantur, et ad res cotidie magis prosperas dirigunt. Jamvero nemo est qui non videat asserverata illa rei publicae jura, absolutissima nullique prorsum obnoxia, legi huic naturali et insitae omnino adversari, eamdemque funditus refellere; itemque patet eadem jura illos legitime initas necessitudines, quibus nationes inter coniunguntur, civitatis moderatorum arbitrio permittere, ac praecipere, quominus recta habeatur animorum omnium concensio ac mutua adjutricis operae collatio." (Encyclical Letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 437-438.)

varied duties towards the great family of nations."[138] But, on the contrary, the Pope continued, the Catholic Christian, convinced that every man is his neighbor and that every nation belongs to the family of nations, must cooperate in saving individual states from being victims to a selfishness which was largely responsible for the conflicts of the past.[139] "Universal charity," he told the Atlantic Treaty Association in 1957, "teaches that in God's plan every man is his neighbor's brother, every people a member in the family of nations which form a single community destined, for a common end and with solemn social obligations resting on all."[140] To a group of officials of the French government, he declared that an underdeveloped country cannot be completely free in a world of economic interdependence, and consequently all men and all national groups must aid the underdeveloped countries, and this obligation increases in keeping with their ability to help and the power they have at their disposal.[141]

---

138 "[...] i traviamenti di un transigente nazionalismo, che nega o conculca la solidarietà fra i singoli popoli, solidarietà la quale impone a ciascuno molteplici doveri verso la grande famiglia delle nazioni." (Christmas Message, Gravi ed ad, Dec. 24, 1948, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 10.)

139 Ibid.

140 The Family of Nations, Your Association, June 27, 1957, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 19, p. 283-286. Original in English.

141 "[...] dans le monde moderne l'interdépendance économique est devenue telle qu'un pays sous-développé ne

The foregoing papal texts constitute an impressive litany of condemnations on the provoking imbalance in the international distribution of the world's resources which God destined for all. They condemn in the name of justice, charity and prudence. The conditions which they describe stand out in sharp contrast to the ideal proclaimed by the Holy Father in his first major statement on the social question: "The fundamental point of the social question is this, that the goods created by God for all men should in the same way reach all, justice guiding and charity helping."[142] When some nations are unable to fulfill their duty to provide the material conditions necessary for their people to live in moderate comfort because other affluent nations fail in the social-international obligations attached to the property they control, indeed justice is violated.[143] What is more,

---

peut jouir d'une entière liberté. L'inégale répartition des dons et des richesses de la nature fait aux hommes une obligation morale de s'aider les uns les autres chacun selon les lumières et les forces qu'il a reçues." (France and Africa, C'est une joie, April 13, 1958, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 20, p. 93-94.)

142 "Cujus praecipuum caput id exigit, ut bona, quae pro hominibus universis Deus creavit, aequa ratione ad omnes affluant, justitia duce, caritate comite." (Encyclical Epistle Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642.)

143 The truth of this statement is particularly applicable today when, for the first time in history, a group of nations have at their disposal the resources, the ingenuity and the technology to provide for the basic material needs

charity demands that each nation not only respect the rights of others, but that it give generously of its own resources to help other nations of the same family realize their end, which is to provide for the conditions necessary for the spiritual, moral and temporal welfare of their citizens. The motivation provided by the inspiring force of charity is indispensable for a just international economic order. For a nation to selfishly hoard wealth, at the expense of others in need, is not only a violation of justice and charity, but of prudence which obliges that nations refrain from that provocation to revolution and war, arising out of a glaring international imbalance of economic well-being. Such is the teaching of Pius XII.

The Pope's total doctrine on the international phase of property distribution may be summarized as follows: (1) the general right of all to the use of the world's

---

of all mankind. For an up to date exposé of this point see Canon Louis JANSSENS, "International Social Justice", trans. from French by R.M. Beihell in Arthur McCORMACK (ed.), Christian Responsibility and World Poverty (A Symposium), Montreal, Palm, 1963, p. 277-279. Pius XII in an address to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, Dec. 8, 1953 (Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vo.. 15, p. 497), referred to the pitiable spectacle of the hungry at a time when the world can feed its people: "Le monde civilisé regarde toujours avec une profonde tristesse les images pitoyables des victimes de la faim, alors que la terre est capable de nourrir tous les nommes."

resources is superior to the rights of the state in this respect and, therefore, serves to furnish the basic moral principle governing the international distribution of wealth; (2) it is the duty of the state to assist its citizens to make operative their right to that measure of material goods necessary to live freely and virtuously; as a consequence, every state has the right of access to that portion of the world's resources sufficient to fulfill its duty of caring for the welfare of its people; (3) an excessive imbalance in the international distribution of wealth is contrary to justice, charity, and prudence.

CHAPTER III

PIUS XII AND THE FORMS OF PROPERTY ENDANGERING ITS EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION

The preceding chapter dealt with Pius XII's concept of private property as it should be according to the natural law and the plan of God. It was conceived as the instrumental means to assure for all the execution of their right to the goods of earth. It was to constitute the material basis for the fundamental dignity and freedom of all men. Viewed as such, the institution of private property had an essential social aspect indissolubly linked with its personal aspect, both joined together in one vital function, namely, to guarantee that the goods of the earth reach all in equitable measure and in a manner that would enhance the dignity of each and every man.

As a primary consequence of the concept, Pius XII emphatically proclaimed the necessity of the most extensive distribution of private property among individuals as well as among nations of the world. This means that, in its institutional framework, the role of private property is, therefore, to minister to the world-wide social character of the earth's resources, without uprooting the personal values linked to private possession. In other words, to realize the concept of property both aspects must harmonize and

operate as one. To emphasize one aspect at the expense of the other would be to distort the concept.

This brings us to the subject matter of the present chapter: Pius XII's appraisal of the various regimes and forms of property in terms of realizing his concept. Just as his concept of private property demanded the widest possible diffusion of its benefits, so also the existing forms of property, restricting its benefits, demanded a total renovation. Likewise, he commended and favored the forms of property, calculated to make more widespread the benefits accruing from personal possession. It shall be the task of this chapter to assemble, analyze and appraise the pronouncements of the Holy Father on forms of the economy threatening to destroy the Christian concept of private property: individualist capitalism, excessive nationalization and compulsory co-partnership in the industrial enterprise. To simplify our framework of reference in discussing each of these topics, we will follow, whenever possible, the broad chronological order of the Pope's documents. This will equally serve to correlate his pronouncements with the problems relevant to the time when they were issued.

I. INDIVIDUALIST CAPITALISM

To understand precisely the Holy Father's role in pronouncing judgements on the various existing arrangements of ownership, it seems necessary to call attention to three basic prerequisites indicated in his more general discussion of the problem: (1) the forms of property are changeable; (2) there is a distinction between the natural institution of private property and the forms it has assumed in the course of history; (3) the Church does not attach herself to any economic doctrine.

First, as to the changing forms of property, Pius XII said little on this subject. The Church's stand was well stated by his predecessor, Pius XI:

> That history proves ownership, like other elements of social life, to be not absolutely unchanging, we once declared as follows: What diverse forms has property had, from that primitive form among rude and savage peoples which may be observed in some places even in our time to the form of possession in the patriarchal age; and so further to the various forms under tyranny — we are using the word tyranny in its classical sense; — and then through the feudal and monarchic forms down to the various types which are to be found in more recent times.[1]

That Pius XII subscribed to the changing nature of ownership is evident from the observation he made in the Christmas

---

1 PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931. English version in H. KOENIG (ed.), Principles for Peace, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1943, No. 967, p. 413. Latin original in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 23 (1931), p. 193.

address of 1942, when he solemnly proclaimed the necessity of extending ownership to the rank and file of the workers; "positive legislation regulating private ownership may change and more or less restrict its use", he declared in connection with a subsequent statement on the duties of legislators to assist the workers in becoming owners.[2] As will be observed, the Pope censures the weaknesses and inequalities of contemporary regimes of property. In this connection it is important to keep in mind that, like his predecessor, he admits the changeability of property forms, and that he does not commit himself to any single system of ownership. In defending private property, therefore, it is the defence of personal rights and not acquired property rights, which is uppermost in the mind of the Holy Father.

Secondly, as to the relations between property as it should be and as it actually is, suffice it to recall the precision with which Pius XII made this distinction in his World Reconstruction message of 1944:

> In defending, therefore, the principle of private property, the Church [...] does not intend to defend absolutely and simply the present state of affairs as if she saw in it the expression of God's will [...]

---

2 "Le norme giuridiche positive, regolanti la proprietà privata, possono mutare e accordare un uso più o meno circoscritto; [...]" Christmas Address, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

> but the Church aims rather at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the design of God's wisdom, and the dispositions of nature [...].[3]

Closely associated with this question is the final point that the Church is independent of any economic system and does not attach herself to any pure economic doctrine. This was Pius XII's message in the preliminary part of his key social document of Pentecost 1941, when he reiterated and made his own the doctrine of his predecessor as to the precise role of the Church in matters pertaining to economic and social life:

> It was in the profound conviction that the Church has not only the right but even the duty to make an authoritative statement on the social question, that Leo XIII addressed his message to the world. He had no intention of laying down guiding principles on the purely practical, we might say technical side of the social structure, for he was well aware of the fact — as Our immediate Predecessor of saintly memory, Pius XI, pointed out ten years ago in his Commemorative Encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno — that the Church does not claim such a mission.[4]

---

3 "Difendendo dunque il principio della proprietà privata, la Chiesa [...] non intende già di sostenere puramente e semplicemente il presente stato di cose, come se vi vedesse la espressione della volontà divina [...] Ma la Chiesa mira piuttosto a far si che l'instituto della proprietà privata sia tale quale deve essere secondo i disegni della sapienza divina e le disposizioni della natura [...]" (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.)

4 "Mosso dalla convinzione profonda che alla Chiesa compete non solo il diritto, ma ancora il dovere di pronunziare una parola autorevole sulle questioni sociali, Leone XIII diresse al mondo il suo messaggio. Non già che egli intendesse di stabilire norme sui lato puramente pratico,

This statement clearly indicates that the Church has not the mission to intervene in social and economic affairs by way of pronouncing judgement on the purely technical phase of an economic system. But, in the ensuing paragraph, the Holy Father draws attention to the ethical aspect of economic life, in which area the Church has the duty to evoke moral principles and from them render decisions as to the acceptability of any social or economic system:

> It is, on the other hand, the indisputable competence of the Church, on that side of the social order where it meets and enters into contact with the moral order, to decide whether the bases of a given social system are in accord with the unchangeable order which God, Our Creator and Redeemer, has shown through the natural law and Revelation, that twofold manifestation to which Leo XIII appeals in his Encyclical.[5]

To illustrate how economic and social conditions affect the moral order even to the extent of endangering the salvation

---

diremmo quasi tecnico, della costituzione sociale; perchè ben sapeva e gli era evidente, — e il Nostro Predecessore di s.m. Pio XI lo ha dichiarato or è un decennio nella sua Enciclica commemorativa Quadragesimo Anno — che la Chiesa non si attribuisce tale missione." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 196.)

5 "E invece inoppugnabile competenza della Chiesa, in quel lato dell'ordine sociale dove si accosta ed entra a toccare il campo morale, il giudicare se le beni di un dato ordinamento sociale siano in accordo con l'ordine immutabile, che Dio Creatore e Redentore ha manifestato per mezzo del diritto naturale e della rivelazione: doppia manifestazione, alla quale si richiama Leone XIII nella sua Enciclica." (Ibid.)

of souls, he goes on to say:

> Upon the form given to society [...] depends and emerges the good or ill of souls, depends the decision whether men [...] do actually in the detailed course of their life breathe the healthy vivifying atmosphere of truth and moral virtue or the disease-laden and often fatal air of error and corruption.[6]

"Before such a thought," continues the Pope, "how could the Church [...] remain silent or feign not to see or take cognizance of social conditions, which, whether one wills it or not, make difficult or practically impossible a Christian life?"[7] To be sure, these are strong words. They serve to focus attention on the fact that external conditions and economic systems can profoundly affect moral behaviours. The widespread destitution resulting from dispossession was the occasion for Pius XII to pronounce moral judgement on the distorted concept of property which engendered such conditions.

---

6 "Dalla forma data alla società, [...] dipende e s'insinua anche il bene o il male nelle anime, vale a dire, se gli uomini [...] nelle terrene contingenze del corso della vita respirino il sano e vivido alito della verità e della virtù morale o il bacillo morboso e spesso letale dell'errore e della depravazione." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 197.)

7 "Dinanzi a tale considerazione e previsione come potrebbe esser lecito alla Chiesa, Madre tanto amorosa e sollecita del bene dei suoi figli, di rimanere indifferente spettatrice dei loro pericoli, tacere o fingere di non vedere e ponderare condizioni sociali che, volutamento o no, rendono ardua o praticamente impossibile una condotta di vita cristiana [...]?" (Ibid.)

In his frequent reference to the excessive imbalance in the distribution of wealth, both between individuals and between nations, Pius XII obliquely censured the economic system accountable for such an injustice. Indicative was his statement to the Italian men of Catholic Action in 1947:

> But the Church is opposed to the accumulation of these goods [the goods of earch] in the hands of a relatively small and exceedingly rich group while vast masses of the people are condemned to pauperism and to an economic condition unworthy of human beings.[8]

Also to be noted is the many times he deplored the anonymous and impersonal character of the huge concentration of power and property in the modern industrial complex. Indicative was his statement to the International Congress of Social Studies in 1950, when he rejected that type of capitalism dominated by large companies and characterized by the transfer of personal responsibility from the private owners to an anonymous corporate group. Warning the workers, in their zeal to reform the large industrial enterprise, not to follow the mistakes of capital, he said:

---

8 "[...] ma la Chiesa si oppone all'accumulamento di quei beni nelle mani di relativamente pochi straricchi mentre vasti ceti del popolo sono condannati a un pauperismo e ad una condizione economica indegna di esseri umani." (Now is the Time for Action, Conforto, letizia, Sept. 7, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 428.)

For other references to the unjust conditions resulting from excessive disparity in economic well-being see: Encyclical Letter Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 642; Christmas Message, Nell'alba e nella luce, Dec. 24, 1941, in AAS, 34 (1942), p. 14, 17; The Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 610.

> These mistakes [the mistakes of capital] consisted in withdrawing, particularly in very large companies, the management of the means of production from the personal responsibility of the private owner, whether individual or company, in order to transfer this management to the responsibility of anonymous corporate groups.[9]

But it was especially in the great messages of Christmas 1942 and of September 1944, that the Holy Father directly and explicitly condemned the actual system of property ownership for the reason that it ignored the fundamental principle that the goods of earth were created by God to serve all men.

> The Church, he said in the Christmas message, while it has condemned the various forms of Marxist socialism [...] cannot ignore or overlook the fact that the worker in his efforts to better his lot, is opposed by a system which is not only not in accordance with nature, but is at variance with God's plan and with the purpose He had in creating the goods of the earth.[10]

Obviously referring to the prevailing system of selfish capitalism, he went on to call for action to restore justice

---

9 "[...] qui [les errements du capital] consistaient à soustraire, principalement dans les très grandes entreprises, la disposition des moyens de production à la responsabilité personnelle du propriétaire privé (individu ou société) pour la transférer sous la responsabilité de formes anonymes collectives." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 486.)

10 "La Chiesa condanna i vari sistemi del socialismo marxista [...] non puo ignorare o non vedere, che l'operaio, nello sforzo di migliorare la sua condizione, si urta contra qualche congegno, che, lungi dall'essere conforme alla natura, contrasta con l'ordine di Dio e con lo scopo, che Egli ha assegnato per i beni terreni." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 16.)

and fraternal love to the world of the working man:

> In spite of the fact that the ways they followed were and are false and to be condemned, what man and especially what priest or Christian could remain deaf to the cries that rise from the depths and call for justice and a spirit of brotherly collaboration in a world ruled by a just God?[11]

Further on in the address, speaking in connection with the duty of the state to aid in making private property available to more and more workers, he proclaimed that the exploitation of private capital had the effect of reducing the worker "to an economic dependence and servitude irreconcilable with his rights as a person."[12] With this statement, Pius XII rejected any system of ownership exploiting capital to the extent that the mass of workers are unable to exercise in dignity their right to the goods of earth. He denounced that system in the name of justice and charity because it contradicted the concept of private property in its social function as the institution ordained by nature to provide all men with the material basis for their personal needs. It resulted in a world without justice and without love.

---

11 "Per quanto fossero e siano false, condannabile e pericolose le vie, che si sequirono; chi, e sopratutto qual sacerdote o cristiano, potrebbe restar sordo al guido, che si solleva dal profondo, e il quale in un mundo di un Dio giusto invoca giustizia e spirito di fratellanza?" (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 16.)

12 "[...] ad una dipendenzia e servitù economica, inconciliabile con i suoi diritti di persona." (Ibid., p. 17.)

It was the same idea that the Holy Father resumed in the address of September 1944. On this occasion, when he vigorously defended the institution of private property, as nature intended it to be, he could not be more explicit in condemning a certain form of capitalism:

> But neither can it [the Church] accept those systems which recognize the right of private property according to a completely false concept of it and which are therefore opposed to a true and healthy social order.
>
> Accordingly, where, for instance, "capitalism" is based on such false concepts and arrogates to itself an unlimited right over property, without any subordination to the common good, the Church has condemned it as contrary to the natural law.[13]

Here again is an uncompromising indictment of that kind of capitalism which in practice denies the social aspect of private property essential to the concept. To justify his condemnation of this false system of ownership he immediately proceeds to describe how it has violated the natural order by excessively concentrating economic goods and thus diverting them from their social purpose to serve all, with the result

---

13 "Ma essa non può nemmeno accettare quei sistemi, che riconoscono il diritto della proprietà privata secondo un concetto del tutto falso, e sono quindi in contrasto col vero e sano ordine sociale.

Perciò là dove, per esempio, il "capitalismo" si basa sopra tali erronee concezioni e si arroga sulla proprietà un diritto illimitato, senza alcuna subordinazione al bene comune, la Chiesa lo ha riprovato come contrario al diritto di natura." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252-253.)

that it is practically impossible for the worker to acquire private property of his own:

> In fact, we see the ever increasing ranks of the workers frequently confronted with this excessive concentration of economic goods which, often hidden under anonymous titles, are successfully withdrawn from contributing, as they should, to the social order and place the worker in a situation where it is virtually impossible for him effectively to acquire private property of his own.[14]

As a result of this situation, he sees the conditions upon which the tyranny of dictatorship flourishes:

> On the one side, we see immense riches dominating public and private economic life and often even civil life; on the other, the countless number of those who, deprived of every direct or indirect security of their own livelihood, take no further interest in the true and high values of the spirit, abandon their aspirations to genuine freedom and throw themselves at the feet of any political party, slaves to whoever offers them in some way bread and security.[15]

---

14 "Noi vediamo infatti la sempre crescente schiera dei lavoratori trovarsi sovente di fronte a quegli eccessivi concentramenti di beni economici, che, nascosti spesso sotto forme anonime, riescono a sottrarsi ai loro doveri sociali e quasi mettono l'operaio nella impossibilità di formarsi una sua proprietà effettiva." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.)

15 "Vediamo, da un lato, le ingenti ricchezze dominare l'economia privata e pubblica, e spesso anche l'attività civile; dall'altro, la innumerevole moltitudine di coloro che, privi di ogni diretta o indiretta sicurezza della propria vita, non prendono più interesse ai veri ed alti valori dello spirito, si chiudono alle aspirazioni verso una genuina libertà, si gettano al servizio di qualsiasi partito politico, schiavi di chiunque prometta loro in qualche modo pane e tranquillità." (Ibid.)

Again, in 1945, to the women of Italian Catholic Action, he added to the catalogue of social evils following in the train of a regime dominated by capitalism:

> Can a woman [...] hope for her real well-being from a regime dominated by capitalism? [...] You know its characteristic signs and you yourselves are bearing its burden: excessive concentration of population in cities, the constant all absorbing increase of big industries, the difficult and precarious state of others, notably those of artisans and agricultural workers, and the disturbing increase of unemployment.[16]

In the apostolic exhortation Menti Nostrae addressed to priests in 1950, Pius XII, once again, denounced the abuses of capitalism precisely because it promoted and defended the wrong concept of private property. After stating that there were some priests who showed timidity and uncertainty in the face of the evils of communism, he went on to say that there were others who were equally timid when confronted with the excesses of capitalism:

> Others show themselves no less timid and uncertain in the face of that economic system which derives its name from the excessive amassing of private wealth [excessive or exaggerated capitalism] the serious effects of which the Church has never ceased to

---

16 "[...] può forse la donna sperare il suo vero benessere da un regime di predominante capitalismo? [...] Voi ne conoscete i segni caratteristici e ne portate voi stesse il gravame: eccessivo agglomerarsi delle popolazioni nelle città, progressivo e invadente incremento delle grandi imprese, difficile e precaria condizione dell'altre industrie, specialmente dell'artigianato e anche più dell'agricoltura, estensione inquietante della disoccupazione." (Woman's Duties in Social and Political Life, Questa grande, Oct. 21, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 288-289.)

> denounce. The Church has not only indicated the abuse of capital and the right to property promoted and defended by this system, but has insisted just as much that capital and private property must be instruments of production for the whole of society and the means of sustaining the freedom and dignity of man.[17]

This passage is an unmistakable manifestation of the opposition between private property as conceived by excessive capitalism and by the Church. It condemns the selfish pursuit of capital as an end in itself for the very reason that it frustrates the true social end of private property which demands that its benefits of freedom and dignity reach every human person.

---

17 "Ex alia vero parte non desunt qui se pavidos atque incertos ostendant, ad oeconomicam illam rationem quod attinet, quae a nimio privatarum divitiarum congestu nomen invenit; ex quo gravia consequi nocumenta Ecclesia non semel declaravit. Ecclesia siquidem non tantum ingentium opum, ac vel ipsius possidenti juris abusum indicavit, quos eadem oeconomica ratio parit ac defendit, sed etiam edocuit divitias ac possessiones ad res labore procreandas conferrent oportere, cum universae hominum societatis emolumento, itemque cum humanae libertatis dignitatisque tuitione atque incremento." (Apostolic Exhortation Menti Nostrae, Sept. 23, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 696.)

The following footnote from the English version of Menti Nostrae by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., serves to explain the use of the word "capitalism" which does not occur in the official Latin text:

"Phrase in brackets inserted by translator. The preceding phrasing is a literal translation of the official Latin text. Because the Italian translation appearing in L'Osservatore Romano used the word "Capitalism" while the Latin did not, the N.C.W.C. News Service requested a precise explanation of the meaning of the Latin phrase. Msgr. Antonio Bacci, Secretary of the Vatican Secretariate for Briefs to Princes, said that what was intended by the Latin phrase was "excessive or exaggerated capitalism". Monsignor Bacci heads the Secretariate that is charged with the preparation in Latin of documents committed to it by the Pope."

In 1951, addressing the International Congress on Rural Problems, Pius XII took the occasion to condemn that tendency in industrial capitalism which collectivizes agricultural labour after the manner of a factory, thus making of the countryside "nothing more than a reservoir of manpower for industrial production".[18] "This is where marxism leads," he said, "but it is where the principle of economic liberalism also leads, once the pursuit of gain on the part of finance capitalism bears with all its weight upon economic life."[19] Again, in 1955, speaking to a group of Italian workers, the Pope declared that it was slanderous to associate the Church with a capitalism which had the effect of enslaving the worker to accumulations of property over which he was meant to be the master:

> How many times have we declared and explained the love of the Church for the working class! Yet the malicious calumny that the Church is aligned with capitalism against the working man is widespread.[20]

---

18 "La [collectivisation] du travail agricole, à la manière d'une usine, [...] réduite à n'être plus qu'une réserve de main d'oeuvre pour la production industrielle." (Rural Life Problems, Soyez ici, July 2, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 555.)

19 "Voilà où le marxisme conduit. Mais voilà où conduisent également les principes fondamentaux du libéralisme économique, dès que la recherche du lucre, de la part du capitalisme financier, pèse de tout son poids sur la vie économique." (Ibid.)

20 "Quante volte noi abbiamo affermato e spiegato l'amore della Chiesa verso gli operai! Eppure si propaga largamente l'atroce calunnia che "la Chiesa e alleata del Capitalismo contro il lavoratori"!" (To the Catholic Association of Italian Workers, May 1, 1955, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 17, p. 72-73.)

All the above quoted texts combine to demonstrate Pius XII's unequivocal condemnation of capitalism when it makes unjust use of the institution of private property by abstracting from the right which all men have to use the world's goods in keeping with dignity and freedom. He saw in such an absolute concept of prime reason accounting for the conditions that were robbing the worker of his right to master himself by mastering things in the process of personal possession. Instead of being the instrument to provide widespread freedom for the workers, private property, under selfish capitalism, is used to erect a system of powerful economic structures enslaving the worker by making it practically impossible to acquire property of his own. This system is evil because it degrades the worker by making his rights as a person subservient to the property rights of a powerful few. It is contrary to the natural law because it makes inoperable the fundamental right of all to the use of material goods, the principle which Pius XII consistently held as primary in his doctrine on the question of property.

The above series of papal statements also serve to manifest the precise manner in which Pius XII clarified the concept of capitalism such as it is condemned by the Church. He was careful and discriminating in the use of the term. Nevertheless, he used the word and condemned what it stood for, when it arrogated to itself an unlimited right to use

of property, without any subordination to the rights of others and the common good. In other words, he denounced capitalism when it meant an excessive concentration of power resulting from accumulation of capital in the hands of individuals who ignore their social responsibilities by excluding others from the personal powers which the ownership of property confers. It was this type of monopoly capitalism that was anathema for Pius XII.

It must, therefore, be noted that the Pontiff used the word "capitalism" with caution and qualification. This is not surprising because the term is difficult to define and is variously understood in different parts of the world.[21] What is more, it is heavily charged with emotional overtones and communistic polemics. However, despite the danger of

---

21 For a compact and simple analysis of capitalism in its various definitions and divisions relative to the doctrine of the Church, see C. VAN GESTEL, O.P., La doctrine de l'Eglise, Vol. I, Bruxelles, La Pensée Catholique, 1957, p. 387-390. For a more extensive treatment of the relations between the principles of capitalism and the Church, both in history and modern times, see Jean VILLAIN, S.J., L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, Vol. I, Paris, Spes, 1953, p. 85-162. For the thesis that capitalism is variously understood in Europe and America, see J.F. CRONIN, Social Principles and Economic Life, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1957, p. 91-94. He expresses the view that private ownership, free initiative, the profit motive and the use of invested funds characterize the American system of capitalism, whereas in Europe, excessive concentration of wealth, exploitation of workers, and an anti-social mentality among employers are often used as synonymous with capitalism. He declares that the elements of the American system are not contrary to Catholic teaching. (Ibid., p. 91-92.)

misinterpretation, it is safe to say that Pius XII accepted the capitalist type of property holding, in which those who own the means of production and receive a profit are usually separate from those who provide the labour and receive a wage. Such a system, as it is in itself, is not rejected by the Holy Father, as indicated by the following texts from his social documents. "Employers and workers are not irreconcilable enemies," said the Pope, addressing the International Union of Catholic Employers in 1949.[22] On the contrary, he stated that there is a community of interest between the leaders of industry and the workers, that one is not subservient to the other, and that "to receive a return for one's work is a prerogative deriving from the personal dignity of anyone, who in one way or the other, be it as an owner or worker, contributes effectively to the output of the national economy."[23]

Private initiative, another characteristic usually associated with moderate capitalism, was highly commended by the Holy Father, when it was socially orientated. It has

---

22 "Chefs d'entreprises et ouvriers ne sont pas antagonistes inconciliables." (Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 283.)

23 "Toucher son revenu est un apanage de la dignité personnelle de quiconque, sous une forme ou sous une autre, comme patron ou comme ouvrier, prête son concours productif au rendement de l'économie nationale." (Ibid.)

been shown that he denounced excessive capitalism precisely for the reason that it made widespread ownership and private initiative impossible. Furthermore, in an address to the Italian Waterworks Society he made a strong appeal in behalf of private initiative reasonably free from state interference: "this private initiative contributes to the wealth of the community, alleviates, as well, the burden of human toil, raises the efficiency of labour, diminishes the cost of production, and develops the habit of saving."[24] He went on to explain that it was for these reasons, that he rejected the idea of the state exercising excessive control over the economic life of its citizens, but he hastened to add that this does not imply that a socially destructive regime of absolute freedom was acceptable in the economic field.[25] In his address to the International Congress on Rural Problems in 1951, when he deplored the impending fact of agriculture becoming an appendage of industry, the Holy

---

24 "[...] l'attività privata [...] contribuisce ad accrescere la ricchezza comune, oltre che ad alleggerire la fatica dell'uomo, a elevare il rendimento del lavoro, a diminuire i costi di produzione, ad accelerare la formazione del risparmio." (The Christian Aspects of Business, Abbiamo accolto, April 13, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 94.)

25 Ibid. On the question of Pius XII's appeal for free enterprise tempered by a higher type of socially orientated freedom, see the address to the Italian Federation of Commerce, Business and the Common Good, Or sono dieci, Feb. 17, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 17, p. 547.

Father carefully noted the benefits of industrial capitalism:

> Everyone of good will, he said, must recognize that the system of industrial capitalism has helped render possible, and has even stimulated an increase in agricultural production; that it has permitted, in many regions of the world, higher levels of physical and spiritual life for rural people.[26]

To seek a profit and to use saved funds to build new physical capital is another element of moderate capitalism acceptable to Pius XII, provided this is done in a manner consistent with social obligations. In Menti Nostrae, 1950, he insisted that private property and capital were instruments of production subordinate to the social and of the economy as well as the means to sustain and defend the freedom and dignity of the person.[27] The Christmas address of 1952 advocated the investment of capital for productive purposes with a sharp criticism for those who would abuse the accumulation of capital by failing to invest it with a view to stimulating employment and general prosperity in the social economy.[28] In an address to bankers, he was equally

---

26 "Tout bon esprit doit reconnaître que le régime économique du capitalisme industriel a contribué à rendre possible, voire à stimuler le progrès du rendement agricole; qu'il a permis, en maintes régions du monde, d'élever à un niveau supérieur la vie physique et spirituelle de la population des campagnes." (Rural Life Problems, Soyez ici, July 2, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 555.)

27 Apostolic Exhortation Menti Nostrae, Sept. 23, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 696.

28 Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 40.

critical of those who would abuse capital by wasting it in luxury and selfish enjoyment or by piling it up without putting it to use for the welfare of the community; he exhorted the bankers to induce their depositors to become shareholders with them in enterprises that would make for the economic development of the community.[29]

To conclude and sum up Pius XII's evaluation of capitalism as a system of property holding, he condemned this economic system when it ignored the common good and the dignity of labour by attributing an absolute value to institutions of private property. He did not condemn the principles of capitalism abstracted from the historical forms in which it found expression. These principles — private possession of the means of production, separation of capital and labour, private initiative, the profit motive, the use of invested funds — applied in proper subordination to the purpose of man and material goods, could make for a better distribution of the world's economic resources.

---

29 Function of Bankers, Votre démarche, Oct. 24, 1951, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 13, p. 323. See also Social Function of Banking, Ci torna, April 25, 1950, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 12, p. 40.

II. EXCESSIVE NATIONALIZATION

In the general sense of the word, nationalization is the process of collectivizing property by transferring it from the private to the public sector of the economy. Before undertaking to present Pius XII's evaluation of this process as a property system, it is necessary to make some precisions as to the various meanings of the term, especially as it was understood and applied in Western Europe during the years immediately following World War II.

First of all, it must be understood that there is a formal distinction between the theory that would advocate the state taking over all the means of production, distribution and exchange, on the one hand, and on the other, the theory that the state can take over the ownership of public utilities together with certain key industries vital to the social and economic welfare of the community. In the first instance we have pure and simple collectivism — the economic side of Marxist socialism sometimes referred to as state capitalism or state socialism.[30] To present the Pope's

---

30 For this viewpoint on the Church's social teaching see THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF SOCIAL STUDIES, A Code of Social Principles, trans. from French by E. de Carson, Oxford, Catholic Social Guild, 1952, p. 55: "Nationalization, taken in its widest sense and applied to all or even the majority of industries ends by force of circumstances in Collectivism [...] or in State Capitalism." See also ibidem, p. 75: "To ward off the dangers and to remedy the abuses of private

judgement on this form of total nationalization shall be our first concern. As to the latter instance — what might be called partial nationalization — there are many forms variously applied in different countries of the world.[31] As a consequence, great care must be exercised in order to understand what the Holy Father condemns and what he accepts in the theory of nationalization understood in the sense of partial public expropriation and control of the productive process. It is true that there can be considerable state ownership without socialism. On the other hand, progressive nationalization of industries can lead to socialism.

This latter type of restrictive nationalization is the usual meaning ascribed to the term. The International Union of Social Studies calls it "a line of social policy whereby an undertaking is taken over by the people

---

capitalism, some wish to install a system of State Capitalism which implies the wholesale nationalization of the means of production."

31 For a compact description of five different systems of nationalization or state enterprise in vogue prior to World War II, with examples from various countries, see Valère FALLON, S.J., Principles of Social Economy, trans. by Rev. John L. McNulty, New York, Benziger, 1933, p. 117-123. For a general description and appraisal of nationalization which he calls socialization, see Johannes MESSNER, Social Ethics, St. Louis, Herder, 1949, p. 922-927. For a comparative study of nationalization and its various forms in France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, and Austria after the second World War, see N.S. TIMASHEFF, "Nationalization in Europe and Catholic Social Doctrine," in The Catholic Mind, New York, America Press, Vol. 46 (1948), p. 17-35.

represented by the political power; it may be limited to ownership or extended to management and profits."[32] Johannes Messner defines it as "the transfer of the means of production of an industry to the ownership of the state with the object of exercising a monopoly of business in the industry."[33] Under a variety of forms, dependent upon the degree of governmental control, restrictive nationalization spread rapidly throughout Europe in the years following the second World War. Confronted with an excessive zeal for nationalization as the guiding principle for social reform on the part of some European Catholic thinkers, Pius XII clarified the issue as to what was licit and illicit on at least five different occasions between 1944 and 1950.[34] As an aid to a

---

32 THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF SOCIAL STUDIES, A Code of Social Principles, p. 54.

33 J. MESSNER, Social Ethics, p. 922.

34 For the contention that an over enthusiastic endorsement of nationalization in France on the part of the Catholic-inspired Mouvement Républicain Populaire (M.R.P.) partially occasioned the pronouncements of Pius XII on the question, see N.S. TIMASHEFF, "Nationalization in Europe and Catholic Social Doctrine", in The Catholic Mind, p. 18-30. For a description of nationalization in post-war Europe, with references to the M.R.P. and the arguments they proposed, see Paul Emile BOLTE, P.S.S., "Theologians on the Right to Property", in Social Justice Review, St. Louis, Catholic Central, Vol. 43 (1950), p. 81-82. For details as to the extent of nationalization in France after World War II see: Marcel CLEMENT, L'Economie sociale selon Pie XII (Synthèse doctrinale), Paris, Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1953, p. 157-159.

fuller understanding of these pronouncements, it is important to recount the Holy Father's outright condemnation of state capitalism which is but the equivalent of wholesale nationalization. From this should emerge the reason why he was so concerned and spoke so frequently on the more restricted type of nationalization.

In the Christmas address of 1942, the Pontiff solemnly proclaimed that the state must do everything, within its competence, to make available for the workers the private ownership of property; otherwise they are in danger of becoming the slaves to those who own all: "whether this slavery," he said, "arises from the exploitation of private capital or from the power of the State, the result is the same"; "indeed," he continued, "under the pressure of a state which dominates and controls the whole field of public and private life even going into the realm of ideas and beliefs and of conscience, this lack of liberty can have more serious consequences as experience shows and proves."[35] The allusion here to a totalitarian system of state capitalism is

---

35 "Che questa servitù derivi dal prepotere del capitale privato o dal potere dello Stato, l'effetto non muta; anzi, sotto la pressione di uno Stato, che tutto domina e regola l'intera vita pubblica e privata, penetrando fino nel campo delle concezioni e persuasioni e della coscienza, questa mancanza di libertà può avere conseguenze ancora più gravose, come l'esperienza manifesta e testimonia." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.)

unmistakable. What is more, he sees this state-domination of the national economic forces a greater threat than the domination of private capitalism, because it enslaves so completely affecting the citizens in every department of life including those of conscience and religion.

In June of the following year, Pius XII was still more emphatic in denouncing the enslaving impact of a super-capitalist state. It was the occasion of an address to twenty thousand Italian workers, apparently victimized by the propaganda of the communists who were calling for a social revolution and falsely claiming to have restored power to the working class. Obviously referring to the observed results of communism, he said:

> You see that the working class remains bound, yoked and tied to the force of state capitalism which restrains and subjects all, not only the family, but even the conscience and transfers the workers into a gigantic labour machine.[36]

In 1946, on the occasion of an address to the employers and workers of the Italian electrical industry, he intimated that collectivism results in state capitalism and therefore is powerless to resolve the conflict between capital and labour. He said:

---

36 "Di fatto voi vedete che il popolo lavoratore rimane legato, aggiogato e stretto alla forza del capitalismo di Stato; il quale comprime e assoggetta tutti, non meno la famiglia che le coscienze, e transforma gli operai in una gigantesca macchina di lavoro." (The Church and Labour, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 174.)

> One cannot imagine that, with collective organization, competition will be really removed, for with the elements of the struggle being changed, the conflict between labor and private capital will reappear as a conflict between labour and state capitalism.[37]

In the great address of 1944, the Holy Father made a striking contrast between the enslaving effects of state capitalism and the freedom resulting from a widely diffused system of private ownership: "take away from the worker," he said, "the hope of acquiring some goods as personal property" and the likely alternative would be "to perpetuate the economic conditions of wartime, by which in some countries, the public authority has control of all the means of production and provides for everybody and everything but with the lash of severe discipline."[38]

With this statement plus the foregoing from the addresses of 1942 and 1943, Pius XII condemned the

---

37 "E nemmeno con la organizzazione collettivistica, che ne seguirebbe, si può pensare che sarebbe realmente rimosso il dissidio, perchè, mutati i termini della lotta, il conflitto spento fra il lavoro e il capitale privato si riaccenderebbe fra il lavoro e il capitalismo di Stato." (Industrial Relations, La vostra presenza, Jan. 24, 1946, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 7, p. 349.)

38 "Togliete al lavoratore la speranza di acquistare qualche bene in proprietà personale; quale altro stimolo naturale potreste voi offrirgli per incitarlo a un lavoro intenso, [...] O si vuol forse perpetuare l'economia di guerra per la quale in alcuni Paesi il pubblico potere ha in mano tutti i mezzi di produzione e provvede per tutti e a tutto, ma con la sforza di una dura disciplina?" (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253-254.)

nationalization of all the means of production, because it denied the right of private property, the principle he laid down as the material basis for freedom in a normal social and economic order. In other words, a system of state super-capitalism would constitute the economic basis for totalitarian tyranny, whether such a system be realized at once or piecemeal. Because the specific act of nationalizing a particular industry could be conceived by some as a step in the direction of total nationalization, it is no wonder that the Holy Father was so discriminating in pronouncing judgement on even the legitimate type of governmental control over industry, which assumed major proportions in Europe during the post-war years. Moreover, his frequently stated doctrine of the distribution rather than the concentration of property would seem to account for his concern over the prevalence of any kind of nationalization. It is within the context of discussing the need for a wider distribution of property that the Pope, in the 1944 address, makes his first reference to the legitimate type of nationalization. If the concentration of wealth is such as to nullify the benefits which private property should ensure, he declared, "the state may in the public interest intervene by regulating its use or even, if it cannot equitably meet the situation in any other way, by decreeing the expropriation of property, giving

a suitable indemnity."[39] From this statement, it follows that he sees expropriation merely as a weapon to be used by the state in the last resort when some great concentration of capital blocks the way to a just distribution. Obviously, the principle of nationalization is acceptable in this case. But it must be considered the exception and not the normal mode of ownership — permitted in very definite and extreme circumstances.

In 1945, addressing the Italian Workers' Association, he clearly spelled out the conditions under which nationalization could be accepted. In his most complete statement on this subject, he said:

> Christian associations agree with nationalization only when it is seen to be required by the common good, that is, when it is seen to be the only really effective means by which to remedy an abuse, or to avoid wasting the country's productive resources and ensure their being systematically organized and directed in the economic interests of the nation; when it is by this means alone that the national economy can be regulated and peacefully developed, and the way thus prepared for the material prosperity of the whole people, a prosperity which will also provide a sound basis for cultural and religious life.

---

39 "Quando la distribuzione della proprietà è un ostacolo a questo fine — ciò che non necessariamente ne sempre è originato dalla estenzione del patrimonio privato — lo Stato può nell'interesse comune intervenire per regolarne l'uso, od anche, se non si può equamente provvedere la altro modo, decretare la espropriazione, dando una conveniente indennita." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

> Moreover, they insist that nationalization in any case implies the obligation of paying a suitable indemnity, that is to say, an indemnity computed according to what is just and equitable in the given circumstances for all the interested parties.[40]

To be noted particularly in this text is the fact that the Pope admits that the common good may demand nationalization but only if and insofar as other less drastic measures have been shown by experience to be insufficient.

Another important statement issued in 1946 was even more cautious in pronouncing judgement on nationalization. Even the legitimate type came under the close scrutiny of the Holy Father. In a letter addressed to Mr. Flory, the president of the Semaines Sociales of France, he wrote as follows:

---

40 "Le Associazioni cristiane assentono alla socializzazione soltanto nei casi in cui apparisce realmente richiesta dal bene comune, vale a dire come l'unico mezzo veramente efficace per rimediare a un abuso o per evitare uno sperpero delle forze produttive del Paese, e per assicurare l'organico ordinamento di queste medesime forze e dirigerle a vantaggio degli interessi economici della nazione, cioè allo scopo che la economia nazionale nel suo regolare e pacifico sviluppo apra la via alla prosperità materiale di tutto il popolo, prosperità tale che costituisca al tempo stesso un sano fondamento anche della vita culturale e religiosa. In ogni caso, poi, esse riconoscono che la socializzazione importa l'obbligo di una congrua indennità, vale a dire calcolata secondo ciò che nelle circostanze concrete è giusto ed equo per tutti gl'interessati." (The Future of Trade Unions, Il Nostro Predecessore, March 11, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 71.)

That Pius XII used the terms nationalization and socialization to mean the same, is obvious from the remark he made in the previous paragraph where he referred to "what is called today the nationalization or the socialization of the enterprise" ("per esempio, di ciò, che oggi si chiama nazionalizzazione o socializzazione dell'azienda e democratizzazione della economia").

> Our Predecessors and we Ourselves have more than once touched upon the moral aspect of this measure. Now it is evident that, instead of making life and work in common less mechanical, this nationalization, even where it is licit, tends rather to make them more so, and that subsequently the profit accruing from nationalization to a true community, such as you understand it, is highly questionable. In our judgement, the establishment of associations or corporate groups in all the branches of the national economy would be much more conducive to both the realization of the end which you pursue [national unity and community spirit] and, at the same time, to the greater success of the enterprise.[41]

In this passage Pius XII makes two significant additions to what he said on this question in March of 1945. First, nationalization even when it is morally legitimate, has a built-in disadvantage in that it tends to accentuate rather than lessen the mechanical character of the worker's life. This "mise en garde" is consistent with the observation he made in 1943, when he told the Italian workers that state capitalism or total nationalization "transfers the workers

---

41 "Nos Prédécesseurs et Nous-même avons plus d'une fois touché le côté moral de cette mesure. Or, il est pourtant évident que, au lieu d'atténuer le caractère mécanique de la vie et du travail en commun, cette nationalisation, même quand elle est licite, risque plutôt de l'accentuer encore et que, par conséquent, le profit qu'elle apporte au bénéfice d'une vraie communauté, telle que vous l'entendez, est fort sujet à caution, nous estimons que l'institution d'associations ou unités corporatives, dans toutes branches de l'économie nationale, serait bien plus avantageuse en même temps au meilleur rendement des entreprises." (Liberty as the Foundation for Community Life and the Danger of Indiscriminate Nationalization, C'est un geste, July 10, 1946, in AAS, 38 (1946), p. 317.)

into a vast labour machine".[42] Because the nationalized industry will always be large and tend to increase in size, there will be a greater inclination to value the workers as a mere cog in the productive machine. In the light of man's "depersonalization" which he observed in the social and economic order of his time, it is not surprising that Pius XII feared any movement that would increase the power of the state over its citizens. In the Christmas address of 1952, he vigorously deplored the depersonalizing influence of an all-powerful state:

> In many countries, the modern State is becoming a gigantic administrative machine. It extends its influence over almost every phase of life. It would like to subject to its administration the entire range of the political, economic, social and intellectual fields, including even the birth and death of its subjects.
>
> No wonder, then, if in this atmosphere of impersonality which tends to penetrate and to encompass life in its entirety, the meaning of the common good is diminished in the conscience of individuals, and if the State loses more and more its original character of a community of morally responsible citizens. In this fact is to be discovered the origin and the source of that current which is submerging modern man under its tide of anguish: his [depersonalization].[43]

---

42 "[...] e transforma gli operai in una gigantesca macchina di lavoro." (The Church and Labour, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 174.)

43 "In non pochi Paesi lo Stato moderno va divenendo una gigantesca macchina amministrativa. Esso stende la sua mano su quasi tutta la vita: l'intiera scala dei settori politico, economico, sociale, intellettuale, fino alla nascita e alla morte, vuol farsi materia della sua amministrazione. Nessuna maraviglia quindi se in questo clima dell'impersonale, che tutta la vita tende a penetrare ed avvolgere, il

The second additional point raised by the Pope in the statement of March 1945, was that cooperative associations of small and medium-sized productive units would be more conducive to the national unity of economic and social life than the nationalization by large industries. This was the idea that the Holy Father promulgated in the address of 1944, when he advocated a wide distribution of small and medium-sized productive units together with the formation of unions among themselves whenever it was necessary to achieve the benefits of bigness. "Co-operative unions," he said, "should ensure for them the advantages of big business."[44] It is true that in the 1945 letter to Mr. Flory he used the expression "associations or corporate groups". But in the following year, a letter, again addressed to Mr. Flory as president of the Semaines Sociales, clarified the meaning of these terms and further explained his position on

---

senso del bene comune si attutisce nelle coscienze dei singoli, e lo Stato perde sempre più il primordiale carattere di una comunità morale dei cittadini.

In tal guisa si rivela l'origine e il punto di partenza della corrente, che travolge in stato di angoscia l'uomo moderno: la sua "spersonalizzazione"." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 37.)

44 "Per lo stesso scopo la piccola e la media proprietà nell'agricoltura, nelle arti e nei mestieri, nel commercio e nell'industria debbono essere garantite e promosse; le unioni cooperative debbono assicurare loro i vantaggi della grande azienda." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.) Emphasis added.

nationalization, which provoked lively commentaries of different interpretations, particularly in France.[45] In answer to the charge that his remarks on nationalization were interpreted as an attempt to meddle in political affairs of the day, he stated that he was treating the subject "on a much higher plane".[46] "There was no question," he said, "of the moral liceity of nationalization insofar as it furthers the material welfare of the nation"; but the precise problem of the Conference in 1946 — "to ascertain whether nationalization afforded an appropriate instrument of national unity and community spirit — called for the most energetic possible development of 'unitary or cooperative associations', for there was a question of these as the context clearly indicated."[47] Obviously referring to the address of 1944, he

---

45 For an account of the European reaction to Pius XII's letter of July 10, 1946 to Mr. Charles Flory, President of the Semaines Sociales of France, see Lewis WATT, S.J., "Pope Pius XII on Nationalization", in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 46 (1948), p. 132-142.

46 "Or il s'agissait là en réalité d'une question d'un ordre plus élevé." (Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, July 18, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 444.)

47 "Non point de la licéité morale de la nationalisation du point de vue du bien matériel de la nation, la question qui par contre se posait, en relation immédiate avec l'objet de la Semaine Sociale de Strasbourg, était de savoir si la nationalisation offrait un moyen approprié de procurer à la nation l'union et l'esprit de communauté. Nous nous trouvions en présence de ce problème: développer le plus puissamment qu'il se pourrait les "unités" ou "sociétés coopératives" — car c'est d'elles qu'il s'agissait, comme le

went on to say that he had in mind the little and medium-sized businesses, a subject upon which he had enlarged in greater detail under other circumstances.[48]

In his final major pronouncement on the question of nationalization, addressed to the Union of Catholic Employees in 1949, Pius XII issued a statement which could well serve as a synthesis of the Church's doctrine on the problem. He said:

> Without doubt, the Church admits nationalization also, within just limits, and considers that it is legitimate "to reserve to the public authority certain categories of property that represent a power so great that it could not be left in the hands of private individuals without imperiling the common good" (Quadragesimo Anno).
>
> But to make nationalization the normal rule for the public organization of the economy would be to reverse the order of things. The function of the public right is to defend the private right, not to

---

contexte le faisait clairement voir —, en prenant la parole sur le sujet." (Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, July 18, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 444.)

For a commentary on this text and that of July 10, 1946, to the effect that the term "corporate body" meant "co-operative body" and for the meaning of corporation and co-operation in Pius XII, see J.Y. CALVEZ and Jacques PERRIN, The Church and Social Justice, trans. from the French by J.R. Kirwin, London, Burns and Oates, 1959, p. 217, 427-432. For further commentary on the reaction to the address of 1946 and Pius XII's clarification of terminology in the address of 1947, see Marcel CLEMENT, L'Economie sociale selon Pie XII (Documents pontificaux), Paris, Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1953, p. 103, footnote; 104, footnote; 122, footnote.

48 Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 444.

> absorb it. Economy is not by its nature an institution of the State any more than are other branches of human activity; it is, on the contrary, the living product of the free initiative of individuals and of their freely formed associations.[49]

This statement makes it obvious that Pius XII, like his immediate predecessor, favoured the nationalization of certain forms of property in the case where private control would involve such a concentration of economic power that the general welfare would be imperiled. But to advocate indiscriminate nationalization of private business, making it the normal pattern for the national economy, would be an unwarranted and illogical conclusion. It would reverse the natural order, making man a slave to the state. Although not mentioned explicitly in this text, it would contradict the principle of subsidiarity whereby the state should not normally undertake any function which some smaller and lesser

---

49 "Il n'est pas douteux que l'Eglise aussi — dans certaines justes limites — admet l'étatisation et juge que "l'on peut légitimement réserver aux pouvoirs publics certaines catégories de biens, ceux-là qui présentent une telle puissance, qu'on ne saurait, sans mettre en péril le bien commun, les abandonner aux mains des particuliers" (Encycl. Quadragesimo Anno, AAS Vol. XXIII, 1931, p. 214). Mais faire de cette étatisation comme la règle normale de l'organisation publique de l'économie serait renverser l'ordre des choses. La mission du droit public est en effet de servir le droit privé, non de l'absorber. L'économie — pas plus d'ailleurs qu'aucune autre branche d'activité humaine — n'est de sa nature une institution de l'Etat; elle est, à l'inverse, le produit vivant de la libre initiative des individus et de leurs groupes librement constitués." (Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 284-285.)

society can perfectly well undertake and fulfill. This principle constituted a major point in Pius XI's program for social reform.[50] It was confirmed and several times repeated by Pius XII. Typical was the following confirmation from the letter sent to the Semaines Sociales of France in 1947:

> In the organization of production, full weight must be accorded this principle — always defended by the social teachings of the Church — that the activities and services of society ought to possess a merely subsidiary character, aiding or supplementing the activity of the individual, the family and the profession.[51]

To conclude this appraisal of nationalization according to Pius XII, the main points of his pronouncements may be formulated as follows:

---

50 In Quadragesimo Anno, June 1, 1931 (AAS, 23 (1931) p. 203, English version Francis J. POWERS (ed.), Papal Pronouncements on the Political Order, p. 69), Pius XI succinctly states the principle of subsidiarity as follows: "None the less, just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so, too, it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be efficiently performed by smaller and lower bodies. [...] Of its very nature, the true aim of all social activity should be to help individual members of the social body, but never to destroy or absorb them."

51 "Il faut, dans l'organisation de la production, assurer toute sa valeur directive à ce principe, toujours défendu par l'enseignement social de l'Eglise: que les activités et les services de la société doivent avoir un caractère subsidiaire strictement, aider ou compléter l'activité de l'individu, de la famille, de la profession." (Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, July 18, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 446.)

(1) Wholesale nationalization, the equivalent of socialism or state capitalism, whether achieved piecemeal or at one stage, is outrightly condemned.

(2) Nationalization of certain industries may be justified, subject to the following conditions:
(a) it must be demanded by the common good,
(b) there must be no other acceptable solution,
(c) there must be a just compensation for the expropriated property.

(3) Even justifiable nationalization is a dangerous expedient and can have effects that are highly questionable because it tends to favor the concentration rather than the diffusion of productive property. Such concentration results in conditions adverse to the personal development of the worker.

(4) Nationalization is not the normal system of property ownership, nor is it the primary or the best way for the government to intervene in the regulation of private property and its just distribution. The promotion of co-operative unions of small and medium-sized businesses plus the corporate form of social and economic life is more conducive to preserving the national solidarity of society.[52]

---

52 C. VAN GESTEL, in his volume, La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, p. 204-205, gives a résumé of an article written by P.A. DE MARIO, S.J., entitled "Nationalization or Corporatism", in the Italian review Civilta Cattolica, Sept. 7, 1946. He states that the article was written to refute the attacks on Pius XII's statement on nationalization in the letter to the Semaines Sociales of France, July 10, 1946, and that it reflects the thought of the Holy See. The following is our English translation of the résumé in VAN GESTEL, op. cit., p. 205:

(1) The Church does not condemn nationalization as such, but condemns only its excess.

(2) The nationalization of industry is in certain cases not only permissible but opportune.

(3) In general it is proper for the state to nationalize certain industries, particularly those which, in the hands of private capitalism, would constitute a means of exploitation, or which would be contrary to the common good.

(4) Nationalization is not the only nor the primary means which the state has at its disposal for giving

III. FORCED AND CENTRALIZED CO-PARTNERSHIP IN THE INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE

In addition to the question of nationalization and its adverse effects on the institution of private property, Pius XII was also confronted with the problem created by proposals to give to the worker partnership in the industrial enterprise by changing its juridical structure. The immediate reaction to such proposals produced two opposite viewpoints: one, exaggerating the right of private enterprise to the extent that any system of co-partnership would destroy it; the other, exaggerating the right of the worker to participate in the ownership of the enterprise to the extent of making it a strict right in commutative justice. The problem therefore, as it faced Pius XII, was how to maintain effective ownership on the part of the employer and at the same time to give the worker a share in the management or control of the industrial enterprise.

---

collective property a social function and placing it at the service of the common good.

(5) Excessive nationalization runs the danger of accentuating, instead of mitigating, the mechanical character of life and work in common.

(6) The issue is not one only of regulating the production and distribution of wealth, but also of guaranteeing the dignity and independence of the human person against all oppression, both political and economic, whether it comes from private capitalism or the state.

On four occasions, — May 1, 1949, June 3, 1950, January 31, 1952 and Sept. 14, 1952 — the Holy Father spoke on this problem, distinguishing between what was undesirable and to be rejected and what was desirable and to be promoted in proposals to reform the structure of the industrial enterprise. To analyze and appraise these statements, it is necessary, first of all, to examine the historical background against which they were issued. This involves a look at Pius XI's reference to co-partnership, and the interpretation it received from some Catholic social thinkers.

In what was probably the first papal statement[53] on the problem of structural reform in the industrial enterprise by way of co-partnership, Pius XI wrote the following:

> First of all, those who declare that a contract of hiring and being hired is unjust of its very nature, and hence a partnership contract must take its place, are certainly in error [...] We consider it more advisable, however, in the present condition of human society, that, so far as is possible, the work contract be somewhat modified by a partnership contract, as is already being done in various ways and with no small

---

53 Prior to this time, pioneers of Catholic social doctrine like Von Kettler, La Tour du Pin and Léon Harmel, proposed various systems of co-partnership in the latter half of the nineteenth century. For a survey of their doctrine and their proposals for reform, see: Jean VILLAIN, L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, Vol. 2, Paris, Spes, 1954, p. 113-162. For a brief account of more recent systems of voluntary co-partnership attempted in France after World War I, see: Marcel CLEMENT, L'Economie sociale selon Pie XII (Synthèse doctrinale), p. 159-160.

> advantage to workers and to owners. Workers and employers thus become sharers in ownership or management or participate in some fashion in the profits received.[54]

In the light of Pius XII's subsequent reference to this text and the interpretation arising from it, the following comments are necessary: (1) Pius XI rejected the idea that a partnership contract must replace the contract of labour on the erroneous presumption that the latter is unjust; he never said that the contract of labour was the only system of collaboration between owner and worker, nor that it was the ideal; (2) his choice of words — "as far as possible", "somewhat" — in advising the use of the partnership contract along with the contract of labour indicated guarded and cautious approval; (3) he set the pattern for the terminology in connection with the various kinds of structural reform of the enterprise by means of co-partnership; the latter is the generic term for three kinds of worker-participation in the enterprise: (a) co-ownership, (b) co-management, (c) sharing of profits.

---

54 "Ac primum quidem, qui operae conducendae locandaeque contractum, vi sua iniustum ac proinde in eius locum societatis contractum sufficiendum esse pronunciant, absono profecto dicunt et prave calumniantur Decessorem Nostrum. [...] Hodiernis tamen humanae consortiones condicionibus consolutius fore reputamus si, quoad eius fieri possit, contractus operae per societatis contractum aliquantum temperetur, quemadmodum diversis modis fieri iam coepit, haud exiguo operariorum et possessorum emolumento. Ita operarii officialesque consortes fiunt dominii vel curationis, aut de lucris perceptis aliqua ratione participant." (PIUS XI, Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931),

With the impetus of this text of Pius XI, exaggerated demands arose in some quarters for the implementation of one or other of these suggested varieties of structural reform in the enterprise. Even in 1945, Pius XII showed concern over these proposed reforms pointing out that they should be studied with care and with due regard for justice and equity. He said:

> After so many years of suffering, distress and hardship, men have good reason to expect a profound improvement in their conditions of living. Hence these plans for reorganization in the world of labour, these projected structural reforms; this developing of ideas concerning property and the enterprise. They sometimes appear in passionate haste and doctrinal confusion and must be examined in the light of the inflexible standards of reason and faith, which is the Church's mission to make clear in its teaching.[55]

But it was not until 1949 that Pius XII spoke out explicitly on the proposals that would force a change in the juridical structure of the industrial enterprise. Events and ideas in Germany along these lines apparently were the occasion for

---

55 "Comment, en effet, après de si rudes années de souffrances, d'angoisses et de misères, les hommes n'attendraient-ils pas, à bon droit, une profonde amélioration de leurs conditions d'existence? De là, ces projets de réorganisation du monde du travail, ces perspectives de réformes de structure, ce développement des notions de propriété et d'entreprise, parfois envisagées dans la précipitation passionnée et la confusion doctrinale, mais qu'il vous faudra confronter avec les normes indéclinables de la raison et de la foi, telles que l'enseignement de l'Eglise a mission de les dégager." (PIUS XII, Letter to Mr. Charles Flory, Nous avons pris, July 14, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 211.)

his intervention.[56] These exaggerated demands for co-partnership in industry reached a climax in September 1949, with the impetus coming from a huge rally of German Catholics at Bochum. Therein it was categorically stated that workers' participation in industry was a right in strict justice and its legal establishment was demanded. From this meeting the following resolution was issued:

> Catholic workers and employers agree that the right to joint management of all workers in social, personal and economic matters of common concern is a natural right according to the order laid down by God and corresponding to the collective responsibility of all. We demand its legal establishment. Following the example of progressive firms, it should be put in practice everywhere from now on.[57]

In this resolution, it is to be noted that the form of co-partnership demanded is that of co-management even to the extent of sharing in the economic decisions of the firm.[58]

---

56 Jeremiah NEWMAN, in his work Co-Responsibility in Industry, Westminster, Md., The Newman Press, 1955, p. 20-36, traces the history and development of co-determination in Germany during the years following World War II until it became compulsory for metal and coal on May 21, 1951. He states that "the social teaching of Pius XII on co-responsibility was largely prompted by developments in Germany" (ibid. p. 20).

57 Cited as a quotation from Christus Rex, July, 1950 p.222, in Jeremiah NEWMAN, Co-Responsibility in Industry, p. 3.

58 In his work, La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, p. 273, C. Van Gestel uses the German terminology to distinguish between the various degrees of the right of co-management extending from the lowest (the right of information) to the highest (the right of decision), which is co-management in the absolute and full sense of the word. From the viewpoint of the extension of co-management, it can be either economic or non-economic, the latter pertaining to decisions

It was this type of co-partnership, or more precisely economic co-management with which Pius XII was primarily concerned in the addresses which we shall now examine.

In May 1949, some months before the Bochum rally, the Holy Father issued his basic statement of doctrine on the matter of compulsory co-partnership in the enterprise. On the occasion of an address to the representatives of the International Union of Catholic Employers' Association, after rejecting indiscriminate nationalization of the economy, he said:

> It would be just as untrue to assert that every particular business is of its nature a society, with its personal relationships determined by the norms of distributive justice to the point where all without distinction — owners or not of the means of production — would be entitled to their share in the property, or at the very least in the profits, of the enterprise. Such a conception stems from the assumption that every business belongs naturally within the sphere of public law. The assumption is inexact. Whether the business is organized in the form of a corporation, or an association of all the workmen as part-owners, or whether it is the private property of an individual who signs a wage contract with all his employees, in the one case as in the other it falls within the competence of the private law discipline of economic life.[59]

---

that are related to questions of personnel, social and technical affairs. Economic co-management is of a more direct nature and would include financial and commercial decisions normally restricted to the board of directors of the enterprise. Obviously, the Bochum resolution was all inclusive in its demands.

59 "On ne serait pas non plus dans le vrai en voulant affirmer que toute entreprise particulière est par sa nature en société de manière que les rapports entre participants y soient déterminés par les règles de la justice distributive,

With this statement, Pius XII rejected the exaggerated contention that the worker necessarily has a right in strict justice to co-partnership in the enterprise; this rejection is inclusive of co-partnership in any of the forms to which Pius XI referred: co-ownership, co-management and profit sharing. What is more he denies the necessary character of such a right in any kind of enterprise — industrial, corporative, and co-operative. The reason he gives is that the enterprise is primarily an economic entity and therefore "falls within the competence of the private law discipline of economic life" ("elle relève de l'ordre juridique privé de la vie économique"). The implication is that the enterprise belongs essentially to that private legal order depending upon the contracts made between the participants in the economic process. Certainly, it is a collaboration between persons, but through the mediation of exchanging things, either goods or services. This means that the

---

en sorte que tous, indistinctement, — propriétaires ou non, des moyens de production, — auraient droit à leur part de la propriété ou tout au moins des bénéfices de l'entreprise. Une telle conception part de l'hypothèse que toute entreprise rentre par nature dans la sphère du droit public. Hypothèse inexacte: que l'entreprise soit constituée sous forme de fondation ou d'association de tous les ouvriers comme co-propriétaires, ou bien qu'elle soit propriété privée d'un individu qui signe avec tous ses ouvriers un contrat de travail, dans un cas comme dans l'autre, elle relève de l'ordre juridique privé de la vie économique." (Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 285.)

workers and the owners in the enterprise are associated with each other in a relationship primarily based upon a process of exchange. Implicit in this text of Pius XII is that the primary relation between employer and employee is determined by exchange or commutative justice governing contracts, and for the worker to demand co-partnership as his natural right would be to violate the rules of this justice. It would mean that the owner would no longer have exclusive control over his property which belongs to him by natural right. It would virtually destroy the concept of private property which, of its nature, is exclusive.

It was this concept of the enterprise — based upon the private juridical order of economic life — that prompted Pius XII to repudiate the contention that it was by nature a society determined by the rules of distributive justice with both owners and workers having the right to share in the property. In other words, the enterprise was not a society like the state whose leaders follow the rules of distributive justice in distributing what is common to the members of a society legally united together for a common objective. The implication is that if the enterprise was by nature a society like the state, then distributive justice which, according to St. Thomas, "is concerned with distributing common goods proportionately", would demand that all workers and owners receive their equitable share of all the

benefits and burdens of the "society".[60] Such a concept of the enterprise Pius XII declared to be erroneous because it is based upon the illusion that "every business belongs naturally within the sphere of public law" ("toute entreprise particulière rentre par nature dans la sphère du droit public").

Further on in this same discourse of 1949, the Pope made a special reference to co-management in the economic decisions of the enterprise: "the owner of the means of production," he said, "must always — within the limits of public economic law — retain control of his economic decisions."[61] This is a clear-cut repudiation of the contention that the worker in the enterprise has the right to share with the owner the power of economic decisions which is proper to him as the owner. It does not mean that the owners of the means of production destroy their right of ownership when they associate with the workers in putting their goods into

---

60 "[...] quae est distributiva communium secundum proportionalitatem." (Summa Theologiae, II-II, q. 61, a. 1.) In his Outlines of Moral Theology, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1953, p. 103, F.J. Connell defines distributive justice as that "which binds the community to render to members what is due them, and whose obligations rest on those who rule the community."

61 "Le propriétaire des moyens de production [...] doit toujours dans les limites du droit public de l'économie rester maître de ses décisions économiques." (Common Interests of Employers and Employees, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 285.)

the productive process. Nor does it mean that all the powers of economic decisions remain solely with those who own the means of production. The Pope specifically mentions that the owner is master of "his" economic decisions. Does this mean that the owner is the master only of his economic decisions and must concede to the worker the right to share in decisions that are proper to social and personnel aspects of the enterprise? This is a question that has stirred up considerable controversy.[62]

It seems that Pius XII was primarily concerned with the exaggerated demands for co-management in economic affairs, because this was the most extreme form under which these demands were presented and challenged in his time. But this did not mean that he accepted the natural right of co-management for other areas of the enterprise such as matters of technique and personnel arrangements. Indeed, he made no such distinction in the basic text quoted above. He simply denied the natural right of the worker to co-partnership without qualifying whether it was of the economic or non-

---

62 For the opinion of the Belgian professor, E. Defonghe, that the papal pronouncements exclude a strict right of co-responsibility only in questions of economic co-management, see: Jeremiah NEWMAN, Co-Responsibility in Industry, p. 18. Dr. Newman is of the opinion that papal teaching denies a strict right to co-responsibility of any kind (ibid., p. 18-19).

economic variety.[63]

In June 1950, the Holy Father once again issued an important statement on the dangers of compulsory co-management in private industry. Addressing the International Congress of Social Studies, he, first of all, condemned that type of forced co-management which would be exercised not by the workers of the enterprise itself, but rather by organizations outside of it like a committee of trade union representatives. In such a situation, he said, the working class would be "following the mistakes of capital".[64] "These mistakes," he continued, "consisted in withdrawing, particularly in very large companies, the management of the means of production from the personal responsibility of the private owner, whether individual or company, in order to transfer this management to the responsibility of anonymous corporate groups."[65] This type of capitalism, characterized by a

---

63 In the practical order, it seems very difficult to conceive of an economic decision merely affecting the goods of the owner without affecting the personnel of the enterprise. In other words the distinctions between economic, social, technical and personnel decisions in the administration of the enterprise are somewhat impractical because they are not mutually exclusive.

64 "[...] que la classe ouvrière suive à son tour les erremements du capital [...]" (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 486.)

65 "[...] qui [les erremements du capital] consistaient à soustraire, principalement dans les très grandes entreprises, la disposition des moyens de production à la responsabilité personnelle du propriétaire privé (individu ou société) pour la transférer sous la responsabilité de formes anonymes collectives." (Ibid., p. 486.)

complete separation between ownership and control of the enterprise, Pius XII deplored because it gravely endangered the concept of private property "as a means of stimulating initiative and of fixing responsibility in economic affairs."[66] Control of the business by groups representing the workers, but not attached to the enterprise itself, would be equally injurious to the true concept of private property. Thus, he continued:

> An equal danger arises when one insists that the wage earners in a company should have the right of economic co-management, especially when the exercise of this right is in fact subject directly or indirectly to organizations outside the company itself.[67]

With this statement, the Pope especially denounces compulsory co-management by the workers through the remote control of representative groups. This is not to be interpreted as an approval of forced co-management involving only the workers within the enterprise.

In the statement immediately following the above, he leaves no doubt as to his position on the natural right

---

66 "[...] pour favoriser les initiatives et fixer les responsabilités en matière d'économie." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 487.)

67 "Pareil danger se présente également lorsqu'on exige que les salariés, appartenant à une entreprise, aient le droit de cogestion économique, notamment quand l'exercice de ce droit relève, en fait, directement ou indirectement, d'organisations dirigées en dehors de l'entreprise." (Ibid.)

of economic co-management of whatever type, when it is based on a false concept of the enterprise as an institution of public law or on a false concept of the wage contract as essentially unjust and therefore demanding replacement by the contract of partnership. "Now neither the nature of the work contract," he said, "nor the nature of the business necessarily imply in themselves such a right."[68] As for the latter, he did not elaborate, very likely because he had covered this point in the text quoted above from the address of 1949. But in respect to the wage contract he made some significant additions. He continued:

> It is beyond all doubt that the wage earners and the employers are both subjects, not objects, of the economy of a nation. There can be no question of denying this parity [...] But at the same time, there is nothing in private-law-relationship, as these are governed by the simple wage contract, which contradicts this fundamental parity. The wisdom of our Predecessor, Pius XI, showed this clearly in the Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno" and accordingly he denies therein the intrinsic need of modifying the wage contract by a contract of partnership.[69]

---

68 "Or, ni la nature du contrat de travail, ni la nature de l'entreprise ne comportent nécessairement par elles-mêmes un droit de cette sorte." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 487.)

69 "Il est incontestable que le travailleur salarié et l'employeur sont également sujets, non pas objets, de l'économie d'un peuple. Il n'est pas question de nier cette parité; c'est un principe que la politique sociale a déjà fait valoir et qu'une politique organisée sur le plan professionnel ferait valoir plus efficacement encore. Mais il n'y a rien dans les rapports de droit privé, tels que les règle le simple contrat de salaire, qui soit en contradiction avec

The significance of this passage is that a worker does not necessarily degrade his fundamental dignity as a human person when he contracts to work for another and thus involves himself in the property of another. The work contract, of itself, does not reduce the worker to a mere piece of merchandise in the economy of the nation. As the agent and the end of the economic process, he still maintains his fundamental equality with the owner on the presumption that the conditions of the contract are just and in keeping with his dignity. From the Holy Father's statement that there was no intrinsic necessity of modifying the wage contract by a contract of partnership, it is not to be concluded that he ruled out its desirability on a voluntary basis or through the intervention of the state when the common good demands it. Indeed, he went on to commend the accomplishment in co-partnership mentioned by Pius XI. "This is not to deny," he said, "the usefulness of what has been achieved up to the present in this matter, in various ways, to the common advantage of employers and employees (Acta Ap. Sedis, Vol. 23, p. 199);" "but in the light of the principles and the facts," he concluded, "the

---

cette parité fondamentale. La sagesse de Notre Prédécesseur Pie XI l'a clairement montré dans l'Encyclique Quadragesimo Anno et, conséquemment il y nie la nécessité intrinsèque d'ajuster le contrat de travail sur le contrat de société." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 487.)

right to economic co-management, which is being claimed, is outside the sphere of these possible achievements."[70] It would seem from this statement that the achievements in co-management which Pius XI praised were not of the forced variety herein mentioned by Pius XII. It is significant to note, also, that the mention of the word "facts" as well as principles would indicate that Pius XII saw the practical disadvantages of economic co-management such as it was demanded in his time.

In an address delivered January 31, 1952, largely devoted to his positive doctrine on the reform of the enterprise, Pius XII mentioned, in passing, those promoting a reform in the structure of industry "by thinking primarily of juridical modifications among its members, be they businessmen or employees included in the business by virtue of the labour contract."[71] "These tendencies," he said,

---

70 "On ne méconnaît pas pour autant l'utilité de ce qui a été jusqu'ici réalisé en ce sens, de diverses manières au commun avantage des ouvriers et des propriétaires" (AAS 23 (1931), p. 199, Encyclique Quadragesimo Anno, Nos. 64-65); mais en raison des principes et des faits le droit de cogestion économique, que l'on réclame est hors du champ de ces possibles réalisations." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 487.) The reference is to the text of Pius XI, quoted above, wherein he advised modification of the work contract by a partnership contract "as is already being done in various ways and with no small advantage to workers and to owners."

71 "[...] pensano in primo luogo a modificazioni giuridiche fra quanti ne sono membri, siano essi imprenditori, o dipendenti incorporati nell'impressa in virtu del contratto di lavoro." (The Catholic Employer, Di tutto cuore, Jan. 31, 1952, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 13, p. 465.)

"do not, as they should, apply the incontestable norms of natural law to the changed conditions of our time, but exclude them."[72] He went on to say that, in the addresses of May 7, 1949, and June 3, 1950, he opposed these tendencies, "not to favor the material interests of one group over another, but rather to assure sincerity and tranquillity of conscience for all those to whom these problems apply."[73]

In his address to the Austrian Katholikentag, Sept. 14, 1952, Pius XII issued his final pronouncement on compulsory co-partnership, rejecting it as a legitimate reform of structure in the industrial enterprise precisely for the basic reason that it was at variance with the right of private property. As a solution to the social question of his time he mentioned the pursuit of two important aims: (1) the termination of the class struggle by an organic co-ordination of employer and employee, (2) the protection of the individual and the family against a process of absorption by the

---

72 "Alla Nostra considerazione non poterano però sfuggere le tendenze che in tale movimenti s'infiltrano, le quali non applicano come si addicele incontestabili norme del diritto naturale alle mutate condizioni del tempo, ma semplicemente le escludono." (The Catholic Employer, Di tutto cuore, Jan. 31, 1952, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 13, p. 465.)

73 "[...] non gia, veramente, per favorire gl'interessi materiali di un gruppo piuttosto che di un altro, ma per assicurare la sincerità e la tranquilità di coscienza a tutti coloro cui questi problemi si referiscono." (Ibid.)

state.[74] "It is for this reason," he said, "that Catholic social teaching, besides other things, so emphatically champions the right of the individual to own property."[75] He continued:

> Herein also lie the deeper motives why the pontiffs of the social encyclicals, and also we ourselves, have declined to declare directly or indirectly, from the labour contract the right of the employee to participate in the operating capital and its corollary the right of the worker to participate in decisions concerning operations of the plant (Mitbestimmung). This had to be denied because, behind this question, there stands that greater problem, the right of the individual and of the family to own property, which stems immediately from the human person: it is a right of personal dignity; a right to be sure, accompanied by social obligations; a right, however, not merely a social function.[76]

This text constitutes a magnificent defence of private property and the importance of keeping it intact against a subtle attack threatening to undermine it. Assuredly, the idea of

---

74 To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 792.

75 "Deshalb setzt die katholische Soziallehre sich neben anderem so bewusst ein für das Recht des Einzelmenschen auf Eigentum." (Ibid.)

76 "Hier liegen auch die tieferen Gründe, weshalb die Päpste der sozialen Enzykliken und Wir Selbst es verneint haben, aus der Natur des Arbeitsvertrags das Miteigentumsrecht des Arbeiters am Betriebskapital und daraus folgend sein Mitbestimmungsrecht, sei es direkt, sei es indirekt, abzuleiten. Es musste verneint werden, weil dahinter jenes grössere Problem sich auftut. Das Recht des Einzelnen und der Familie auf Eigentum ist ein unmittelbarer Ausfluss des Personseins, ein Recht der persönlichen Würde, freilich ein mit sozialen Verpflichtungen behaftetes Recht; es ist aber nicht lediglich eine soziale Funktion." (Ibid.)

co-partnership is a good one, but not when it endangers the very institution ordained to procure for the human person the benefits of managing one's own property. In this text, the Holy Father clearly indicates that the right of property is devoid of meaning unless it includes the right of exclusive personal management, but always subject to the social function which it essentially entails. He implies that there is a world of difference between saying that private property is a social function and that it has a social function. He was explicit in stating that it is a personal function accompanied by a social function. This was the fundamental reason why he could not condone the idea of the worker claiming co-ownership or co-management of the enterprise simply because he worked there.

Again, it is important to note that the Pope did not exclude other arrangements that would enable the worker to be at home and not a stranger at the scene of his work, to develop and not to degrade himself in the productive process. Suffice it to mention here two of his pronouncements which typify his endorsement of co-partnership between workers and owners as basic in the structure he envisioned for the large productive unit of property — the industrial enterprise. In the message of 1944, he said: "Where big business even today shows itself more productive, there should be given the possibility of tempering the labor contract with the

contract of society."[77] His message to the Catholic employers and workers of Spain was along the same lines:

> She [the Church] regards with approval and favors everything which, within the limits permitted by circumstances aims at introducing the elements of a partnership contract (contrato de sociedad) into the wage contract (contrato trabajo), and better the general conditions of the worker. The Church, likewise, counsels all to use whatever contributes towards making relations between employer and workers more human, more Christian and more conducive to mutual confidence.[78]

With these statements, the Pope makes it clear that there is a type of co-partnership between owner and the workers which ought to be promoted and encouraged by every legitimate means. "Our Holy Father Pope Pius XII," wrote Monsignor Montini, Pro-secretary of State in 1952, "has many times referred to the juridico-social position of the workers

---

77 "Dove la grande azienda ancor oggi si manifesta maggiormente produttiva, deve essere offerta la possibilità di temperare il contratto di lavoro con un contratto di società." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

78 "Ella ve con buenos ojos y aun fomenta todo aquello que, dentro delo que permiten las circunstancias, tiende a introducir elementos del contrato de sociedad en el contrato de trabajo y mejora la condición general del trabajador. La Iglesia exhorta igualmente a todo que contribuye a que las relaciones entre patronos y obreros sean más humanas, más cristianas y estén animadas de mutua confianza." (The Church's Concern for Economic Life, Amadísimo hijos, March 11, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 215.) See also Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 284; Letter to Mr. Charles Flory, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 622.

in industry, accurately distinguishing what belongs within the sphere of natural law, from that which forms part of the aspirations of the working class and which can consequently be pursued by legitimate means as an ideal."[79] This text is from a letter by the then Msgr. Montini, now Pope Paul VI, written to Archbishop Siri of Genoa on the occasion of the twenty-fifth Italian Social Week at Turin in September 1956. In it he presented, what may well be called, an official commentary on the question of co-partnership in the documents of Pius XII. He cleared up some controverted points as to precisely what the Pope rejected and what he encouraged as desirable.[80] After quoting from the Holy Father's address on June 3, 1950, he wrote:

---

79 Letter of Msgr. Montini to the Archbishop of Genoa, Sept. 22, 1952, Osservatore Romano, Sept. 22-23, 1952. English version in Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII (and a letter of His Excellency Msgr. Montini), Huntingdon, Indiana, Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1953, p.34-40.)

80 For a compact critical analysis of the difference of opinion in respect to Pius XII documents on co-management see: Jeremiah NEWMAN, Co-Responsibility in Industry, p. 15-19. In a footnote, page 19, the author thus states the source of the confusion, quoting as an authoritative reference: I. BOWERS, "Le problème de la cogestion", in Bulletin social des industriels, Dec. 1953 and Jan. 1954: "The controversies on this matter show a tendency to confuse two different questions, one is the question as to whether the granting of a right to workers to participate in economic co-management can be allowed at all on Catholic principles; the other is whether there is a strict natural right to its introduction. The first poses no great difficulty, especially when the granting is done by voluntary action [...] It is important to note that the two questions are extremely different."

> A true right of the workers to co-management cannot therefore be conceded as axiomatic. But this fact does not prohibit employers from having the laborer participate in some fashion and some degree in management, just as it does not prevent the State from conferring upon labour the right to make its voice heard in the administrative management of certain definite affairs and in certain definite cases where the extraordinary power of anonymous capital, when left to itself, manifestly harms the community.[85]

In this interpretation of Pius XII's doctrine, Msgr. Montini made an explicit point of declaring that it is within the power of the state to confer on the workers the right of co-management in certain defined cases where the common good demands it. The mere mention of such restrictions indicates that it would be wrong for the state to force co-management on industry as a whole. Obviously, this would be tantamount to excessive nationalization. It would be contrary to the Holy Father's emphatic insistence that private industry is to be governed not by public law but by private law.

From the foregoing critical analysis of Pius XII's sentiments on the subject of forced and centralized co-partnership, as a proposal to reform the structure of the large productive unit of property, the following conclusions may serve to summarize his judgement on this question:

---

85 Letter of Msgr. Montini to the Archbishop of Genoa, loc. cit.

(1) He makes a clear distinction between co-partnership of the voluntary variety which is to be promoted, and co-partnership of the forced variety which he repudiates.

(2) Voluntary co-partnership is to be commended because it extends the personal benefits of private property by contributing to the development of the worker's personality.

(3) He repudiates the claim to the right of co-management based on the false assumption that the wage contract of its nature creates ownership or co-partnership in the enterprise. The enforcement of such a claim would render nugatory the right of private property.

(4) He rejects the claim to the right of co-management on the false assumption that the enterprise is by nature primarily a society of public law governed by the rules of distributive justice. This contention is equally at variance with the right of private property.

(5) He made a special point of condemning compulsory co-management centralized in organizations outside the company itself. This would distort the concept of private property by separating ownership from control, and this conduces to the evils associated with anonymous capitalism.

(6) His major concern was with rejecting the false claims for economic co-management around which centered the controversies of his time.

(7) He repudiated the idea of indiscriminate co-management imposed on industry by the state. He supported the right of the state to confer co-management on the workers in definite cases when the extraordinary powers of anonymous capital left to itself would be detrimental to the common good.

CHAPTER IV

THE ROLE OF THE ECONOMY AND OF THE FORMS OF OWNERSHIP IN THE DIFFUSION OF PROPERTY

The foregoing chapter served to demonstrate that Pius XII applied his social teachings to contemporary movements threatening to undermine the personal and social function of private property. He pronounced moral judgement on individualist capitalism, exaggerated nationalization and forced co-ownership and co-management in the industrial enterprise. Judgements of this kind usually constitute the second level of papal intervention in the economic order.[1] The first level — the reformulation and refinement of the moral principles governing economic life — was the burden of the previous chapter. The third level — the Pope's judgement on the forms and factors combining to realize a just order in economic life — shall be the task of this and the following chapters; in our frame of reference, restricted as it is to the problems of ownership in the economic order, this constitutes for the most part, the specific proposals and directives which could be considered

---

1 For an analysis with examples from the social encyclicals to illustrate the various levels of papal intervention see: Jean VILLAIN, S.J., L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, Paris, Spes, 1953, Vol. 1, p. 27-34, and J.F. CRONIN, Catholic Social Principles, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1950, p. 59-61.

as the Pope's practical program for the diffusion of property.[2]

The order of presenting these factors shall follow the plan of Pius' basic document on property, that of Pentecost, June 1, 1941. This shall be supplemented by

---

2 For the permanent and basic solution to the problem of a just social and economic order, Pius XII emphasized the paramount role of the Christian spirit expressed in the practice of justice and charity among all men. In Summi Pontificatus, 1939 (Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 31 (1939), p. 413-453), he pointed out that the fundamental cause of economic miseries is a lack of moral conviction and can be cured only from a renewal of spiritual energies originating with Christ and made manifest through the practice of justice inspired by charity:

"For true though it is that the evils from which mankind suffers today come in part from economic instability and from the struggle of interests regarding a more equal distribution of the goods which God has given as a means of sustenance and progress, it is not less true that their root is deeper and more intrinsic, belonging to the sphere of religious belief and moral convictions which have been perverted by the progressive alienation of the peoples from that unity of doctrine, faith, customs and morals which once was promoted by the tireless and beneficient work of the Church. If it is to have any effect, the re-education of mankind must be, above all things, spiritual and religious. Hence, it must proceed from Christ as from its indispensable foundation; must be actuated by justice and crowned by charity."

In his Easter message of peace, 1939 (AAS, 31, p. 149), he underlined the importance of the role of charity joined with justice in effecting enduring tranquillity in the social order; without a brotherly bond between strict justice and charity, he warned, the eye of the mind is clouded and, therefore, fails to discern the rights of another. In Sertum Laetitiae, 1939 (AAS, 31, p. 642), his first major reference to the problem of property distribution, he stressed the vital role of charity united with justice: "the fundamental point of the social question is this, that the goods created by God for all men should in the same way reach all, justice guiding, charity helping." In 1951

many other pronouncements clarifying and expanding his reform program in keeping with the changing times of his long pontificate. On the basis of this analysis, Pius XII's positive program for the distribution of property shall be presented under the following headings: (1) the role of the national economy and its forms, (2) the role of the state, the subject for the next chapter. Because Pius XII's approach to the whole economic and social question is a multiple and integrated one, it is not possible to consider each factor completely in isolation from the other. As a

---

(AAS, 43, p. 215), he told the workers and employers of Spain that a just distribution of wealth can only be achieved by men of virtue who live their faith, renounce luxury and prudently fulfill their duties in the Spirit of Christ. In 1952 (AAS, 44, p. 620-621), the whole tenor of his message to the Semaines Sociales of France proclaimed the need of a more equitable distribution of wealth depending mainly on the virtue of those who own. At the outset of his solution to the problem of wealth and poverty, he reminded the conference that the teaching of revelation on riches, detachment and the spirit of poverty gives soul, inspiration and a new dimension to all the efforts to bring justice to the economic order. In 1956 (Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 604-605), he intimated that a well-distributed regime of private property is conditioned not solely by economic or materialistic solidarity but especially by a unity of Christian spirit and brotherhood as the only climate in which the goods of the world can be effectively used to the advantage of all: "Society's proper balance has its surest basis in a moral order which is inspired not by cold calculating logic conceived exclusively with the equitable distribution of material goods, but rather by justice and generous charity, by the example of Christ, which is to say, by that generous love, which entails forgetfulness of self, renunciation, and sacrifice."

consequence there must be considerable overlapping in the above order of presentation. A further observation in connection with this plan is the fact that at no time does the Holy Father advocate a system that is purely of the economic and technical order. Reiterating the teaching of Leo XIII and Pius XI on the competence of the Church to speak authoritatively on the social question, he spoke thus in the discourse of June 1, 1941:

> He [Leo XIII] had no intention of laying down guiding principles on the purely practical, we might say technical, side of the social structure; for he was well aware of the fact — as our immediate Predecessor of saintly memory, Pius XI, pointed out ten years ago in the commemorative Encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno — that the Church does not claim such a mission.[3]

To acquire that sufficiency of material wealth necessary to live as a human being should, is the direct and immediate duty of the individual person. "Man has in truth the entirely personal duty to preserve and order to perfection his material and spiritual life," Pius XII expostulated in the basic address of Pentecost 1941.[4] But

---

3 "Non già che egli intendesse di stabilire norme sul lato puramente pratico, diremmo quasi tecnico, della costituzione sociale; perchè ben sapeva e gli era evidente, — e il Nostro Predecessore di s.m. Pio XI lo ha dichiarato or è un decennio nella sua Enciclica commemorativa Quadragesimo anno — che la Chiesa non si attribuisce tale missione." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 196.)

4 "Spetta invero all'uomo il dovere del tutto personale di conservare e ravviare a perfezionamento la sua

no man is an island. Hence the Holy Father insisted on the necessity of an organized community and its authority to facilitate and to safeguard the fulfillment of personal rights and duties. Vital as it is, the state is not the sole guardian of human rights; it is not the only responsible factor in providing the conditions necessary to facilitate the realization of the universal right to the use of material goods. Pius XII assigned a greater share of the burden to all the citizens in their united and organized efforts to administer the resources of the nation so as to satisfy the economic needs of all in keeping with human dignity. This he referred to as the national economy.[5]

Discussing the factors in the distribution of wealth in his letter on this subject to the Semaines Sociales of France, he said that "this basic distribution is originally and normally brought about by virtue of the continuous

---

vita materiale e spirituale." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941) p. 200.)

5 The bearing of the national economy on the diffusion of property will be the terms of reference in this chapter. For a more extensive treatment of Pius XII's concept of the national economy see: Marcel CLEMENT, L'Economie sociale selon Pie XII (Synthèse doctrinale), Paris, Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1953, passim; Emile GUERRY, The Social Doctrine of the Church, trans. from French by Marian Hederman, New York, St. Paul's Publications, p. 114-201.

dynamism of the social economic process."[6] Further on, in the letter, he wrote:

> To meet the demands of social life, such a distribution cannot be left to the free play of blind economic forces, but must be viewed on the level of the national economy, since it is on that level that one gets a clear picture of the aim which should be pursued in the service of the common temporal good.[7]

Such an economy — in which all would participate and, with one objective end, for which all would strive — was for Pius XII the ideal instrument to realize true prosperity for all the citizens. To develop his thougnt on this ideal economy, relative to the diffusion of property, shall constitute the task of the first section of this chapter. But this ideal must be realized in the economy of the contemporary world. It is true, Pius XII severely judged that world: "The great misery of the social order is that it is neither deeply Christian nor truly human, but only technical and economic," he lamented in an address to a group of

---

6 "Cette distribution de base se réalise originairement et normalement en vertu du dynamisme continuel du processus économique et social." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 621.)

7 "Pour répondre aux exigences de la vie sociale, elle ne saurait être abandonnée au libre jeu des forces économiques aveugles, mais doit être envisagée au niveau de l'économie nationale, car c'est là que se prend une claire vision de la fin à poursuivre, au service du bien commun temporel." (Ibid., p. 622-623.)

businessmen in 1952.[8] But it is also true that he offered his own proposals as to what form the economy should assume so as to realize widespread ownership for all. Hence the second section of this chapter shall be devoted to an analysis of these proposals.

I. THE IDEAL NATIONAL ECONOMY AND THE DIFFUSION OF PROPERTY

It was in the 1941 Pentecost address where Pius XII first revealed the essential lines of his teaching on the national economy. This was in connection with the factors necessary to assist the person in fulfilling the right to the use of things material. The duties of the state was his first consideration. Following this, he immediately proceeded to define the role of the national economy:

> Likewise the national economy, as it is the product of the men who work together in the community of the State, has no other end than to secure without interruption the material conditions in which the individual life of the citizens may fully develop.[9]

---

8 "La grande miseria dell'ordine sociale è che esso non è profondamente cristiano ne realmente umano, ma unicamente tecnico ed economico." (The Catholic Employer, Di tutto cuore, Jan. 31, 1952, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 13, p. 465.

9 "Anche l'economia nazionale, com'è frutto dell'attività di uomini che lavorano uniti nella comunità statale, così ad altro non mira che ad assicurare senza interrompimento le condizioni materiali, in cui possa svilupparsi pienamente la vita individuale dei cittadini." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.)

The content of this text lends itself to the development of the main lines of thought in the Pope's concept of the national economy with reference to the equitable distribution of wealth. He states what the goal of that economy must be and who are to be responsible for its achievement. Under these two headings our investigation shall proceed. Other pronouncements on the subject shall be introduced as occasion arises.

A. The Goal of the Economy

The Pope's statement, to the effect that the national economy has "no other end" than to provide the "material conditions" necessary for the personal development of all, explicitly affirms the primacy of the economy in administering to the economic needs of all its citizens. The statement is simple and direct; but its implications are far-reaching. First, the economy is not to provide directly for the welfare of the individual. But it is to provide the material conditions whereby each and every person may live honorably. Its role is, therefore, none other than to provide for the common temporal good.[10]

---

10 In his letter to the Semaines Sociales of France (July 7, 1952, in AAS 44, p. 623), referred to immediately above, Pius XII made it explicit that the common temporal good was the proper mission of the national economy.

Secondly, the economy is not for the benefit of a few privileged, but is to serve all. It is, as he stated more explicitly in a speech on international trade in 1948, "to establish in a stable manner, for all members of society the material conditions required for the development of their cultural and religious life."[11] It is, therefore, not to be a closed economy, confined to securing the needs of its own citizens, but rather open to all nations in a spirit of solidarity.[12]

Thirdly, it is not to be an economy primarily orientated towards quantitative increases of material production or the accumulation of profits, rather it is to secure for all the people what they need to live humanly even though the gross national productivity is not impressive. The Holy Father elaborated on this point immediately

---

11 "E di mettere, in una maniera stabile, alla portata di tutti i membri della società le condizioni materiali richieste per l'incremento della loro vita culturale e spirituale." (Christian Principles of International Trade, Il desidero, March 7, 1948, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 10, p. 12.)

12 This characteristic of the national economy was developed and documented in Chapter II under Pius XII's teaching on the international phase of an equitable distribution of wealth. His concept of an open, international economy was made explicit in the Christmas Message of 1941 (AAS, 34, p. 17), the Christmas Message of 1952 (AAS, 45, p. 40), and the Christmas Message of 1954 (AAS, 47, p. 21).

after his brief statement on the nature of the economy. In his discourse of Pentecost 1941, he went on to say:

> From this, beloved children, it will be easy for you to conclude that the economic riches of a people do not properly consist of the abundance of goods, measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members. If such a just distribution of goods were not secured, or were affected only imperfectly, the real scope of national economy would not be attained; for, although there were at hand a lucky abundance of goods to dispose of, the people, in not being called upon to share them, would not be economically rich, but poor. Suppose, on the other hand, that such distribution is effective genuinely and permanently and you will see a people, even if it disposes of less goods, making itself economically sound.
>
> These fundamental concepts regarding the riches and poverty of peoples, it seems to Us particularly opportune to set before you today, when there is a tendency to measure and judge such riches and poverty by balance sheets and by purely quantitative criteria of the need or the redundance of goods.[13]

---

13 "Dal che, diletti figli, vi tornerà agevole scorgere che la ricchezza economica di un popolo non consiste propriamente nell'abbondanza dei beni, misurata secondo un computo puro e pretto materiale del loro valore, bensi in ciò che tale abbondanza rappresenti e porga realmente ed efficacemente la base materiale bastevole al debito sviluppo personale dei suoi membri. Se una simile giusta distribuzione dei beni non fosse attuata o venisse procurata solo imperfettamente, non si raggiungerebbe il vero scopo dell'economia nazionale; giacchè, per quanto soccorresse una fortunata abbondanza di beni disponibili, il popolo, non chiamato a parteciparne, non sarebbe economicamente ricco, ma povero. Fate invece che tale giusta distribuzione sia effettuata realmente e in maniera durevole, e vedrete un popolo, anche disponendo di minori beni, farsi ed essere economicamente sano.

Questi concetti fondamentali, riguardanti la ricchezza e la povertà dei popoli, Ci sembra particolarmente

Here he advocates an abundance of goods in the economy, when they provide an effective material base for the personal and social development of all the citizens. But he rejects the concept of an economy confined in its scope to the highest productivity, unevenly distributed. In his address to the Catholic International Congress for Social Study, he came right to the point when he said that production must give ground to the consuming needs of the public: "the duty pressing for attention is the judicious adjustment of production to consumption on the basis of human needs and human dignity."[14] This unambiguous statement leaves no doubt that the whole process of production, in its methods and output, must yield to the right of all to live in dignity and thus realize the objective goal of the national economy. But, who are responsible to make this goal a reality? Can it be realized by the disjointed efforts of the multitude or is organization required? If organization, must it be regimentation, or is there a chance

---

opportuno porre innanzi alla vostra considerazione oggi, quando si è inclinati a misurare e giudicare tale ricchezza e povertà con bilance e con criteri semplicemente quantitativi, sia della ridondanza dei beni." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200-201.)

14 "Devant le devoir pressant, dans le domaine de l'économie sociale, de proportionner la production à la consommation, sagement mesurée aux besoins et à la dignité de l'homme [...]" (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 488.)

for the individual to express his freedom in the economic process towards a common goal? For Pius XII's answer to the problems, implicit in these questions, we now turn our attention.

B. The Agents of the Economy.

In the basic text of the 1941 address, the Pope answers the above question, without elaborating on details: "The national economy [...] is the product of the men who work together in the community of the state" ("L'economia nazionale [...] è frutto dell'attività di uomini che lavorano uniti nella comunità statale"). Enough is said here to indicate that the goal of the economy will be realized as a result of the united, responsible efforts of all within a developed political society. In other words, not only is the economy for all the people, but it must be by all the people, a truly democratic economy centered on the human person as its end and agent. That the individual must assume the responsibility and be given the opportunity to develop his personality in shaping the structure of a true national economy, is a constantly recurring theme with Pius XII. "The human person represents not only the purpose of the economy but is its most important element," he told a

congress of Catholic employers' associations in 1955.[15] In 1948, to an audience of Catholic Actionists, he declared that the heart of the solution to the social question was the restoration of order to a disordered economy; this could be achieved only by a universal effort to prevent people from becoming mere objects deprived of their rights and exposed to the exploitation of others; he finally appealed for a united effort to assure that "all, instead, will be subjects, that is having a legitimate share in the function of the social order."[16]

The pilot text of 1941 furthermore implies that the goal of the economy is not to be attained by individuals working in isolation from each other; on the contrary, it is to be achieved by the united efforts of the multitude directed to the same end. In another major pronouncement on the national economy, Pius XII elaborated this very idea. To a convention on international trade in 1948, he said:

---

15 "[...] la persona umana, come è il fine della economia così ne il più importante motore." (The Catholic Employer, Avete tenuto, June 5, 1955, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 16, p. 120.)

16 "[...] tutti siano anche soggetto, vale a dire legittimamente partecipi alla formazione dell'ordine sociale" (Address to Young Men, Nel vedere, Sept. 12, 1948, in AAS, 40 (1948), p. 412.)

> Economic life means social life. The purpose of economic life to which its very nature tends and to which individuals are equally bound to help in the different spheres of their activity, is to establish in a stable manner for all members of society, the material conditions required for the development of their religious and cultural life.[17]

Here he calls for a blending of social action with individual action in the functioning of a genuine economy. He situates economic life within the genus of social life. It, therefore, must comply with that type of unity which he called for in the supreme society of the human race; in Summi Pontificatus he so described that unity:

> In the light of this unity of all mankind which exists in law and in fact individuals do not feel themselves isolated units, like grains of sand, but feel united by the very force of their nature and by their internal destiny, into an organic, harmonious mutual relationship which varies with the changing of the times.[18]

---

17 "Chi dice vita economica, dice vita sociale. Lo scopo a cui essa tende per la sua stessa natura, e a cui gli individui sono egualmente obbligati di servire nelle diverse forme della loro attività, è di mettere, in una maniera stabile, alla portata di tutti i membri della società le condizioni materiali richieste per l'incremento della loro vita culturale e spirituale." (Christian Principles of International Trade, Il desidero, March 7, 1948, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 10, p. 12.)

18 "Quamobrem, si hanc iure ac reapse datam totius humani generis unitatem intente consideramus, non seiuncti nobis singuli cives, quasi arenarum grana, videntur, sed inter se potius apto compositoque ordine ac mutua variaque ob temporum diversitatem necessitudine congregati ex naturali ac superna impulsione destinationeque." (Encyclical Letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 428.)

To return to the text of 1948, another point emphasized is that all individuals are bound to procure the common goal of the economy according to their function in the economic process, "in the different spheres of their activity" (nelle diverse forme della loro attività). Surely the implication is that they are not to be regimented in their organized contribution to the development of the economic process. On the contrary, all are free to work out their economic destiny within the limits of the common temporal goal. The fact that the economy has one natural end, to which all are subject, does not remove the underlying multiplicity of economic agents under free enterprise. In the mind of Pius XII the economy is rather the product of men acting freely and responsibly in their varied functions within economic life. In other words, the economy is the result of a socially orientated free enterprise. This was the teaching that he underlined in his speech to the International Association of Catholic Employers' Associations in 1949, when he issued a stern warning against any trend to make nationalization "the normal rule for the public organization of the economy" ("la règle normale de l'organisation publique de l'économie").

> The economy is not by its nature an institution of the state any more than are other branches of human activity; it is, on the contrary, the living product of the free initiative of individuals and

of their freely formed association.[19]

He made it equally clear that the administration of the economic process was not to be the product of mechanistic laws conceived by the socially irresponsible freedom promoted by economic liberalism. "To meet the demands of social life, such a distribution cannot be left to the free play of blind economic forces", he wrote in the letter to the Semaines Sociales of France in 1952.[20] "So the Church," he wrote in concluding this letter, "taking a position midway between the errors of liberalism and statism invites you to pursue your investigations along the course she has many times set forth for you."[21] For Pius XII, this course for the organization of the economy was imbedded in the very nature of things designed to enhance individual freedom under the law of the common temporal good.

---

19 "L'économie — pas plus d'ailleurs qu'aucune autre branche d'activité humaine — n'est pas de sa nature une institution de l'Etat; elle est, à l'inverse, le produit vivant de la libre initiative des individus et de leurs groupes librement constitués." (Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949) p. 285.) Emphasis added.

20 "Pour répondre aux exigences de la vie sociale, elle [une saine distribution des biens] ne saurait être abandonnée au libre jeu des forces économiques aveugles." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 622-623.) Emphasis added.

21 "Ainsi, à égale distance des erreurs du libéralisme et de l'étatisme, l'Eglise vous invite, elle, à poursuivre vos recherches dans la voie qu'elle a maintes fois tracée." (Ibid., p. 623.)

To conclude this section, suffice it to say that the foregoing pronouncements combine to delineate the principles governing the ideal national economy in respect to the diffusion of property. But for Pius XII, principles, with all their permanent value, were but beginnings as they were meant to be. They were not to be confined to a vacuum, but applied to the contemporary forms of economic activity. Hence, to make the national economy the effective instrument in the distribution of property that it was meant to be, he called for action. He called for the creation of conditions, in the economic order, conducive to the flourishing of the forms of property most adaptable to the satisfaction of personal values and a more even distribution of the earth's resources. What these forms were, is the question to be answered forthwith.

II. THE FORMS OF PROPERTY IN THE IDEAL NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Christmas message of 1942 drew attention to the vital function of a social order that would make some form of private property accessible to all. In connection with the demands arising from the moral dignity of work, Pius XII said:

> These exigencies include, besides a just wage which covers the needs of the worker and his family, the conservation and perfection of a social order which will make possible an assured, even if modest, private property for all classes of society.[22]

This strong statement leaves no doubt that the social order should be structured so as to permit the largest possible number to have access to some type of property, modest though it may be. The inference is that there are several types of property. What they are, the Pope does not spell out in this passage. But in another vigorous statement from the address of September 1, 1944, he recognizes the two distinct forms of property described by the economists: consumable goods, primarily destined for use, and productive capital goods from which the owner derives income:

> The Christian conscience cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders impossible or nugatory in practice, the natural right to property, whether over consumptive goods or the means of production.[23]

---

22 "Queste esigenze comprendono, oltre ad un salario giusto, sufficente alla necessità dell'operaio e della famiglia, la conservazione ed il perfezionamento di un ordine sociale, che renda possibile una sicura, se pur modesta proprietà privata a tutti i ceti del popolo." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 20.)

23 "La coscienza cristiana non può ammettere come giusto un ordinamento sociale che o nega in massima o rende praticamente impossibile o vano il diritto naturale di proprietà, così sui beni di consumo come sui mezzi di produzione." "The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.) Emphasis added.

This is obviously a rejection of the communist economic philosophy based on collective ownership, especially of capital goods.[24]

An equitable division of consumable material possessions, as basic in the satisfaction of human needs, naturally assumes importance in Pius XII's pronouncements for reform in the economy. This follows from the primacy he attributes to the right of all to the use of the world's material resources. But it is the category of productive property to which he most frequently refers, undoubtedly because of the complex problems surrounding its equitable distribution in modern society. In this connection, two types of

---

24 Msgr. E. GUERRY, in his synthesis of The Social Doctrine of the Church (p. 83, 84), makes the observation based on documentation, that there is an increasing tendency in collectivist regimes to recognize the right to a certain amount of private property even in capital possessions; he quotes this statute from the socialist International of 1951: "The socialist International recognizes that socialist planning is compatible with the continuation of private ownership in certain important sectors, and particularly in small and medium-sized industries." (Op. cit., p. 83, footnote 14). Gustav Gundlach, S.J., sees no reason to be enthusiastic about this trend. In "Communism as an Economic System", in Richard E. MULCAHEY, S.J. (ed.), Readings in Economics, Westminster, Md., Newman Press, 1959, p. 297-309, he significantly notes that an empirical approach is quite useless in attempts to define the economic philosophy of communism. His thesis is that communism, while accepting private ownership in individual cases, denies it as a social institution of the natural law. He solidly justifies his position: "Private property legally exists today in the economic system of Russian Communism. It is true, however, that in the present-day-Russia we are dealing with a communism on the march, and not with a pure form of communism.

possessions are discernible in his documents and he evaluates them accordingly: small-scale property and large-scale property. Hence, within our frame of reference, three categories of property shall be examined: (A) consumable, (B) small-scale productive, and (C) large-scale productive.

A. Consumable Property.

Pius XII was acutely aware of the vast number within the economy — both national and international — who were without the means to satisfy their most fundamental needs: food, clothing, shelter, education and medical treatment.[25] Confronted with this anomaly, little wonder that he appealed for an economy that would ensure, at least, the permanent satisfaction of man's basic needs. In 1949, he called upon the International Labour Organization to actively

---

It is also true that private property in Russia exists only as a concession of the State, which may be revoked at any time, since private property is not considered as a social institution of natural law and has no existence as such." (Op. cit., p. 299.)

25 Typical was his studied observation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations when he referred to the problems arising from the situation, where seventy percent of the peoples of the world were underfed. (Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 15, p. 496.) For other references see the introductory chapter of this dissertation.

participate in structuring an economy that would solve the world-wide crisis in the shortage of housing facilities; he called for an economy "which should adjust itself to man's fundamental needs".[26] To a congress of Italian workers, he noted the urgency of meeting such basic needs and so listed them: "necessities there are, of course, which must be met urgently: food, clothes and housing; the children's education; wholesome recreation for soul and body."[27]

In addition to the above statements on consumable goods in general, Pius XII singled out the homestead as the preeminent form of private property. This in the language of the economists, is consumable property of the durable variety. It was the only kind of property referred to in the basic document of Pentecost 1941. In the context of developing the family-argument for private property, the Pope said:

> Of all the goods that can be the object of private property, none is more conformable to nature, according to the teaching of Rerum Novarum, than the land, the holding in which the family lives, and

---

26 "Une économie [...] qui se règle sur les besoins primordiaux des hommes" (Housing Problems, Voyez Messieurs, March 25, 1949, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 11, p. 20.)

27 "Senza dubbio, vi sono necessità che debbono essere urgentemente soddisfatte: gli alimenti, il vestito, l'abitazione, l'educazione del figli, il sano ristoro per l'anima e per il corpo." (Christian Principles in Labour, Eccovi ancora, June 29, 1948, in AAS, 40 (1948), p. 335.)

> from the products of which it draws all or part of its subsistence. And it is in the spirit of the Rerum Novarum to state that, as a rule, only that stability which is rooted in one's own holding, makes of the family the vital and most perfect and fecund cell of society, joining up in a brilliant manner in its progressive cohesion the present and future generations. If today, the concept and the creation of vital spaces is at the centre of social and political aims, should not one, before all else, think of the vital space of the family and free it of the fetters of conditions which do not permit one even to formulate the idea of a homestead of one's own?[28]

Here it would seem that the living space he refers to should include, as a minimum, a home and a plot of land. Of course he attributes the highest value to this living space when, from it, the total or partial income of the owner is derived. In that case, it would take on the dimension of productive property, the subject of our next topic. At any rate, the text puts the focus on the homestead as a superior form of

---

28 "Fra tutti i beni che possono esser oggetto di proprietà privata nessuno è più conforme alla natura, secondo l'insegnamento della Rerum novarum, di quanto è il terreno, il podere, in cui abita la famiglia, e dai cui frutti trae interamente o almeno in parte il di che vivere. Ed è nello spirito della Rerum novarum l'affermare che di regola, solo quella stabilità, che si radica in un proprio podere, fa della famiglia la cellula vitale più perfetta e feconda della società, riunendo splendidamente con la sua progressiva coesione le generazioni presenti e future. Se oggi il concetto e la creazione di spazi vitali è al centro delle mete sociali e politiche, non si dovrebbe forse, avanti ogni cosa, pensare allo spazio vitale della famiglia liberanda dai legami di condizioni, che non permettono neppure la formazione dell'idea di un proprio casolare?" (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 202-203.)

private property because it enables the family to live in keeping with the freedom and independence which it must have to fulfill its mission to itself and to society.

In the Christmas address of 1942, the Holy Father repeated the urgency of widespread family property specifically in the form of home ownership. Among the duties he enjoined upon those who would reconstruct a peaceful social order was that of providing the conditions to enable the family to live as an economic, spiritual and moral unity. To this end, he made a universal appeal:

> He [who would have the Star of Peace shine out and stand over society] should strive to secure for every family a dwelling where a material and morally healthy family life may be seen in all its vigor and wonder.[29]

Again, in his address to the Italian workers in 1943, he specified "a dwelling worthy of human being", as a fundamental prerequisite for personal and family needs.[30] To the women of Italian Catholic Action, he said that social justice demanded conditions to facilitate accession to houses necessary for all.[31] To the Catholic international congress

---

29 "[...] pensi a procurare ad ogni famiglia un focolare, dove una vita familiare, sana materialmente e moralmente, riesca a dimostrarsi nel suo vigore e valore." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 20.)

30 "[...] un abitazione degna di persona umana" (The Church and Labour, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 175.)

31 Woman's Apostolate, Per quanto legittima, July 24, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 418-419.

for social study and social action, he left no doubt as to the priority and the urgency of familial property for all, in the form of living space consonant with human dignity:

> The time has come to face squarely in its full dimensions, the duty of providing for countless families, in their natural, moral, juridical and economic unity, a just living space which meet, however modestly but at the very least in sufficient measure, the demands of human dignity.[32]

From the content of the above statements, it is evident that Pius XII attributes importance to the necessity of an economic order in which all will have the possibility of aspiring to, at least, the ownership of consumer goods especially homes and other durable possession. To be noted is that he does not explicitly mention productive goods when he speaks of the necessity of private ownership.[33]

---

32 "Il faut regarder bien en face, dans toute son ampleur, le devoir de donner à d'innombrables familles, dans leur unité naturelle, morale, juridique, économique, un juste espace vital répondant, fût-ce dans une mesure modeste, mais tout au moins suffisante, aux exigences de la dignité humaine." (Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 485-486.) Other passages from Pius XII's documents refer to the duty of the state in favoring both private and cooperative housing projects (Nov. 21, 1953, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi Vol. 15, p. 478), and to the duty of society, especially welfare organization, to eliminate the exploitation of slum areas by helping the victims to help themselves in acquiring adequate housing facilities (May 3, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 352-354).

33 The strongest statement of any papal document on the necessity of private ownership of property for all was that of Pope Pius XII in his Christmas message of 1942: "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come

The question, therefore, arises: To what extent does he consider it necessary to have an economy so arranged as to facilitate the widest possible diffusion of owners in the means of production? Must all be working proprietors in establishments of their own? If not, is it possible to have an economy of widely distributed productive ownership, where some work on their own property, but the majority work in the large companies owned by others? Such practical questions imply problems to be solved with practical answers; Pius XII arose to the occasion and mapped the course for the economy to follow. That course was but an application of his main argument for private property as the economic base to guarantee personal freedom. But such a freedom cannot be guaranteed by the satisfaction of basic material wants. Important as it is, man does not live by bread alone. A socialist regime could conceivably provide for such wants. It is therefore to be expected that Pius XII would concern himself more extensively with the solution to the concrete

---

fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; a cui risponde l'obbligo fondamentale di accordare una proprietà privata, possibilmente a tutti." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 17.) "The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all." Here again productive property is not explicitly specified.

problems in connection with a more just distribution of productive goods. His first and favorite proposal was for an economy that would promote the multiplication of small-sized property owners.

B. Small Scale Productive Property

How to structure an economy that would effectively distribute private ownership in the means of production and, at the same time, maintain high productivity to meet the legitimate needs of the consuming public? This was the problem confronting Pius XII in his 1944 address on post-war reconstruction. The excessive centralization of economic goods in fewer and often unknown hands, he viewed as a symptom of a diseased economy based on a socially irresponsible concept of private property. The spectacle of this diseased economy with its enslaving effects he thus describes:

> In fact, We see the ever increasing ranks of the workers frequently confronted with this excessive concentration of economic goods which, often hidden under anonymous titles, are successfully withdrawn from contributing, as they should, to the social order and place the worker in a situation where it is virtually impossible for him effectively to acquire private property of his own.
>
> We see the small and medium holdings diminish and lose their value in human society, and constrained to join in a conflict ever more difficult and without hope of success.
>
> On the one side, We see immense riches dominating public and private economic life and often even civil life; on the other, the countless number of those

> deprived of every direct or indirect security of their own livelihood take no further interest in the true and higher values of the spirit, abandon their aspiration to genuine freedom, and throw themselves at the feet of any political party, slaves to whoever promises them in some way bread and security.[34]

To remedy such concentration of power, destructive to widespread freedom, he called for responsible action calculated to respect and safeguard "the vital function of property in its personal and social role".[35] When the actual distribution of property frustrates this function, he appealed for a united effort designed to increase the number of small-scale property holders, whether in farms, shops, business establishments or factories. He said:

---

34 "Noi vediamo infatti la sempra crescente schiera dei lavoratori trovarsi sovente di fronte a quegli eccessivi concentramenti di beni economici, che, nascosti spesso sotto forme anonime, riescono a sottrarsi ai loro doveri sociali e quasi mettono l'operaio nella impossibilità di formarsi una sua proprietà effettiva.

Vediamo la piccola e media proprietà scemare e svigorirsi nella vita sociale, serrata e costretta com'è ad una lotta difensiva sempre più dura e senza speranza di buon successo.

Vediamo, da un lato, le ingenti ricchezze dominare l'economia privata e pubblica, e spesso anche l'attività civile; dall'altro, la innumerevole moltitudine di coloro che, privi di ogni diretta o indiretta sicurezza della propria vita, non prendono più interesse ai veri ed alti valori dello spirito, si chiudono alle aspirazioni verso una genuina libertà, si gettano al servigio di qualsiasi partito politico, schiavi di chiunque prometta loro in qualche modo pane e tranquillità." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253.)

35 "[...] la funzione vitale della proprietà privata nel suo valore personale e sociale" (Ibid., p. 254.)

> When the distribution of property is an obstacle to this end — which is not necessarily nor always an outcome of the extension of private inheritance — the State may, in the public interest, intervene by regulating its use or even, if it cannot equitably meet the situation in any other way, by decreeing the expropriation of property, giving a suitable indemnity.
>
> For the same purpose small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades, in commerce and industry should be guaranteed and promoted; co-operative unions should ensure for them the advantages of big business.[36]

This practical directive to resolve an immoral defect in the economic order undoubtedly appeared idealistic in a world dominated by big business.[37] But Pius XII was an educator and a social reformer with a vision, not Utopian but Christian. He envisioned an economic order where

---

36 "Quando la distribuzione della proprietà è un ostacolo a questo fine — ciò che non necessariamente nè sempre è originato dalla estensione del patrimonio privato —, lo Stato può nell'interesse comune intervenire per regolarne l'uso, od anche, se non si può equamente provvedere in altro modo, decretare la espropriazione, dando una conveniente indennità. Per lo stesso scopo la piccola e la media proprietà nell'agricoltura, nelle arti e nei mestieri, nel commercio e nell'industria debbono essere garantite e promosse; le unioni cooperative debbono assicurare loro i vantaggi della grande azienda [...]"(The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS. 36 (1944), p. 254.)

37 That this ideal is not beyond realization is evident from a trend towards small business in some of the more advanced industrial nations. J.F. CRONIN, in Social Principles and Economic Life, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1959, p.275, observes that, in spite of obstacles, there has been a one third increase in the number of small businesses in the United States since 1941. For somewhat the same gratifying results in France, see: Msgr E. GUERRY, The Social Doctrine of the Church, p. 123.

productive private property would be the means not to enslave but to liberate individuals and families for the effective fulfillment of their personal duties. Personal and family-sized ownership and control in the means of production, when possible, was a natural consequence of this vision.

A fact worthy of note in this text is the Pope's endorsement of cooperatives to insure for the small-scale property holder the efficiency of big business. The context would indicate that he is referring to productive cooperatives.[38] It is apparent that he singles out cooperatives for the reason that it is their mission to keep the ownership and control of productive property close to the masses of the people. Obviously, if they fail to qualify in this respect, the papal endorsement would no longer apply. They must, however, involve the responsibility of all the members; this was the warning of Pius XII in reference to the value of cooperatives as an instrument to increase the efficiency of the family-type farm:

---

38 For a concise and accurate analysis of the cooperative movement in its philosophy and techniques to insure ownership for all, see: M.M. COADY, Masters of their Own Destiny. New York, Harper, 1939; see also: A.F. LAIDLAW, Campus and the Community: The Global Impact of the Antigonish Movement, Montreal, Howest House, 1961.

> However hard this work may be, man finds himself still master of his world through action at the heart of the community: of the family, of the neighborhood, and also, secondarily, of various economic cooperatives, provided, nevertheless, that these remain in all truth, and not merely as a matter of form, grounded on the responsibility of the entire membership.[39]

Conceived as such, Pius XII never hesitated to point to cooperatives as a realization of Christian social teaching. Typical was this message to the Christian workers of Belgium:

> The watchword of your trade union can be phrased: "Help yourself and God will help you." It is that of your National Federation of Christian Cooperatives — a magnificent fruit from the tree of the Church's social doctrine. What a great contribution these cooperatives have made to the improvement and the security of the economic conditions of the worker and his family! There you have a work of authentic solidarity which is in accordance with the words of the Apostle: "Bear one another's burdens" (Gal. 6, 2). This too We bless.[40]

---

39 "Si dur que soit ce travail, l'homme s'y trouve encore maître de son monde par l'activité au milieu de la communauté: de la famille, de l'entourage et aussi, subsidiairement, de coopératives économiques variées, pourvu toutefois qu'elles restent, en vérité et non seulement pour la forme, fondées sur la responsabilité de tous les participants." (Problems of Rural Life, Soyez ici, July 2, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 557.)

40 "Le mot d'ordre du syndicat pourrait se formuler par l'adage: "Aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera". C'est celui de votre Fédération nationale des Coopératives chrétiennes, fruit magnifique de l'arbre de la doctrine sociale de l'Eglise! Quelle contribution ces Coopératives ont apportée à l'amélioration et à la sécurité de la situation économique du travailleur et de sa famille! Voilà, certes, une oeuvre d'authentique solidarité, qui répond à la parole de l'Apôtre: "Portez les fardeaux les uns des autres" (Gal. 6, 2). Elle aussi Nous la bénissons!" (Workers' Organizations,

To return to the text of the 1944 message, it is to be noted that the Pope added conviction to his appeal for a multiplication of owners in small-sized property, when he emphasized that technical progress towards "giantism" in industry must yield to the necessity of assuring access to private property for the greatest number. He said:

> And it should not be said that technical progress is opposed to such a scheme, and in its irresistible current carries all activity forward toward gigantic business and organizations, before which a social system founded on the private property of individuals must inevitably collapse. No. Technical progress does not determine economic life as a fatal and necessary factor. It has indeed too often yielded timidly to the demands of rapacious, selfish plans calculated to accumulate indefinitely; why should it not then yield also to the necessity of maintaining and ensuring private property for all, that cornerstone of social order? Even technical progress, as

---

Soyez les bienvenus, Sept. 11, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 548.)

For other passages from Pius XII referring to the corrective role of cooperatives in the distribution of wealth see the following addresses and letters: The Life of the Farmer, Con particolare, Nov. 15, 1946, in AAS, 38 (1946), p. 436; Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, July 18, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 444; Need for Housing Projects, De gran cuore, Nov. 21, 1953, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 15, p. 478; The Bank: Servant of the People, Dalla sua, March 18, 1951, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 13, p. 11; To the Italian Cooperative Federation, Vi accogliamo, May 10, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 189; To the Organization for the Improvement of the Fucino, Siamo ben lieti, May 25, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 248; Farming: A Model for Human Effort, Eccoci convenuti, May 18, 1955, in AAS, 47 (1955), p. 499.

> a social factor, should not prevail over the general good, but should rather be directed and subordinated to it.[41]

This is not condemnatory of the large productive industrial unit as such. But it is a stern reminder that the great advance in technology, which makes possible the high productivity of industry must bow to the demand of the common good and the social function of property, if it results in preventing individuals from acquiring ownership and control in the means of production.

In subsequent statements, Pius XII repeated and amplified his favorite plan for the effective distribution of productive property: the multiplication of owners in small and medium-sized enterprises. That this was in keeping with nature's design to ensure stability and order in society was part of the message he delivered to the Belgian

---

41 "Nè si dica che il progresso tecnico si oppone a tale regime e spinge nella sua corrente irresistibile tutta l'attività verso aziende ed organizzazioni gigantesche di fronte alle quali un sistema sociale fondato sulla proprietà privata dei singoli deve ineluttabilmente crollare. No; il progresso tecnico non determina, come un fatto fatale e necessario, la vita economica. Esso si è fin troppo spesso docilmente chinato dinanzi alle esigenze dei calcoli egoistici avidi di accrescere indefinitamente i capitali; perchè dunque non si piegherebbe anche dinanzi alla necessità di mantenere e di assicurare la proprietà privata di tutti, pietra angolare dell'ordine sociale? Anche il progresso tecnico, come fatto sociale, non deve prevalere al bene generale, ma essere invece a questo ordinato e subordinato." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

workers in 1949. In that address, his concluding theme was to the effect that powerful organizations, whether in capital or in labour, were structural hazards to the freedom of the individual and the stability of society. "The strength of an organization, no matter how powerful one may consider it to be, is not of itself an element of order", he stated; "a firm and social position can be built only on the foundations laid by nature, and in reality by the Creator as the basis of the sole genuine society" he continued; "here is why," he concluded, "we also never tire of recommending an increase in the number of owners of private property of medium and of small industries."[42] From this statement, it is obvious that Pius XII fears the very existence of huge concentration in property because they constitute for the owners a built-in temptation to abuse their power to the detriment of widespread personal freedom. In this light must be understood his recommendation to decentralize power through the diffusion of ownership in productive property.

---

42 "La force de l'organisation, si puissante qu'on veuille la supposer, n'est pas d'elle-même, et prise en soi, un élément d'ordre; [...] une situation ferme et solide ne peut s'édifier que sur des bases jetées par la nature [...] comme fondements de la seule véritable stabilité. [...] Voilà pourquoi Nous ne Nous lassons pas non plus de recommander la diffusion progressive de la propriété privée, des moyennes et petites entreprises." (Workers' Organizations, Soyez les bienvenus, Sept. 11, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 550-551.)

In the agricultural economy, the Holy Father extolled rural life when the farms were owned and operated by the family. In an address to the International Congress on Rural Problems, he described the "exodus" from the countryside to the city where the industrial conditions of mass production tended to stifle the initiative and self reliance of the workers; he feared the depersonalizing consequences of industrial capitalism, when applied to agricultural production. In proposing a solution, he held high the personal and family values of the small-size farm. He said:

> A single remedy, universally applicable, would be difficult to find. It is none the less true that the work of the farm acts as a powerful defence against all these disorders. We are thinking here first of the peasant farm, of the family-type farm. Of such is made up that rural class which by reason of its over-all social character, and also by reason of its economic function, forms as it were the nucleus of a healthy rural population. To say this is not to deny the utility, often the necessity, of larger farm enterprises. Nevertheless, in permanent contact with nature, as God created and governs it, the worker in the fields knows by daily experience that human life is in the hands of its Author. No other working group is so suited as his to the life of the family, viewed as a spiritual, economic and juridical unit, and also in the matter of production and consumption.[43]

---

43 "Un remède, universellement applicable, peut être difficile à trouver: il n'en reste pas moins que le travail des terriens oppose à tous ces désordres une défense puissante. Nous pensons ici d'abord à l'exploitation paysanne, à l'exploitation familiale. Telle est la classe rurale, qui, par l'ensemble de son caractère social, et aussi par son rôle économique, forme comme le noyau d'une saine paysannerie. Cela ne revient pas à nier l'utilité,

He made a stronger appeal along these lines in a letter addressed to Cardinal Siri for the 1957 Italian social week:

> We eagerly desire to see Catholics continue to move forward courageously toward the goals set by Catholic social doctrine, carefully seeing to it that the agricultural unit in each of its forms corresponds to the demands of human personality while remaining in harmony with the service of all. Most of all, wherever possible, you should favor the wider spread of an economically efficient family unit among country people. When it is set into the framework of a cooperative union and defended by a professional association, this unit constitutes a bulwark of sound liberty, a protective dike against the danger of urbanism, and an effective contribution to the continuation of the sound traditions of the people.[44]

---

souvent la nécessité d'exploitations agraires plus vastes. Néanmoins, en contact permanent avec la nature, telle que Dieu l'a créée et la gouverne, le travailleur des champs sait par expérience quotidienne que la vie humaine est entre les mains de son Auteur. Nul autre groupement de travail n'est aussi adapté que le sien à la vie de famille, en tant qu'unité spirituelle, économique et juridique, et même en ce qui concerne la production et la consommation." (Problems of Rural Life, Soyez ici, July 2, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 557.)

44 "È Nostro vivo desiderio che i cattolici continuino a muoversi coraggiosamente verso le mete auspicate dalla dottrina sociale cattolica, avendo cura che l'azienda agricola in ogni sua forma soddisfi le esigenze della persona umana in armonia al servizio di tutti e soprattutto che venga favorita, ove sia possibile, la diffusione dell'azienda contadina familiare economicamente efficiente, la quale — convenientemente integrata dall'unione cooperativa e difesa dall'associazione professionale — rappresenta un baluardo di sana libertà, un argine contro il pericolo dell'urbanesimo, un efficace contributo alla continuità delle sane tradizioni del popolo." (Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 835.)

In October 1956, Pius XII delivered two addresses on the personal and social advantages of an economy which permits small-scale ownership to survive and to flourish. Together they comprise his most extensive pronouncement on this subject. In the first address to the Catholic association of small and medium-sized businesses, he noted that the subject for discussion was: "how small and medium-sized business interests help to inject man into society and the economy".[45] "That is a subject of primary importance from which all reforms, all attempts to introduce greater harmony and stability into modern society should derive their inspiration", continued the Pope.[46] He then went on to express the idea that the solution to this problem was to be found in structuring an economy according to human scale — an economy conducive to the personal development of all within its jurisdiction.[47] In the concrete order, this meant for the Pope an economy that would permit small and

---

45 "[...] comment les petites et moyennes entreprises contribuent à l'insertion de la personne humaine dans la société et l'économie." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 798.)

46 "C'est là un thème d'importance primordiale, dont doivent s'inspirer toutes les réformes, toutes les tentatives visant à introduire dans la société moderne plus d'harmonie et de stabilité." (Ibid.)

47 Ibid.

medium-sized business to grow and flourish:

> Small and medium-sized business directed by Christians can, more easily than others, perceive and put into practice concrete solutions to this serious problem.[48]

To justify this solution, he agrees with the contention that widespread personal and familial enterprises of small and average size are most in keeping with the metaphysical and psychological arguments for private property, in its essential personal and social function. He said:

> You like to point out that the large number of medium-sized businesses in which the head is at the same time the owner and occasionally the founder, assures a very broad distribution of private property, which is the essential condition of stability for society; while guaranteeing the independence and dignity of individuals and families, it does not confer upon them exorbitant economic power which would carry them beyond the scope of their true responsibilities.
>
> The private businessman, merchant, and farmer see to it that the value of their property is increased through their work; they see their labor directly sanctioned, as also the negligent acts or errors which they commit. Between material wealth and its possessor there is thus established a sort of constant tension — that of productive activity subjected to powerful stimulants for the greater good of the community.[49]

---

48 "Les petites et moyennes entreprises, dirigées par des chrétiens, peuvent plus aisément que d'autres apercevoir et mettre en oeuvre les solutions concrètes de ce grave problème." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 799.)

49 "Vous aimez à relever que la multiplicité des entreprises de dimensions moyennes, dont le chef est en même temps propriétaire et parfois fondateur, assure une répartition très large de la propriété privée, qui est une condition essentielle de stabilité pour la société; en

Here, he presents the ideal role of small business in achieving stability in society while assuring the dignity of individuals. Once again he contrasts the human dimension of the small enterprise with the massive corporation of such a structure as to imperil the function of a truly democratic economy. There is no implication here that the owners and operators of a small business are any more socially conscious than are the executives of large industry. On the contrary, in the concluding part of this address, the Holy Father called attention to the reputation of selfishness among the middle class, exhorting them to cooperate with one another and use their favored position in a manner that would procure the welfare of all. He said:

> The middle classes are often reproached for their exaggerated individualism, their desire for total independence, and their scorn for whatever runs counter to established customs. If social life presupposes in individuals all the independence

---

garantissant l'indépendance et la dignité des individus et des familles, elle ne leur confère pas toutefois une puissance économique exorbitante, qui dépasserait la portée de leurs vraies responsabilités. L'entrepreneur privé, le commerçant, l'agriculteur se soucient de faire fructifier leurs biens par leur travail; ils voient sanctionner directement leur labeur, comme aussi les négligences ou les erreurs qu'ils commettent. Entre les biens matériels et leur possesseur s'établit ainsi une sorte de tension continuelle, celle de l'activité productive soumise à de puissants stimulants pour le plus grand bien de la communauté." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 799.)

> compatible with the good of the whole, it demands to an even greater extent cooperation, mutual agreement based upon confidence, the renunciation of certain privileges and of certain somewhat narrow or selfish points of view. [...] It is to the advantage of all that small and medium-sized businesses be well organized in all domains and cause their distinctive qualities to be shown to better advantage.[50]

In the other address of October 1956, Pius XII spoke to the International Institute of the Middle Classes. Here again he accentuated the role of small scale business owners especially as contributors to social and political stability. Along with skilled and professional workers, he identified them as the middle class between large scale capitalism on the one hand and the wage earning class on the other.

> This embraces those who generally contribute to production through their work and personal capital: craftsmen, independent tradespeople, owners of small and medium-sized businesses, the majority of farmers, professional men, certain

---

50 "On reproche souvent aux classes moyennes l'individualisme exagéré, un souci d'indépendance totale, la méfiance envers ce qui trouble des habitudes établies. Si la vie sociale suppose dans les individus toute l'indépendance compatible avec le bien de l'ensemble, elle appelle davantage encore la collaboration, l'accord mutuel basé sur la confiance, le renoncement à certains privilèges, à certaines vues un peu étroites ou égoïstes. [...] Il importe pour l'avantage de tous que les petites et moyennes entreprises s'organisent solidement dans tous les domaines et fassent mieux valoir leurs qualités distinctives." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 799.)

> categories of civil servants and military men, and most persons who live on independent means.[51]

He went on to elaborate on the important role of the middle class:

> The intermediary position you occupy, the large numerical place you hold in the population, the virtues proper to your place in life, make you an element of moderation and equilibrium which is in danger of being stifled if the obligations which encumber it exceed its real resources.
>
> The share of personal responsibility which you normally exercise in your activities, the family scale generaly assumed by your enterprises, maintain and develop within you a sense of work well done, thrift, and foresight. All these are happy fruits of that relative autonomy which you rightly consider an essential part of your social position. It has been established that the countries in which the middle classes have been too restricted and too weak are often exposed to serious and violent political excesses.[52]

---

51 "[...] ceux qui, en général, participent à la production par leur travail et leurs capitaux personnels, les artisans, les commerçants autonomes, les petits et moyens industriels, la majorité des agriculteurs, les professions libérales, certaines catégories de fonctionnaires et de cadres, la plupart des rentiers." (The Middle Class, En accueillant, Oct. 25, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 603.)

52 "La situation intermédiaire que vous occupez, la place numérique considérable que vous tenez dans la population, les vertus propres à vos milieux, font de vous un élément de modération et d'équilibre qui risque d'être étouffé si les charges dont il est grevé dépassent ses ressources réelles. La part de responsabilité personnelle que vous avez normalement dans vos activités, l'échelle le plus souvent familiale de vos entreprises, entretiennent et développent chez vous un sens du travail bien fait, de l'épargne et de la prévoyance, heureux fruits de l'autonomie relative, dont vous considérez à juste titre qu'elle fait partie essentielle de votre condition sociale. On a constaté que les pays où les classes moyennes étaient trop

To be noted here is the fact that Pius XII attributes great value to the occupations involving technical skill and professional competence. It is apparent that he does not expect all to rest their security in the ownership and operation of productive property. Nor does he see widespread ownership in small-scale property as the unique means, to achieve personal dignity and social stability.

To conclude and comment further on the above series of texts relative to the desirability of small-scale property, it is evident that the Holy Father favored an economy characterized by extensive ownership in productive property of human dimension. There must be many persons who possess the economic basis of freedom, if the economy is to be truly democratic. This derives, in large measure, from personal ownership and control in the means of production. He unmistakably favors an economy stabilized and balanced by a large and influential middle class of small-scale property owners plus independent professional and skilled workers. There is no implication that Pius XII expected the economy to be composed entirely of working proprietors or even a majority of such. But he definitely wanted a substantial

---

réduites et trop faibles se trouvaient exposées aux excès politiques les plus graves et les plus violents." (The Middle Class, En accueillant, Oct. 25, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 604.)

increase in the number of those who work on their own property — whether it is a farm, artisan workshop, a business or a small factory. He noted that the institution of the family is strongest when such a system prevails; this is particularly so in the case of the small-sized farm. He endorsed democratically operated cooperative establishments designed to assure economic viability to the small and average-sized business.

All these specific directives point to the fact that Pius XII envisioned an economy where all those who aspired to the ownership, control and operation of productive property, could really do so. Undoubtedly he could see this type of ownership as setting the tone for economic society and serving to offset the threats to industrial peace occasioned by the gulf existing between a few owners on the one hand and the masses of wage-earners on the other.

The foregoing pronouncements, if taken in isolation from others he issued on the subject of distribution, could lead to the unwarranted interpretation that Pius XII accepts only one type of productive property, and that it alone qualifies as an effective instrument in the diffusion of

wealth.[53] That such is not the case and that it is possible to have an effective distribution of property in the large enterprise is the proposition now awaiting verification.

C. Large-Scale Productive Property

Although he attributed preeminence to the ideal of extensive ownership in the small enterprise as the most effective means to distribute property, nonetheless Pius XII accepted the principle of private property for the larger forms of capitalist ownership. He verified this by appealing to the inviolability of private property in his rejection of any strict right to co-management on the part of

---

53 Such an interpretation would serve to identify Pius XII with the distributist approach to the problem of wealth concentration. C. VAN GESTEL, in La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, p. 108-109, 171-173, describes the distributist movement as a philosophy and a technique dedicated to the proposition that the concentration of property under the control of a few must be decentralized so that all will have access to some productive property, especially land, as the economic base for human freedom. Among the leaders of this movement he lists such notable names as: Father Vincent McNabb, Gilbert Keith Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc and Christopher Dawson. J.F. CRONIN, in Catholic Social Principles, p. 634-642, also describes this movement; he writes approvingly of their goal, but disagrees with their negative approach bordering on the revolutionary method of drastic state action to decentralize big business (p. 641-642). On this score it is evident they part company with the positive evolutionary program advocated by Pius XII. What is more, they seem to imply that there is only one valid type of productive property: the small enterprise. There is no such narrow vision of the forms of property in the teaching of the Holy Father.

the worker in the firm where he is an employee.[54] In 1952, Msgr. Montini, at that time substitute Vatican Secretary of State, in a letter to the Italian Catholic Social Week, clearly stated the position of Pius XII in respect to both types of property:

> The Church, therefore, has always benevolently regarded and encouraged those forms of business undertakings in which she finds it possible for the personal initiative of all participants to assert itself and to expand, as, for example, in the case of craftsmen's projects, the family-sized farm, and cooperative undertakings. [Radio Message, Sept. 1, 1944.] But the Church also maintains that, in complete conformity with the proper order, big business can remain within the realm of private initiative, provided that evident considerations of the common good do not militate against such a situation (Discourse of His Holiness to "The International Union of the Catholic Owners' Associations", May 7, 1949).[55]

It is true, the Pope had reason to uphold the validity of large-scale properties. He was aware of their useful function to increase productivity and make available to the consuming public more and better goods. In the Christmas message of 1952, he had words of praise for such large productive units of industry, but he denied that they should

---

54 See Chapter III for the documentation of Pius XII's defence of private property against forced co-management, supra, p. 174-196.

55 Letter of Msgr. Montini to the Archbishop of Genoa, Sept. 22, 1952, in Osservatore Romano, Sept. 22-23, 1952. English version in Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII and a Letter of His Excellency Monsignor Montini, Huntington, Indiana, Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1953, p. 38.

prevail as the pattern for economic and social life wherein the family, private property in personal possession, the state and voluntary organizations are the natural institutions to assure the satisfaction of man's material needs. He said:

> One knows where to look for the technologist's point of view in social thought; namely to the gigantic enterprises of modern industry. We do not intend here to pronounce judgement on the necessity, utility and disadvantages of forms of production such as these. Indubitably, they are marvelous realizations of the inventive and constructive genius of the human spirit. Deservedly are these enterprises held up for world-wide admiration which, following norms which have been maturely considered, succeed both in production and in management in coordinating and in uniting the forces of men and of matter. And the present age may take legitimate pride in the stable way in which these enterprises are organized and not infrequently in the wholly novel and characteristic beauty of their external set-up. But what must be denied is that these forms either can or should avail as a general model according to which modern social life should be arranged or with which it should be made to conform.[56]

---

56 "Si sa ove è da ricercare il tecnicismo nel pensiero sociale: nelle gigantesche imprese della industria moderna. Non abbiamo qui l'intenzione di pronunziare un giudizio sulla necessità, la utilità e gl'incovenienti di simili forme della produzione. Senza dubbio esse sono attuazioni maravigliose della potenza inventiva e costruttiva dello spirito umano; a buon diritto vengono additate all'ammirazione del mondo queste intraprese, che, secondo norme maturamente riflettute, riescono, nella fabbricazione e nell'amministrazione, a coordinare e a conglobare l'azione degli uomini e delle cose; nessun dubbio egualmente che il loro solido ordine e non di rado la bellezza tutta nuova e propria delle loro forme esterne siano motivo di legittimo orgoglio alla presente età. Ciò che invece dobbiamo negare è che esse possano e debbano valere come modello generale per la conformazione e l'ordinamento della moderna

Pius XII was equally aware of the fact that the majority of breadwinners in the advanced countries were wage-earners, dependent upon the executives of the large industries. How to achieve the personal benefits of ownership in such a setting was a question which evoked extensive response from the Holy Father.

In the 1952 letter to the Semaines Sociales of France, on the very question of justice in the distribution of wealth and income, Pius XII traced the main lines along which the large enterprise should proceed in order to qualify as an effective instrument in the distribution of personal property among the workers. His approach was two-fold: 1) through a just wage system; 2) through some forms of co-partnership; the more direct approach. His earlier and later statements on this difficult question must be examined to get the full import of his message. But the 1952 letter states the problem and provides the frame of reference. He wrote:

---

vita sociale." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 36.)

He continues this line of thought by denouncing an economy where the only form of property is a vast productive system destructive to the natural institutions designed to assure personal dignity: the family, the state and personal property (ibid., p. 37).

> This basic distribution is originally and normally brought about by virtue of the continuous dynamism of the social economic process which We have just recalled; and this process is, for a great many men, the source of their wages as recompense for their work. But we must not lose sight of the fact that, from the point of view of the national economy, these wages represent the income realized by the worker. Executives of industry and workers are here cooperators in a common task; both of them are called upon to derive their livelihood from the net and gross profits of the economy. And from this point of view, their mutual relations do not in any way render the one subservient to the other. In Our discourse of May 7, 1949, We said: "To receive a return for one's work is a prerogative deriving from the personal dignity of anyone who, in one way or another [...] contributes effectively to the output of the national economy."
>
> But since all are "eating at the same table," so to speak, it would seem fair that — while respecting differences in functions and responsibilities — the shares given to each should conform to the common dignity which they have as men, and that, in particular, these shares should permit a greater number of persons both to attain that independence and security which comes from possession of private property, and to participate with their families in the spiritual and cultural goods to which earthly goods are ordained.
>
> Furthermore, if both the owners and the workers have a common interest in the healthy prosperity of the national economy, why would it not be legitimate to give to the workers a just share of responsibility in the organization and development of that economy?[57]

---

57 "Cette distribution de base se réalise originairement et normalement en vertu du dynamisme continuel du processus économique et social que Nous venons d'évoquer; et c'est, pour un grand nombre d'hommes, l'origine du salaire comme rétribution de leur travail. Mais il ne faut pas perdre de vue que, sous l'angle de l'économie nationale, ce salaire correspond au revenu du travailleur. Chefs d'entreprise et ouvriers sont ici coopérateurs dans une oeuvre commune, appelés à vivre ensemble du bénéfice net et global de l'économie, et, sous ce rapport, leurs relations mutuelles ne mettent aucunement les uns au service des

The first and major part of this text appears to deal with a just material remuneration for the worker in the enterprise: the latter part, with the intangible remuneration deriving from some form of co-responsibility. As to the first, the matter of a fair share from the industry's output, Pius XII notes that the worker is a contributor to the overall productivity of the economy; in this respect he is not subservient to the employer but a partner in the direction and regulation of the economic process. The implication is that he is not to be regarded as a piece of equipment or a cost item in the industry. On the contrary, as an agent of the economy as well as the goal of the economy, he is to be

---

autres. "Toucher son revenu, disions-Nous, est un apanage de la dignité personnelle de quiconque, sous une forme ou sous une autre..., prête son concours productif au rendement de l'économie nationale" (Allocution du 7 mai 1959 aux membres de l'UNIAPAC).

Mais dès lors que tous "mangent à la même table", pour ainsi dire, il apparaît équitable, tout en respectant la diversité des fonctions et des responsabilités, que les parts de chacun soient conformes à leur commune dignité d'hommes, qu'elles permettent en particulier à un plus grand nombre d'accéder à l'indépendance et à la sécurité que donne la propriété privée et de participer avec leur famille aux biens de l'esprit et de la culture auxquels sont ordonnés les biens de la terre. En outre, si patrons et ouvriers ont un intérêt commun à la saine prospérité de l'économie nationale, pourquoi ne serait-il pas légitime d'attribuer aux ouvriers une juste part de responsabilité dans la constitution et le développement de cette économie?" (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 621-622.)

treated with the dignity which this status implies. In practical terms this means for Pius XII, that his wages or his material share from the economic process should be such as to enable himself and his family to acquire private property as the economic basis for spiritual and cultural development. Whether the Pope means shares in the enterprise where he works or independent productive property of his own is not clear from this text. Before commenting on the co-responsibility proposal, other statements of Pius XII, on the question of the worker's remuneration, must be examined.

In an address to the workers and employers of Spain, the Pope stressed the primary importance of a just wage to better distribute the income of industry so as to enable the worker to live honorably, to save and, therefore, to acquire property of his own:

> There always will be economic inequalities. But all those who in any way are able to influence the progress of society must aim to obtain a situation which permits people who do the best they can not only to live, but to save. There are many factors which must contribute to a greater diffusion of property. But the principal one always will be a just salary. You know very well, beloved children, that a just salary and a better distribution of natural wealth constitute two of the most impelling demands in the social program of the Church.[58]

---

58 "Siempre habrá desigualdades económicas. Pero, todos los que de algún modo pueden influir en la marcha de la sociedad deben tender siempre a conseguir una situación tal, que permita a cuantos hacen lo que está en su mano, no sólo el vivir, sino aun el ahorrar.

In another address to a group of Spanish workers, he repeated:

> The Church advocates a more just distribution of natural goods, based principally on a just salary, which will guarantee your present life and that of your families while allowing a certain amount of saving for the future.[59]

Undoubtedly, the above two texts refer to a wage level sufficient to meet the fundamental needs of the workers and their families; but he mentions specifically a wage that will permit the worker to save and provide for the future security of himself and family. Obviously, if the worker is to acquire property from which he drives income, he must be able to do so principally through the savings from his wages. Conceivably, he could save sufficient to acquire property in the form of investments or a small business enterprise. This would be in keeping with Pius XII's favorite program

---

Son muchos los factores que deben contribuir a una mayor difusión de la propriedad. Pero el principal será siempre el justo salario. Vosotros sabéis muy bien, queridos hijos, que el justo salario y una mejor distribución de los bienes naturales constituyen dos de las exigencias más apremiantes en el programa social de la Iglesia." (The Church's Concern for Economic Life, Amadísimos hijos, March 11, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 214-215.)

59 "[...] la Iglesia propugna una más justa distribución de los bienes naturales, partiendo principalmente de la base de un justo salario, que garantice la vida presente vuestra y de vuestra familia, abriendo las puertas al ahorro como garantía del porvenir." (To a Group of Spanish Workers, Hijos amadísimos, Nov. 1, 1954, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 16, p. 234.)

for the distribution of property through a multiplication of owners in small-sized enterprise. Hence it is not surprising that he singled out a just wage as the primary means for the workers to procure an equitable distribution in productive as well as consumable property.

But savings from a just wage was not the only solution to a more effective distribution of property concentrated in the large enterprise. Pius XII also proposed that, within the enterprise, the relations between the employers and the workers should be such as to permit the latter to share in the benefits of productive ownership especially by some form of co-management. It is true he rejected the notion of a forced form of co-responsibility which would render useless the right of private property. It is also true that he advocated the sharing of responsibility, between owners and workers, as a means of distributing the more intangible fruits of their joint effort. In the 1952 letter to the Semaines Sociales, this was the substance of his second approach to solve the problem of distribution in a manner favorable to the worker:

> Furthermore, if both the owners and the workers have a common interest in the healthy prosperity of the national economy, why would it not be legitimate to give to the workers a just share of responsibility in the organization of that economy?[60]

---

60 "En outre, si patrons et ouvriers ont un intérêt commun à la saine prospérité de l'économie nationale,

Although no details are spelled out, this is an implicit affirmation that the workers have a just claim to a fair share of responsibility in the operation of the economy. For all practical purposes the economy for the worker is the operation of the enterprise where he is employed. Pius XII's thinking on this subject becomes clearer in the light of other pronouncements on this delicate topic.

It was in the address of September 1, 1944, that the Holy Father first acknowledged the fact that large-scale industry is sometimes economically indispensable, and that, where this is the case, the wage contract should be modified to give the workers the personal values accruing from property ownership:

> When the distribution of property is an obstacle to this end — which is not necessarily nor always an outcome of the extension of private inheritance — the State may, in the public interest, intervene by regulating its use or even, if it cannot equitably meet the situation in any other way, by decreeing the expropriation of property, giving a suitable indemnity.
>
> For the same purpose small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades, in commerce and industry should be guaranteed and promoted; co-operative unions should ensure for them the advantages of big business.[61]

---

pourquoi ne serait-il pas légitime d'attribuer aux ouvriers une juste part de responsabilité dans la constitution et le développement de cette économie?" (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 622.)

61 The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254; for text cf. supra, p. 224, note 36.

This was Pius XII's explicit endorsement of the co-partnership forms (co-ownership, co-management, and profit sharing), encouraged by Pius XI in Quadragesimo Anno.[62] From the time of this statement until 1956, Pius XII issued no detailed or direct pronouncement on the benefits of co-partnership. Undoubtedly, he was preoccupied with the alleged claims of some groups to a form of co-management which would destroy the right of private property. But, in the major portion of a 1956 address to the Catholic association of small and medium-sized businesses, he issued his most emphatic and complete statement on the desirability of co-partnership by legitimate means. In reference to the status of employees of any business — small or big — he said:

> But if the owner of a business finds therein the means to maintain and to consolidate his social position, is it not proper that he should strive to enable all those depending upon him and giving him the support of their work to benefit from the same advantages? Do they not also have the right to occupy a stable position in society, to possess material necessities for themselves and their families, to enhance the value of their property through their initiative, and to derive therefrom a legitimate profit?
>
> This is not the place to examine in detail how small and medium-sized businesses can contribute to strengthening the social status of their personnel by helping them to have greater access to the

---

62 For the text and context of Pius XI's reference to co-partnership, see Chapter III, p. 175, 176.

> benefits of property and to the autonomy which goes with it. It is Our wish that the greatest possible number of men may achieve that stability which the guarantee of permanent resources, subject to growth through personal labor, procures.[63]

Here the Holy Father makes it clear that the worker has more than a right to a just wage from the employer. He has a right to that independence and security derived from access to property possession. He has a right not only to the economical advantages of the enterprise, but also to the personal and social benefits accruing from an opportunity to stimulate his initiative and to challenge his personal talents. There is a strong implication in this text that the worker should be enabled to have a stake in the business either by profit sharing or by investment in the firm or by both. This seems obvious from the statement which follows:

---

63 "Mais, si le propriétaire de l'entreprise trouve par là le moyen de maintenir et de consolider sa position sociale, ne convient-il pas qu'il s'efforce de faire bénéficier des mêmes avantages tous ceux qui dépendent de lui et lui prêtent l'appui de leur travail? N'ont-ils pas eux aussi le droit d'occuper dans la société une situation stable, de posséder les biens nécessaires pour eux-mêmes et leur famille, de les mettre en valeur par leur initiative et d'en tirer un profit légitime? Ce n'est pas ici le lieu d'examiner dans le détail comment les petites et moyennes entreprises peuvent contribuer à renforcer la condition sociale de leur personnel, en l'aidant à accéder davantage aux bienfaits de la propriété et à l'autonomie qu'elle confère. Nous souhaitons qu'il soit donné au plus grand nombre d'hommes possible de conquérir cette stabilité que procure la garantie de ressources permanentes, susceptibles d'être accrues par le labeur personnel." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956) p. 799.)

> It is certain that the worker and the employee who know that they are directly involved in the successful operation of a business, because a part of their wealth is invested and fructifying therein, will feel themselves more intimately obliged to contribute to it through their efforts and even their sacrifices.
>
> In that way, they will feel themselves more fully men, trustees of a greater share of responsibility; they will realize that others are beholden to them, and thus they will apply themselves with greater courage to their daily task, in spite of its often harsh and tedious character.[64]

The next paragraph of the document shifts the emphasis to that function of leadership in the enterprise whereby the worker should be given reasonable freedom to assume responsibility and make his own decisions so that he may find in his work that self expression to which he has a right:

> On the other hand, the economic and social role which every man aspires to play demands that the individual's course of activity not be completely subject to the will of others. The head of a business values above all his power to make autonomous decisions: he foresees, orders, and directs assuming responsibility for the decisions which he makes. His natural gifts, his previous, theoretical training, his technical competence, and his experience find

---

64 "Il est certain que l'ouvrier et l'employé, qui se savent directement intéressés à la bonne marche d'une entreprise, parce qu'une part de leurs biens y est engagée et y fructifie, se sentiront plus intimement obligés d'y contribuer par leurs efforts et même leurs sacrifices. De la sorte, ils se sentiront plus hommes, dépositaires d'une plus large part de responsabilité; ils se rendront compte que d'autres leur sont redevables, et s'emploieront avec plus de coeur à leur besogne quotidienne, malgré son caractère souvent dur et fastidieux." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 799.)

> employment in the function of leadership, and serve as a basis for the development of his personality and for creative joy.
>
> But, once again, will the head of the business deny his subordinates what he esteems so highly himself? Will he limit the role of his daily cooperators to that of simple executants, who cannot turn their own experience to account as they would like, and who remain wholly passive with regard to the decisions which govern their own activity?[65]

This passage enuntiates Pius XII's ideal type of co-management in the enterprise — not a forced co-management or exercised by representatives of the workers outside the industry — but achieved by a mutual recognition of rights: the right of the head of the business to the power of direction and ultimate decision, the right of the worker to develop himself as a man at the very scene of his work. To this end the duty of the employer is paramount; he must

---

65 "D'autre part, la fonction économique et sociale, que tout homme aspire à remplir, exige que le déploiement de l'activité de chacun ne soit pas totalement soumis à la volonté d'autrui. Le chef d'entreprise apprécie avant tout son pouvoir de décision autonome: il prévoit, ordonne, dirige, en assumant les conséquences des mesures qu'il prend. Ses dons naturels, sa formation théorique antérieure, sa compétence technique, son expérience trouvent à s'employer dans la fonction de direction et deviennent principe d'épanouissement de sa personnalité et de joie créatrice. Mais, encore une fois, le chef refusera-t-il à ses inférieurs ce qu'il apprécie tant lui-même? Réduira-t-il ses collaborateurs de tous les jours au rôle de simples exécutants silencieux, qui ne peuvent faire valoir leur propre expérience comme ils le souhaiteraient, et restent entièrement passifs à l'égard de décisions qui commandent leur propre activité?" (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 799-800.)

conduct the business in a manner that will enable the workers to fulfill their right to self development. The worker, in turn, is not to infringe upon the right and control of ownership proper to the employer, as the Holy Father stated elsewhere. But according to the spirit of this text, there seems to be no reason to prevent the worker from seeking a guarantee for that type of co-management which would facilitate his right to autonomy and self development in the process of his work.

On the basis of the foregoing texts, in connection with the distribution of the fruits of industry to the advantage of the worker, Pius XII's teaching may be summarized as follows: if the mass of workers are to share the benefits of personal possession in the means of production, two conditions must be fulfilled: first, the level of wages must be such as to enable them to have access to private property; secondly, they must be given the opportunity to aspire to a form of co-partnership which will provide the security and personal involvement associated with private ownership of smaller dimensions. This broad-minded approach to a difficult question serves to emphasize that Pius XII entertained no narrow conception that would reduce all property to a single form. Certainly he expresses preference for widespread small and medium-sized productive units

where personal responsibility is directly involved. But he also holds up the ideal of consecrating the economic world of big business and industry through an economy regulated by justice, inspired by charity and directed towards the welfare of all participants in the fulfillment of their personal rights.

CHAPTER V

THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN THE DIFFUSION OF PROPERTY

Does the State have the right and the duty to supervise the distribution of property? What is the basis of this right? Does it conflict with personal freedom? What is the extent of this right? Is it limited or unlimited? This is the first series of question for which we must seek an answer in the documents of Pius XII. If the state has such a right, what means should it use in making it effective, in making it secure a better distribution of material goods? Does the state have a positive, essential role in promoting a wider extension of the smaller property unit, in legislating to provide social security for the indigent, in planning to coordinate and to increase the nation's productivity, in establishing fiscal, trade and migration policies that will make for a more just distribution of the world's resources and at the same time protect the personal values inherent in the right of private possession? The Pope's answer to this second series of questions involves the function of the state on a more practical level. His answer to the first group of questions primarily concerns the role of the state on the more theoretical plane. As a consequence, this section shall be developed under two headings:

I. The principles governing the state's intervention in the diffusion of property,

II. The application of these principles to the practical means best calculated to extend the personal and social values of private ownership.

I. THE PRINCIPLES

The preliminary section of the basic document of June 1, 1941 praises the achievements of Leo XIII's Rerum Novarum, especially the tone of conviction with which it defined the role of the Church in making authoritative statements in the economic order. To this role Pius XII agreed whole-heartedly and then went on to develop his own ideas on the subject. But before doing so, he pointed out, by way of contrast, the role of the state in the general area of economic life, and thus left us with one of his most important statements on the function of government in the nation's economy. He spoke in rather general terms without mentioning specifically the question of property; but he said sufficient to indicate that the state had a definite positive duty to stimulate, integrate and to coordinate the social and economic activities of individuals and free groups, and that it also has the duty to use its moderating authority to prevent economic imbalances occasioned by clashes of interest between individuals and between several groups. He spoke thus:

> In the general framework of labour, to stimulate the sane and responsible development of all the energies, physical and spiritual, of individuals and their free organization, there opens up a wide field of action where the public authority comes in with its integrating and co-ordinating activity exercised first through the local and professional corporation and finally in the activity of the State itself, whose higher moderating social authority has the important duty of forestalling the dislocation of economic balance arising from plurality and divergence of clashing interests, individual and collective.[1]

Another achievement for which he gave full credit to Leo XIII was the concept he developed of the state in respect to social welfare, contrasting it with the negative hands of policy of economic liberalism in the nineteenth century:

> And, while the State in the Nineteenth century, through excessive exaltation of liberty, considered as its exclusive scope the safeguarding of liberty by the law, Leo XIII admonished it, that it had also the duty to interest itself in social welfare, taking care of the entire people and of all its members, especially the weak and the dispossessed, through a generous social program and the creation of a labor code. His call evoked a powerful response; and it is a clear duty of justice to recognize the program which has been achieved in the lot

---

1 "Nell'ambito generale del lavoro, allo sviluppo sano e responsabile di tutte le energie fisiche e spirituali degl'individui e alle loro libere organizzazioni si apre un vastissimo campo di azione multiforme, dove il pubblico potere interviene con una sua azione integrativa e ordinativa, prima per mezzo delle corporazioni locali e professionali, e infine per forma dello Stato stesso, la cui superiore e moderatrice autorità sociale ha l'importante ufficio di prevenire i perturbamenti di equilibrio economico sorgenti dalla pluralità e dai contrasti degli egoismi concorrenti, individuali e collettivi." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 33 (1941), p. 196.)

> of workers through the pains taken by Civil Authorities in many lands.[2]

Within the context of today's widespread activity on the part of the state, Leo XIII's words would seem to be somewhat cautious and guarded. The extent of the state intervention in the economic order appears to be much more explicitly stated in the immediately preceding text of Pius XII.[3]

But, it is in the main section of this address where the Pope enunciates the principle of state intervention in respect to the specific question of private property in its role of making active the right of all to the use of material goods. Within the context of expounding on the fundamental importance of this right, he states the principle that the state has the natural right to intervene in regulating and supervising all arrangements of private property

---

2 "E mentre lo Stato, nel secolo decimonono, per soverchio esaltamento di libertà, considerava come suo scopo esclusivo il tutelare la libertà con il diritto, Leone XIII lo ammoni essere insieme suo dovere l'applicarsi alla provvidenza sociale, curando il benessere del popolo intero e di tutti i suoi membri, particolarmente dei deboli e diseredati, con larga politica sociale e con creazione di un diritto del lavoro. Alla sua voce rispose un'eco potente; ed è sincero debito di giustizia riconoscere i progressi, che la sollecitudine delle Autorità civili di molte Nazioni hanno procurato alla condizione dei lavoratori." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 198.)

3 The final chapter shall include a section on the relations between the teachings of Leo XIII and Pius XII in the matter of property and the factors contributing to its equitable distribution.

and the exchange of goods through free enterprise. He said:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has, in fact, from nature the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth while it is left to the will of man and to to the juridical Statutes of Nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of the right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods. Undoubtedly, the material order deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods, by interchange and gift, as well as the functioning of the State over both these institutions. But all this remains subordinated to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope.[4]

This is an explicit affirmation of the principle that the state has its own distinctive role to fulfill in regulating the institution of private property, the use of property rights and the process of trade and exchange, all with a

---

4 "Ogni uomo, quale vivente dotato di ragione, ha infatti dalla natura il diritto fondamentale di usare dei beni materiali della terra, pur essendo lasciato alla volontà umana e alle forme giuridiche dei popoli di regolarne più particolarmente la pratica attuazione. Tale diritto individuale non può essere in nessun modo soppresso, neppure da altri diritti certi e pacifici sui beni materiali. Senza dubbio l'ordine naturale, derivante da Dio, richiede anche la proprietà privata e il libero reciproco commercio dei beni con scambi e donazioni, come pure la funzione regolatrice del potere pubblico su entrambi questi istituti. Tutto ciò nondimeno rimane subordinato allo scopo naturale dei beni materiali, e non potrebbe rendersi independente dal diritto primo e fondamentale, che a tutti ne concede l'uso; piuttosto deve servire a farne possibile l'attuazione in conformità con il suo scopo." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.) Emphasis added.

view to realizing the providential end of material goods. This right of the state, therefore, is not the creation of men, but the creation of nature itself. Like private property it is not absolute and unlimited but relative and limited to the needs of all. Surely, the implication is that the state, in its zeal to distribute material goods, is not to destroy private possession and legitimate commerce but rather to control such rights and make them harmonize with the rights of all to the use of material goods.

Following this direct statement as to the subordinate role of the state in respect to property rights, the Pope then goes on to elaborate on the precise function of the state in providing for the common good and at the same time ensuring the freedom and dignity of the human person in the pursuit of his existential ends. Without specifically mentioning the state, he, first of all, makes it clear that whatever safeguards "the native right to the use of material goods" (il diritto originario sull'uso dei beni materiali) provides assurance that personal dignity and responsibility will be respected:

> The safe guardianship of this right will insure the personal dignity of man and will facilitate for him the attention to and fulfillment with reasonable liberty, of his moral duties.[5]

---

5 "La tutela di questo diritto assicurerà la dignità personale dell'uomo, e gli agevolerà l'attendere e il soddisfare in giusta libertà a quella somma di stabili

Obviously drawing attention to the reasonableness of this position he went on to emphasize that man himself has the primary responsibility to provide for himself both on the level of the material and the spiritual:

> Man has in truth the entirely personal duty to preserve and order to perfection his material and spiritual life so as to secure the religious and moral scope which God has assigned to all men, and has given them as the supreme norm.[6]

Having established this fundamental principle, he immediately proceeded to expound on the precise role of the state in respect to all human rights:

> To safeguard the inviolable sphere of the rights of the human person and to facilitate the fulfillment of his duties should be the essential office of every public authority. Does this not flow from that genuine concept of the common good which the state is called upon to promote? Hence it follows that the care of such a common good does not imply a power so extensive over the members of the community that, in virtue of it, the public authority can interfere with the evolution of that individual activity which we have just described, decide directly on the beginning or — excepting the care of legitimate capital punishment — the ending of human life, determine at will the manner of his physical, spiritual, religious and moral movements in opposition to the personal duties or rights of man, and to

---

obbligazioni e decisioni, di cui è direttamente responsabile verso il Creatore." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199-200.)

6 "Spetta invero all'uomo il dovere del tutto personale di conservare e ravviare a perfezionamento la sua vita materiale e spirituale, per conseguire lo scopo religioso e morale, che Dio ha assegnato a tutti gli uomini e dato loro quale norma suprema [...]." (Ibid., p. 200.)

> this end abolish or deprive of efficacy his natural rights to material goods. To deduce such extension of power from the care of the common good would be equivalent to overthrowing the very meaning of the word common good and falling into the error that the proper scope of man on earth is society, that society is an end in itself, that man has no other life which awaits him beyond that which ends here below.[7]

This text serves to crystallize the thought of Pius XII as to what the state must do and what the state must avoid within the domain of human rights, inclusive of property rights. It, therefore, requires extensive comment with the addition of supplementary texts bearing on the same subject.

First, it is to be noted that the Pope stresses that it is the essential duty of every public authority to

---

7 "Tutelare l'intangibile campo dei diritti della persona umana e renderle agevole il compimento dei suoi doveri vuol essere ufficio essenziale di ogni pubblico potere. Non è forse questo che porta con sè il significato genuino del bene comune, che lo Stato è chiamato a promuovere? Da qui nasce che la cura di un tal 'bene comune' non importa un potere tanto esteso sui membri della comunità, che in virtù di esso sia concesso all'autorità pubblica di menomare lo svolgimento dell'azione individuale sopra descritta, decidere direttamente sull'inizio o (escluso il caso di legittima pena) sul termine della vita umana, determinare a proprio talento la maniera del suo movimento fisico, spirituale, religioso e morale in contrasto con i personali doveri e diritti dell'uomo, e a tale intento abolire o privare d'efficacia il diritto naturale ai beni materiali. Dedurre tanta estensione di potere dalla cura del bene comune vorrebbe dire travolgere il senso stesso del bene comune e cadere nell'errore di affermare che il proprio scopo dell'uomo sulla terra è la società, che la società è fine a se stessa, che l'uomo non ha altra vita che l'attende fuori di quella che si terminà quaggiù." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 200.)

assist in safeguarding the rights and facilitating the fulfilment of the duties of the human person. It is an essential duty and, therefore, not simply dependent upon political expediency or other empirical circumstances.

Secondly, the duty of the state to provide such assistance is implied within the true nature of the common good, which is the proper object of the state's activity. "The whole political and economic activity of the state", the Pope said in the Christmas Broadcast of 1942, "is directed to the permanent realization of the common good."[8] Hence it is that the principle governing the state's intervention in economic and social life is the common good of which the state is the guardian. In no way does the proper concept of the common good, safeguarded by the state, interfere with the realization of the personal values inherent in human rights. On the contrary, "it is the noble prerogative and function of the state to control, aid and direct the private and individual activities of national life that they converge harmoniously towards the common good."[9] Such

---

8 "[...] che tutta l'attività dello Stato, politica ed economica serve per l'attuazione duratura del bene comune." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 13.)

9 "Eo igitur nobilissimo munere fungitur res publica, ut in nationis vita, privata singulorum incepta et opera recognoscat, temperet atque promoveat; eaque ad comune omnium bonum convenienter dirigat; [...]." (Encyclical Letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 433.)

were the words Pius XII used to describe the general function of the state in the Encyclical Summi Pontificatus.

Thirdly, he soundly repudiated those in public authority who would so distort the meaning of the common good that, in its name, they would destroy the dignity of individuals in the free exercise of their personal rights, even to the extent of abolishing their rights to material goods. This would be tantamount to a perversion of the natural order wherein society exists for man, and not man for society.

Subsequent documents of the Holy Father serve to confirm the principles contained in the basic text of 1941. What is more, they appear to provide precision and clarity to his concept of the proportion that must exist between the role of the state and the free exercise of personal initiative in economic activity. The following texts combine to further demonstrate that it is the responsible function of government to enlarge rather than restrict the area of human freedom, to strengthen rather than weaken the rights of private property.

In the Christmas address of 1942, he explained the function of government in relation to the individual and social activities of its citizens. His theme was that the state is not to dominate but to serve. He declared:

> That social life, such as God willed it, may attain its scope, it needs a juridical order to support it from without, to defend and protect it. The function of this juridical order is not to dominate but to serve, to help the development and the increase of society's vitality in the rich multiplicity of its ends, leading all the individual energies to their perfection in peaceful competition and defending them with appropriate and honest means against all that may militate against their full evolution.[10]

Further on in this address, he drew attention to the necessary role of governmental legislation as a preventative in forestalling the possibility of the worker's freedom being destroyed by the exploitation of private capital or even by concentrations of excessive power within the state itself. He points to legislation as a necessary means to make the possession of private property a possibility for all:

> The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private property, if possible, to all. Positive legislation regulating private ownership may change and more or less restrict its use. But if legislation is to play its part in the pacification

---

10 "Affinchè la vita sociale, quale è voluta da Dio, ottenga il suo scopo, è essenziale un ordinamento giuridico, che le serva di esterno appoggio, di riparo e protezione; ordinamento la cui funzione non è dominare, ma servire, tendere a sviluppare e accrescere la vitalità della società nella ricca molteplicità dei suoi scopi, conducendo verso il loro perfezionamento tutte le singole energie in pacifico concorso e difendendole, con mezzi appropriati ed onesti, contro tutto ciò che è svantaggioso al loro pieno svolgimento." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 13.) Emphasis added.

> of the community, it must prevent the worker, who is or will be a father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person. Whether this slavery arises from the exploitation of private capital or from the power of the state the result is the same.[11]

This text makes it clear that, whenever there is a maldistribution of private property, it is the state's duty to enact legislation not only to protect property rights but to extend the benefits of private property as widely as possible. Since the propertyless worker is the most victimized by concentrations of wealth, it is natural that he should be the first concern of the state's power to legislate. In practice, this means that the state has widespread and undisputed power to enact legislation conducive to the extension of private ownership always with a view to safeguarding the right of the individual to work out his economic destiny in freedom and dignity. Such legislation is

---

11 "La dignità della persona umana esige dunque normalmente come fondamento naturale per vivere il diritto all'uso dei beni della terra; a cui risponde l'obbligo fondamentale di accordare una proprietà privata, possibilmente a tutti. Le norme giuridiche positive, regolanti la proprietà privata, possono mutare e accordare un uso più o meno circoscritto; ma se vogliono contribuire alla pacificazione della comunità, dovranno impedire che l'operaio, che è o sarà padre di famiglia, venga condannato ad una dipendenza e servitù economica, inconciliabile con i suoi diritti di persona.

"Che questa servitù derivi dal prepotere del capitale privato o dal potere dello Stato, l'effetto non muta [...]." (Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 13.) Emphasis added.

the more urgent when the mass of workers are reduced to the indignity of slaves by the exploitation of accumulated capital or by the omnipotent state. Otherwise the peace of society is imperiled.

In the address of September 1, 1944, almost totally devoted to the urgency of a fairer distribution of wealth, the Holy Father was even more convincing in proclaiming the essential role of the state as a controlling power over private property as a natural institution destined to serve the values of the human person and at the same time secure its social values by administering to the needs of all. He said:

> The social and economic policy of the future, the controlling power of the state, of local bodies, of professional institutions cannot permanently secure their end, which is the genuine productivity of social life and the normal return on national economy, except by restricting and safeguarding the vital function of private property in its personal and social values. When the distribution of property is an obstacle to this end which is, not necessarily nor always, an outcome of the extension of private inheritance, the state may, in the public interest, intervene by regulating its use or even, if it cannot equitably meet the situation in any other way, by decreeing the expropriation of property, given a suitable indemnity. For the same purpose, small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades, in commerce and industry should be guaranteed and promoted; [...].[12]

---

12 "La politica sociale ed economica dell'avvenire, l'attività ordinatrice dello Stato, dei Comuni, degl'istituti professionali, non potranno conseguire durevolmente il loro alto fine, che è la vera fecondità della vita sociale e il normale rendimento della economia nazionale, se non

Here, once again, is a clear-cut affirmation of the state's right to intervene for the purpose of protecting the institution of private property in its necessary role as a guarantor of personal freedom as well as the instrument to provide for the economic welfare of all. If the distribution of ownership frustrates this purpose, then it is the business of the state to overhaul the institution of private property in a manner that will respect human dignity and the common good. In the concluding part of this text, he obviously has the state in mind, when he stresses the urgency of encouraging the promotion of the moderate-size property holding as a means of effecting a more equitable diffusion of the nation's wealth.

The foregoing texts culled especially from the important addresses of June 1, 1941, Christmas 1942, and September 1, 1944. serve to make available the main lines of Pius XII's thought on the principle and the extent of the

---

rispettando e tutelando la funzione vitale della proprietà privata nel suo valore personale e sociale. Quando la distribuzione della proprietà è un ostacolo a questo fine — ciò che non necessariamente nè sempre è originato dalla estensione del patrimonio privato — lo Stato può nell'interesse comune intervenire per regolarne l'uso, od anche, se non si può equamente provvedere in altro modo, decretare la espropriazione, dando una conveniente indennità. Per lo stesso scopo la piccola e la media proprietà nell'agricoltura, nelle arti e nei mestieri, nel commercio e nell'industria debbono essere garantite e promosse." (The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)

state's intervention in economic and social life, with the accent on the domain of property rights. One thought seems to dominate his treatment of this doctrine: it is the business of the state to aid, control and stimulate the person in the free exercise of his rights whether in the economic sphere or elsewhere. This is to be achieved not by smothering or mothering him, but rather by creating the external conditions that will facilitate the full flowering of personal initiative. In other words this is to secure the common good which is the mission proper to the state. For example, in the matter of property rights it is not the normal function of the state to expropriate them, except in cases where the common good demands such action. On the contrary, it is the function of the state to regulate the use of private property by enacting legislation and by initiating any other legitimate means that will create the external conditions conducive to the acquisition of property by more and more of its citizens.

Within this concept of the state deduced from the documents cited above, there is contained the famous principle of subsidiarity which has to do with relations between the state and individuals as well as the groups under its jurisdiction. Pius XII gave to this principle its full and essential meaning when he defined the role of the state in terms of a definite positive assistance to the individual

or the group. It is not the function of the state to substitute for the latter, except in cases where no other effective course is possible. Its intervention by way of assistance is an essential one, not simply incidental to circumstances when the individual or the group defaults. It is true that the latter negative concept of the subsidiary role of the state could be ascribed to Pius XII if certain texts are considered in isolation from the main body of his teaching. For example, there is a citation from a letter written to the Semaines Sociales of France in 1947, which we had occasion to quote in connection with the problem of nationalization. In the context of a warning to avoid the opposite error of laissez-faire capitalism, he wrote:

> In the organization of production, full weight must be accorded this principle — always defended by the social teachings of the Church — that the activities and services of society ought to possess a merely subsidiary character, aiding or supplementing the activity of the individual, the family and the profession.[13]

Again in 1956, to the Italian Chamber of commerce, he spoke thus:

---

13 "Il faut dans l'organisation de la production, assurer toute sa valeur directrice à ce principe, toujours défendu par l'enseignement social de l'Eglise: que les activités et les services de la société doivent avoir un caractère strictement subsidiaire, aider ou compléter l'activité de l'individu, de la famille, de la profession." (Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, July 18, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 446.)

> No one will deny the need for assurance and vigilance exercised by public authority in the interest of the businessmen themselves as well as in that of the public. We may hope, then, that the state will be able to remain within the limits of its function of meeting the needs of private enterprise by keeping a watchful eye upon its progress, and by lending a helping hand, should the need arise. But the state ought not to take the place of private enterprise so long as the latter functions usefully and successfully.[14]

Here and in the preceding quotation we have a somewhat negative and restrictive interpretation of the state's subsidiary role. This is not surprising in the light of Pius XII's deep concern over the widespread penetration by the state into the sphere of the national economy during the year following the second world war. "In every area", he told the International Congress of Administrative sciences in 1950, "it has been necessary to deplore, here and there, excesses in the power of the state."[15] "In many countries", he expostulated in his Christmas address of 1952, "the modern state is becoming a gigantic administrative machine; it

---

14 "Nessuno negherà la necessità di accertamenti, di una vigilanza esercitata dalla pubblica autorità a vantaggio dei commercianti stessi, come del bene comune. Ma sia lecito di augurare che lo Stato sappia rimanere nei limiti della sua funzione di supplire alla intrapresa privata, che la segua, che al bisogno l'aiuti, ma che non si sostituisca ad essa, quando può agire con utilità e buon successo." (Business and the Common Good, Or sono dieci, Feb. 17, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 17, p. 547.)

15 "A toute époque, on a eu à déplorer, ici et là, des excès de la puissance de l'Etat." (The Modern State, A vous Messieurs, August 5, 1950, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 12, p. 159.)

extends its influence over almost every phase of life."[16] Little wonder, therefore, that he was wary about the extent of the state's function in the national economy. To be noted, however, is the fact that the quotations indicating such a cautious approach do not represent the main body of his teaching, where the subsidiary role of the state was shown to be positive, direct, essential and definite.

To conclude this section, we present two texts which serve to reinforce what has been said heretofore in connection with the state in its role as the promoter of personal values through the medium of safeguarding the common good. In his address to the International Congress of Administrative Sciences, Aug. 5, 1950, he presented the following concept of the state:

> It [the state] is not an omnipotence crushing all legitimate autonomy. Instead, its function, its magnificent function consists in favoring, helping and promoting an intimate coalition, an active cooperation aimed at a higher unity of members who, while respecting their subordination to the purpose of the state, contribute in the most effective manner to the welfare of the whole community, precisely in so far as they preserve and develop their individual and natural character. Neither the individual nor the family should be absorbed by the state. Each one retains and should protect his liberty of movement to the extent that he does not tend to prejudice the common good.

---

16 "[...] lo Stato moderno va divenendo una gigantesca macchina amministrativa. Esso stende la sua mano su quasi tutta la vita." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 37.)

> Furthermore, individuals — each and every one — and families have certain rights and liberties which the state must always protect; which it must never violate or sacrifice to a pretended common good.[17]

Some new insights into the nature of state activity are apparent in this text. Noteworthy is the point that the individual whose rights and liberties must be protected by the state makes his greatest contribution to the social welfare precisely to the extent that he develop his own natural and individual character associated with others in serving the common good. Noteworthy also is the fact that he repeats the idea that he developed in the basic address of 1941: a concept of the common good which would dissociate itself from the development of personal values is a counterfeit for the genuine common good.

The second text is from a letter addressed to Charles Flory, President of the Semaines Sociales of France,

---

17 "Il n'est pas une omnipotence oppressive de toute légitime autonomie. Sa fonction, sa magnifique fonction, est plutôt de favoriser, aider, promouvoir l'intime coalition, l'active coopération dans le sens d'une unité plus haute de membres qui, tout en respectant leur subordination à la fin de l'Etat, pourvoient de la meilleure façon au bien de toute la communauté, précisément en tant qu'ils conservent et développent leur caractère particulier et naturel. Ni l'individu, ni la famille, ne doit être absorbé par l'Etat. Chacun garde et doit garder sa liberté de mouvement dans la mesure où elle ne risque pas de porter préjudice au bien commun. En outre, il y a certains droits et libertés des individus — de chaque individu — ou de la famille, que l'Etat doit toujours protéger et qu'il ne peut violer ou sacrifier à un prétendu bien commun." (The Modern State, A vous Messieurs, August 5, 1950, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 12, p. 160.)

July 14, 1954, dealing with the roots of civil crisis. Here the Pope is crystal clear in pointing out the dual role of the state: to protect liberty and, at the same time, to procure the common good, avoiding the temptation to be identified with one or other of the extremes — economic liberalism or statism. He wrote:

> To protect the liberty of the citizen then, as at the same time to serve the common good through the active cooperation of all vital forces of the nation, those invested with public authority should carry out their duties with firmness and independence [...].
>
> Faithfullness to this ideal on the part of those who govern will be, moreover, their best safeguard against the dual temptation which awaits them as they confront the increasing amplitude of their task: a temptation to weakness which would cause them to yield to the combined pressure of men and events; or, a contrary temptation to espouse statism, as a result of which public authority would substitute itself unduly for free private initiative in order to regulate directly the social economy and other branches of human activity. Now if one cannot today deny to the state a right which liberalism denied to it, it is nonetheless true that the role of the state is not essentially the direct assumption of the economic, cultural and social functions which lie outside its province, rather it is to insure the true independence of its authority so as to be able to delegate to those who exercise lawful power in a country an equitable share of responsibility, without imperiling its own mission of co-ordinating and orientating all efforts towards a higher common good.[18]

---

18 "Aussi bien est-ce pour protéger la liberté du citoyen, en même temps que pour servir le bien commun par l'active coopération de toutes les forces vives de la nation, que les pouvoirs publics doivent exercer leur activité avec fermeté et indépendance. Ils le feront avec une claire vision de leur mission et de ses limites [...].

Two main thoughts occur in terms of commentary on this text. First, it would appear that Pius XII supports a sound middle-of-the-road policy for the state in economic as well as other forms of social life, a policy neither to be identified with the rigorous abstention from economic life advanced by economic liberalism in its philosophy of the state, nor with the direct assumption (under normal condition) of economic and other social activities advocated by a theory which he labels "statism". A second thought is that encroachment of the state in the area of individual activity appears to be the chief factor perpetrating the crisis between citizen and government, the subject discussed at the Semaines Sociales. The Pope sees the evil of such

---

"La fidélité des gouvernants à cet idéal sera au surplus leur meilleure sauvegarde contre la double tentation qui les guette devant l'ampleur croissante de leur tâche: tentation de faiblesse qui les ferait abdiquer sous la pression conjuguée des hommes et des événements; tentation inverse d'étatisme par laquelle les pouvoirs publics se substitueraient indûment aux libres initiatives privées pour régir de façon immédiate l'économie sociale et les autres branches de l'activité humaine. Or, si l'on ne peut aujourd'hui nier à l'Etat un droit que lui refusait le libéralisme, il n'en reste pas moins vrai que sa tâche n'est pas en principe d'assumer directement les fonctions économiques, culturelles et sociales qui relèvent d'autres compétences; elle est bien plutôt d'assurer la réelle indépendanse de son autorité, en sorte de pouvoir accorder à tout ce qui représente une puissance effective et valable dans le pays une juste part de responsabilité, sans péril pour sa propre mission de coordonner et d'orienter tous les efforts vers une fin commune supérieure." (Roots of Civil Crisis, En ouvrant à Rennes, July 14, 1954, in AAS, 46 (1954), p. 486-487.)

an encroachment not only in the fact that it frustrates the activities of individuals and the group; it also perverts the very nature of the state itself, by usurping the role of the individual, thus undermining the independence of the state's own authority as well as imperiling its proper mission to serve the common good. The civil crisis is, therefore, basically a moral crisis.

II. THE PRINCIPLES APPLIED

To achieve the goal of widespread ownership, the state is bound to provide all the assistance within its competence. Certainly, this principle, such as it was developed by Pius XII, could be invoked to justify the state undertaking a comprehensive and vigorous program to aid in distributing the benefits of property within its boundaries. The question now is centered on the specific form of state intervention the public authorities should undertake to achieve this worthy aim. To give the answer in the light of Pius XII's pronouncements is the task now at hand. The possibility of nationalization as the normal means to distribute the benefits of ownership can be dismissed immediately, since this problem was explored in chapter III. Suffice it to recall that allowance was made for public ownership when the common good demands it. The principle is clear. The problem is situated in determining when the

common good demands the application of the principle since such a good cannot be determined with the precision of a mathematical yardstick. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Pope's approach to the decentralization of property accentuates the positive. In this connection, he not only endorsed state measures to achieve widespread ownership; he also proposed and urged a specific role for the state in three areas which, for the sake of orderly development, we choose to categorize and present as follows: A. Promotion of small-scale property ownership, B. Economic planning for a productive and balanced economy, and C. State participation in systems of social insurance.

A. Promotion of Small-scale Property Ownership.

As the previous chapter demonstrated, Pius XII attributed a unique importance to the family-sized unit of private property and advocated an increase in the number of such owners. To this end, he called upon the state to exercise a special role. "If private property has to conduce to the good of the family", he noted in the 1941 discourse, "all public standards and especially those of the state, which regulate its possession, must not only make possible and preserve such a function [...] but must also perfect it even more."[19]

19 "Se la proprietà privata ha da condurre al bene della famiglia, tutte le norme pubbliche, anzi tutte quelle

Subsequent pronouncements spelled out what the state should do towards perfecting private property in its God-given mission to assure personal and family dignity, with the accent on the latter. To exemplify, in his speech to the International Association of Small Business, he advocated a state-inspired fiscal policy designed to aid small business when in danger of being swallowed up by the large enterprise:

> The evolution of the modern economy to the accompanying rhythm of discoveries and the innumerable applications which stem therefrom accentuates the uneasiness of small and medium-sized businesses with respect to their bigger competitors. The modernization of mechanical equipment and more rational methods of mass production and distribution work quite frequently to the advantage of enterprises which have large amounts of capital on hand. On occasion, there is even the dreaded danger of being crushed by the giants, who exercisw the full pressure of their weight on weaker structures; but you too have at your disposal means of protection and defence both from inside and outside your social group. The state, which possesses in you an important factor of stability, should not refuse you the support on which you are counting, especially in the domain of credit and the tax structure.[20]

---

dello Stato che ne regolano il possesso, devono non solo rendere possibile e conservare tale funzione [...] ma ancora perfezionarla sempre più." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 202.)

20 "L'évolution de l'économie moderne, au rythme des découvertes et des applications innombrables qui en découlent accentue le malaise des petites et moyennes entreprises face à leurs concurrentes de dimensions plus grandes. La modernisation de l'équipement mécanique, les méthodes plus rationnelles de production en masse et de distribution

This text contains a keen economic analysis of a problem before which the state must not refuse special help to enable small business to remain competitive. Although he refrains from stating details, nonetheless there is good reason to believe that a government policy, granting special low tax concessions and low credit costs to the small business, would be in line with the thinking of Pius XII; this would have to be on the presumption that the small business is operating under an economic disadvantage. Otherwise the concession would be unfair to the larger business and contrary to what he said, on another occasion, concerning taxes and the moral principles for their justification. To the International Association of Financial and Fiscal Law, he noted that the necessary burden of taxes should be borne by the citizens in proportion to their ability to contribute and they should not favor one branch of business to the detriment of another:

---

avantagent le plus souvent les entreprises qui disposent de capitaux considérables. Vous redoutez même parfois le péril d'être écrasés par des géants qui pèsent de tout leur poids sur des structures plus faibles; mais vous disposez aussi de moyens de protection et de défense tant à l'extérieur qu'à l'intérieur de votre groupe social. L'Etat, qui possède en vous un important facteur d'équilibre, ne doit pas vous refuser l'appui sur lequel vous comptez, surtout dans le domaine du crédit et du système fiscal." (Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 800-801.)

> It is the obligation of the state to assess upon its citizens only necessary levies which are furthermore proportionate to their means; taxation, then, can never become a convenient way for public authority to make up a deficit brought on by an improvident administration, or a means of favoring one industry or branch of business at the expense of another of equal utility.[21]

This again testifies to the danger of invoking the Pope's name for approval of anything and everything on the basis of an isolated text.

In the context of an appeal to preserve and promote whatever contributes to the personal and social values attached to rural life, the Holy Father issued two pronouncements respecting the role of the state in distributing farm ownership according to human scale. "It is not our business to define the particular provision that society ought to adopt in order to fulfill its obligation of coming to the assistance of the rural population", he told the confederation of Italian Tenant Farmers in 1956; "nevertheless", he went on to say, "it seems to us that the aims pursued by your confederation are in accordance with the duties which

---

21 "Mais l'Etat a l'obligation de ne répartir entre ceux-ci que des charges nécessaires et proportionnées à leurs ressources. L'impôt ne peut donc jamais devenir pour les pouvoirs publics un moyen commode de combler le déficit provoqué par une administration imprévoyante, de favoriser une industrie ou une branche du commerce aux dépens d'une autre également utile." (Taxes, Parmi les nombreux, Oct. 3, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 508-509.)

society has towards you."[22] He, then, went on to present a detailed program involving the role of society in agricultural reform:

> Such are, for example, the wider diffusion of agricultural ownership and its productive development; the placing of farmers who are not property owners in the position of salaried employees working under contract with an income sufficient to insure their stability on the lands cultivated by them and to facilitate their rise to full property rights, preserving, of course, the regard due to productivity, to the rights of the owners and above all to their investments; encouraging them with concrete assistance to improve their method of cultivating the soil and their income as well as the prosperity of the nation by promoting in their favor those forms of assistance and insurance which are common among other groups of laborers, but administered according to the special conditions of the farmer; promoting the technical training, especially of the young men, in keeping with modern and rational methods which are in continual progress; and, finally, taking pains to remove the acute difference between agricultural and industrial income, which is the cause of the abandonment of the countryside to the great disadvantage of an economy which in a country like yours, is based in large part upon agricultural production.[23]

---

22 "Non spetta a Noi definire i particolari provvedimenti che la società deve adottare per adempiere l'obbligo di prestare aiuto alla categoria rurale; nondimeno Ci sembra che gli scopi perseguiti dalla vostra Confederazione coincidano coi doveri della società stessa verso di voi." (The Farmer's Three Duties, Vi siamo grati, April 11, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 278.)

23 "Tali sono, ad esempio, diffondere la proprietà agricola e il suo sviluppo produttivo; porre gli agricoltori non proprietari in condizioni di salari, di contratti e di reddito tali da favorire la loro stabilità sui fondi da essi coltivati e facilitare il conseguimento della piena proprietà (salvo sempre il riguardo dovuto alla produttività, ai diritti dei proprietari e sopratutto ai loro investimenti);

Following this, he noted the additional duty of society to aid in providing impoverished rural areas with such amenities as "adequate housing, roads, schools, aqueducts, electric power, medical centres."[24] He concluded his reference to the role of society in the life of the life of the farmer with this note of caution:

> Your right to ask the nation for these and other services is admitted, but you must not forget to ask for them without taking account of what the nation can actually do, or with the impatience of those who regard the state as the mere servant of individuals or of particular classes.[25]

---

incoraggiarli con aiuti concreti a migliorare le colture e il patrimonio zootecnico, in modo che se ne avvantaggi sia il loro reddito sia la prosperità nazionale; promuovere inoltre a loro favore le forme di assistenza e di assicurazioni, comuni agli altri lavoratori (ma amministrate secondo le speciali condizioni dell'agricoltore); agevolare la preparazione tecnica, specialmente dei giovani, secondo i metodi razionali e moderni in continuo progresso; ed infine adoperarsi affinchè venga rimossa quella troppo stridente differenza tra il reddito agricolo e l'industriale, che causa l'abbandono delle campagne, con tanto danno della economia in un Paese come il vostro, fondato in buona parte sulla produzione agricola." (The Farmer's Three Duties, Vi siamo grati, April 11, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 278-279.)

24 "[...] sufficientemente qua e là di abitazioni, di strade, di scuole, di acquedotti, di energia elettrica, di ambulatori medici." (Ibid., p. 279.)

25 "Orbene, mentre è consentito a voi di richiedere alla comunità nazionale l'attuazione di questi e simili provvedimenti, non dovete dimenticare il vostro obbligo di non esigerli senza tener conto delle reali possibilità della nazione, o con l'impazienza di chi guarda lo Stato quale semplice servitore degli individui e delle classi." (Ibid.)

The second pronouncement, from a letter to Cardinal Siri, on the occasion of the 1957 Italian Social Week reiterates much of the above with the addition of a stronger emphasis on the state's right to regulate and restrict the use of private ownership in land, even to the extent of expropriation; the right is to be exercised with a view to forestalling the unfair imbalance between the rural and other classes in the nation. "If the human values of farm life are to be effectively safeguarded", he wrote, "it is clear that the principal help has to come from the farmers themselves."[26] But he went on to note:

> The efforts of individuals and organizations are not enough, however. The state must intervene to some extent, for it cannot surrender its position as guardian of the common good in such an important sector. Without taking the place of the personal activity of the people directly concerned and their organizations, it has the duty of stimulating and coordinating the efforts of private individuals, and of bringing about general conditions with regard to public education, communications, and the various types of insurance and social security, for example, which can do the most to prevent an unfair inequality between various classes and to guarantee in its place a positive and continuous economic and social development.[27]

---

26 "Per il raggiungimento poi di una efficace tutela dei valori umani della vita agricola, è chiaro che l'aiuto principale deve venire dagli agricoltori stessi [...]." (Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 833.)

27 "Non bastano però gli sforzi individuali ed associati. Occorre in certa misura anche l'intervento dello Stato, il quale in un settore così importante non può

At this juncture, he makes a practical application of the principle that the state has the right to intervene in regulating the use of private property such as he had enunciated in the September message of 1944. Obviously referring to the maldistribution in farm ownership, detrimental to the social and personal values inherent in private property, he pinpointed the precise role of the state confronted with this anomaly. He went on to write:

> For this reason, with a full recognition of the vital part played by private property and its value to society as well, We have still seen fit to declare that when "the distribution of property is an obstacle to this end — and this obstacle does not always or necessarily arise from the extension of private ownership — the state can step in, in the interests of the common good, to regulate its use, and even appropriate it, upon payment of a just indemnity, if there is no other way to correct the situation".[28]

---

rinunciare alla sua funzione di responsabile del bene comune. Senza sostituirsi alla attività personale degli interessati e dei loro gruppi, esso è chiamato a coordinare e a stimolare le energie dei privati, come pure a dar vita a quelle condizioni generali in ordine all'istruzione pubblica, alle comunicazioni, alle forme di previdenza e sicurezza sociale, che possono impedire il più possibile uno squilibrio fra le varie classi, e garantire invece un positivo e continuativo sviluppo economico e sociale." (Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 834.)

28 "Per questo motivo, pur riconoscendo la funzione vitale della proprietà privata nel suo valore anche sociale, Noi abbiamo affermato che quando "la distribuzione della proprietà è un ostacolo al fine — ciò che non necessariamente nè sempre è originato dalla estensione del patrimonio privato — lo Stato può nell'interesse comune intervenire per regolarne l'uso, se non si può equamente provvedere in

In connection with the foregoing texts relating to how the state can best play its part in distributing ownership, it is to be observed that Pius XII attributes primary importance to that form of government intervention which will provide the framework for the smaller unit of property to expand and flourish. This is not to deny that he would look with disfavor on legislation designed to prevent an increase in large scale concentrations of ownership, when they are not technically indispensable. On the contrary his statement, to the effect that the state has the duty to regulate and restrict the right of ownership in the interests of the common good, serves to give impetus to such socially orientated legislation. Another significant observation is that he says little about taxation as an effective and direct means to redistribute property, except to note that a fiscal policy should favor the smaller unit when its economic viability is jeopardized, and that the burden of taxation should bear heavier on the wealthy. Conceived as such, taxes could be considered as an effective instrument to remedy the imbalance created by concentrated wealth.

---

altro modo, decretare la espropriazione, dando una conveniente indennità." (Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 834-835.)

B. State Participation in Systems of Social Insurance.

Systems of social insurance designed to redistribute wealth and to offset the imbalance between different classes of citizens assumed major proportions during the pontificate of Pius XII. Indirectly they tended to increase the income of workers and thereby add to their capacity to acquire property of their own. It is not surprising that the Pope endorsed them, designed as they were, to aid the indigent. Indeed, his vigorous insistence on the universality of the right to the use of material goods, would certainly be an endorsement to any legitimate movement given to assure security to the very young, the sick, the aged and the unemployed. "We have repeatedly and even with greater insistence", he said in his Christmas message of 1950, "proclaimed the fight against unemployment and the striving after a sound social security as an indispensable condition, if all members of a nation both high and low are to be united in a single corporate body."[29]

---

29 "Perciò molte volte, e con sempre maggior insistenza, noi abbiamo segnalato la lotta contro la disoccupazione e lo sforzo verso una ben intesa sicurezza sociale come una condizione indispensabile per unire tutti i membri di un popolo alti e bassi, in un sol Corpo." (Christmas Message, Un anno, Dec. 23, 1950, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 55.)

In his 1956 speech to the Italian Federation of Commerce, he described social security and generally approved of its growth in modern times:

> Undoubtedly, nowadays more than in the past, there is a growing desire to assure to all classes of society guarantees that will preserve them from the mishaps and chances inherent in the fluctuations of the economy; guarantees that will protect employment and its rewards; guarantees that will provide for sickness and incapacitating accidents that may reduce a man to idleness and deprive him of the means of livelihood. This solicitude is quite justified; but in many cases the present system of social security has not yet succeeded in putting an end to difficult situations or in healing wounds that are always open.[30]

Since most of the contemporary systems to provide social insurance were administered and partially subsidized by the state, Pius XII obviously felt it necessary to point out the precise role of public authority. Here, as in elsewhere, he promoted the positive subsidiary role of the state, but at the same time, issued a stern warning that the autonomy of individuals and local associations must be

---

30 "Senza dubbio si nutre, ora più che nel passato, il desiderio di assicurare a tutte le classi sociali garanzie che le preservino da contraccolpi e da casi inerenti alle fluttuazioni della economia, che proteggano l'impiego e la retribuzione, che prevedano le malattie e le incapacità suscettibili di ridurre un uomo alla inazione e privarlo dei mezzi di sostentamento. Sono queste ben giuste sollecitudini; in molti casi del resto il sistema di sicurezza sociale non riesce ancora a far cessare condizioni penose e a guarire piaghe sempre aperte." (Business and the Common Good, Or sono dieci, Feb. 17, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 17, p. 546-547.)

safeguarded and, to finance such programs, private property must not be taxed out of existence. Furthermore, he appeared to be disturbed over the prospect that an exaggerated desire for artificial forms of social security would make obsolete the institution of private property as the natural means to provide personal freedom and independence. In this connection, the following major pronouncements on state-subsidized social insurance serve to illustrate his deep concern.

In his 1943 discourse to the Italian workers, he stated that the "whole complex structure of society is in need of adjustment and improvement, salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution but in evolution through concord."[31] Among the factors contributing to this prudent and progressive evolutionary process, he included the state's role in providing social security:

> Not to aim at making the lives of individuals depend entirely on the whims of the state, but to procure rather that the state, whose duty it is to promote the common good, may, through social institutions such as insurance and social security societies, supply support and complete all that helps to strengthen workers' association, and especially

---

31 "Ma tutta l'intera e complessa struttura della società ha bisogno di raddrizzamenti e di miglioramenti [...] non nella rivoluzione, ma in una evoluzione concorde sta la salvezza e la giustizia." (The Church and Labor, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 172, 175.)

> the fathers and mothers of families who are earning a livelihood for themselves and their dependents through work.[32]

Here he recognizes that the state has a role to play, but must not overplay it to the detriment of autonomous institutions. Somewhat the same idea he repeated in the Christmas address of 1955, when he defended the primary role of the family and private property in providing security. His defence was aimed at those who would rest their security solely in artificial systems based on the achievements of technology and a better organization of the nation's productive forces: "to establish security", he said, "they conclude, there will therefore no longer be any necessity to have recourse to property either private or collective, either in goods or in money."[33] "In this excessively artificial system, man's security over his own life", he

---

32 "Non mirare a far dipendere totalmente la vita dei singoli dall'arbitrio dello Stato, ma piuttosto procurare che lo Stato, di cui è dovere promuovere il bene comune, con istituzioni sociali, quali sono le società di assicurazione e di previdenza sociale, supplisca, assecondi a compia quel che giova a confermare nella loro azione le associazioni operaie, e specialmente i padri e le madri di famiglia, che assicurano a sè e ai loro col lavoro la vita." (The Church and Labor, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 175.)

33 "Per stabilire la sicurezza, essi concludono, non sarà perciò più abile il ricorso alla proprietà, sia privata che collettiva, sia in natura che in capitale." (Christmas Message, Col cuore aperto, Dec. 24, 1955, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 35.)

continued, "is dangerously separated from arrangements and forces for the organization of the community which are inherent in true human nature and which alone render possible a responsible association of men."[34] He, then, went on to enumerate in the order of their importance, these "inherent forces in true human nature":

> Somehow though with necessary adjustments to the times, family and property must remain among the fundamentals of the free settlements of persons. Somehow, the lesser social units and the state must be able to come together as complementary agents of security.[35]

This strong statement is indicative of Pius XII's high regard for private property and the family as basic in the attainment of security. Local associations and the state, as complementary forces, are also necessary. But private property and the family, among the agents working for social security, are basic and rank first in importance.

---

34 "In questo troppo artificiale sistema la sicurezza dell'uomo per la sua vita è pericolosamente separata dalle disposizioni e dalle energie per l'ordinamento della comunità, inerenti alla stessa vera natura umana, e le quali soltanto rendono possibile una unione solidale degli uomini." (Christmas Message, Col cuore aperto, Dec. 24, 1955, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 35.)

35 "In qualche modo, sebbene col necessario adattamento ai tempi, la famiglia e la proprietà debbono restare tra i fondamenti della libera sistemazione personale. In qualche modo le comunità minori e lo Stato debbono poter intervenire come fattori complementari di sicurezza." (Ibid.) Emphasis added.

In the lengthy letter of 1952, addressed to the Semaines Sociales of France, the Pope issued his most detailed statement on systems of social security. The subject discussed at the conference was the imbalance between wealth and poverty and how to cope with it by a better distribution of the national income. The letter is totally devoted to this subject. At one point in it, discussing the problem of achieving an equitable return for the workers in the enterprise, he admitted that what he had previously said on this question sufficed "to show the difficulty involved in a sound distribution of earthly goods."[36] In this connection, he proceeded to point out the indispensable role of the state:

> To meet the demands of the social life, such a distribution cannot be left to the free play of blind economic forces, but must be viewed on the level of the national economy, since it is on that level that one gets a clear picture of the aim which should be pursued in the service of the common temporal good. Whoever considers the problem in this fashion is led to question himself concerning the normal, even though restricted, functions which are vested in the state in these matters.[37]

---

36 "Ces quelques réflexions montrent déjà la difficulté d'une saine distribution." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 622.)

37 "Pour répondre aux exigences de la vie sociale, elle ne saurait être abandonnée au libre jeu des forces économiques aveugles, mais doit être envisagée au niveau de l'économie nationale, car c'est là que se prend une claire vision de la fin à poursuivre, au service du bien commun

Following this, he stated what the role of the state was in respect to the poor and indigent; this was secondary to what he said previously on the state's function in increasing and coordinating production:

> But it also devolves upon the state to see to it that the very poor people are not unjustly wronged. On this point, the doctrine of Our predecessors is explicit wherein they teach that in the protection of private rights, the authorities should have particular concern for the weak and the needy: "The wealthy class", as Leo XIII observed, "constructs for itself, as it were, a bulwark out of its wealth, and has less need for governmental protection. But the needy masses, on the contrary, without the means to protect themselves, rely especially upon the protection of the state" [Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno, citing Rerum Novarum, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, XXXIII, 1931, page 185].[38]

With this principle as the foundation, he went on justify state participation in programs of social insurance having due respect for the rights inherent in the private sector of the economy:

---

temporel. Or, qui considère ainsi les choses est conduit à s'interroger sur les fonctions, normales encore que restreintes, dévolues à l'Etat en ces matières." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 622-623.)

38 "Mais c'est aussi le propre de l'Etat de veiller à ce que les plus pauvres ne soient pas lésés injustement. Sur ce point, l'enseignement de Nos Prédécesseurs est formel: dans la protection des droits privés, les gouvernants doivent se préoccuper surtout des faibles et des indigents: 'La classe riche, observait Léon XIII, se fait comme un rempart de ses richesses et a moins besoin de la protection publique. La masse indigente, au contraire, sans ressource pour la mettre à couvert, compte surtout sur le patronage de l'Etat." (Ibid., p. 623.)

> It is for this reason that, in the face of the increased insecurity of many families whose precarious condition threatens to jeopardize their material, cultural and spiritual interests, some institutions have been endeavoring now for several years to correct the most flagrant evils which result from an over-mechanical distribution of the national income. While leaving due liberty to private factors of responsibility operating in the economic life, these institutions, remaining themselves adequately independent of the political power, can become for the low-income masses and for the poor of every category an indispensable remedy for the evils caused by the present economic or monetary disorder. However, the various forms and methods of such institutions should be studies with great care, and one could not possibly commit oneself unreservedly to a course wherein excessive taxes might threaten the rights of private property and wherein abuses of collective security might infringe upon personal or family rights.[39]

From the tenor of this passage, it would appear that Pius XII's approach to systems of social insurance tends to be

---

39 "C'est ainsi que, devant l'insécurité accrue d'un grand nombre de familles, dont la condition précaire risque de compromettre les intérêts matériels, culturels et spirituels, des institutions s'efforcent, depuis quelques années, de corriger les maux les plus flagrants qui résultent d'une distribution trop mécanique du revenu national. Laissant une légitime liberté aux responsables privés de la vie économique, ces institutions, suffisamment indépendantes elles-mêmes du pouvoir politique, peuvent devenir, pour la masse des petits salariés et des pauvres de toute catégorie, une indispensable compensation aux maux engendrés par le désordre économique ou monétaire. Il convient toutefois d'en étudier avec prudence les modalités, et il ne serait pas possible de s'engager sans réserves dans une voie où les excès de la fiscalité risqueraient de compromettre les droits de la propriété privée et où les abus de la sécurité collective pourraient porter atteinte à ceux de la personne et de la famille." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 623-624.)

cautious.[40] He seems to fear that they would serve to enhance political power and, by excessive taxation to finance them, endanger the right of private property.[41]

---

40 The context indicates that the institutions referred to are associated with the political powers. Benjamin L. Masse, S.J., a frequent commentator on papal social doctrine, in "Pope Pius XII on wealth and poverty", America, N.Y., Vol. 87, No. 22, Aug. 30, 1952, p. 156, states that, in connection with the address of July 7, 1952, "an inquiry in Rome brought the unofficial answer that by 'institution' the Holy Father had in mind those systems of social security, public and semi-public, which exist in all industrialized states today."

41 The text would seem to indicate that he accepts the principle of a redistribution of the national income in that he deplores the "over-mechanical distribution of the national income" (une distribution trop mécanique du revenu national). Other pronouncements on the question of fiscal policies indicate that he distrusts taxation as the normal, natural means to effect this redistribution. In his speech on taxes to the International Association for Fiscal and Financial Law (Parmi les nombreux, Oct. 3, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 508-509), he noted that modern states, because of extended social welfare program, need more money with the result that the heavy taxation required might result in diminishing economic incentive to the detriment of industry and commerce. In a speech on Public Finance (En nous procurant, Oct. 2, 1948, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 10, p. 240), he admonished those responsible for public finance not to destroy morals from the top by a tax policy detrimental to private initiative and personal concern for one's own family security; such a policy must be directed in terms of an efficient economic organization which would provide the material basis for spiritual and cultural values.

In addition to the above statements, Pius XII's doctrine on the principle of subsidiarity and the importance he attached to private property and the family as guarantees for security would seem to militate against a tax policy designed with an express purpose of distributing wealth and income. In this connection it is of interest to note that Bernard W. Dempsy, in "Opportunity Rejoined", Social Order, op. cit., January, 1956, p. 42, welcomes

In reference to a remedial program for the depressed state of agriculture already referred to, Pius XII made two significant statements concerning social insurance for farmers. In the first instance, he called upon the state to promote "those forms of assistance and insurance which are common among other groups of labourers, but administered according to the special conditions of the farmers."[42] In the second instance, he called upon the state to fulfill its role in effecting general conditions conducive to the formation of "various types of insurance and social security", which would be one way "to prevent an unfair inequality between various classes and to guarantee in its place a positive and continuous economic and social development."[43] Here he definitely approved social insurance in its capacity to remedy the imbalance between classes of citizens following upon an unfair distribution of wealth.

---

changes for the better relative to income distribution in the United States, but laments that this change is not the result of Catholic social thought; on the contrary it is almost entirely due to the tax system.

42 "[...] le forme di assistenza e di assicurazioni, comuni agli altri lavoratori (ma amministrate secondo le speciali condizioni dell'agricoltore); [...]." (The Farmer's Three Duties, Vi siamo grati, April 11, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 278.)

43 "[...] alle forme di previdenza e sicurezza sociale, che possono impedire il più possibile uno squilibrio fra le varie classi, e garantire invece un positivo e continuativo sviluppo economico e sociale." (Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 834.)

C. Economic Planning for a Productive and Balanced Economy.

In the address of 1952, referred to above, in the context of the state's duty towards the economically disadvantaged, the Holy Father stressed that the first duty devolving upon the state, in the matter of a sound distribution of earthly goods, was to plan for an increased production in the economy with a view to achieving a fairer distribution:

> First of all, the duty of increasing production and of adjusting it wisely to the needs and the dignity of the man places in the foreground the question as to how the economy should be regulated insofar as production is concerned. Now, although the public authorities should not substitute their tyrannical omnipotence for the legitimate self-government of private initiatives, these authorities have, nonetheless, in this matter, an undeniable role of coordination, which is made even more necessary in the confusion of present conditions, especially present social conditions. Specifically, without the cooperation of the public authorities it is not possible to formulate a concerted economic policy which would promote active cooperation on the part of all, and the increase of industrial production, the direct source of the national income.[44]

---

44 "Tout d'abord le devoir d'accroître la production et de la proportionner sagement aux besoins et à la dignité de l'homme pose au premier plan la question de l'ordonnance de l'économie sur le chapitre de la production. Or, sans substituer leur omnipotence oppressive à la légitime autonomie des initiatives privées, les pouvoirs publics ont ici un rôle indéniable de coordination qui s'impose plus encore dans l'enchevêtrement des conditions actuelles surtout sociales. En particulier, ce n'est pas sans leur concours que peut se constituer une politique économique d'ensemble qui favorise l'active coopération de tous et l'accroissement de la production des entreprises,

He, then, goes on to exemplify how a policy designed to stimulate credit and to check miserliness as well as luxurious spending, would result in a more balanced economy:

> Now if we think of the many riches which are lying dormant or being squandered in useless spending, but which if put back into circulation could contribute, through judicious and profitable use, to the welfare of so many families, could not these riches still serve the common good by opportunely helping to restore men's confidence, by stimulating credit, by checking egoism, and by promoting in this way a better balance in the economic life?[45]

In the above statements, the Pope is articulate on the urgency of the state's participation as the coordinator of all the factors conducing towards increased production and thereby increasing the national income. The obvious presumption is that what is not produced cannot be shared. If the total national income is low, any system of distribution, fair though it may be, would be reduced to a mere sharing of poverty. "To meet the demands of social life such a distribution cannot be left to the free play of

---

source directe de revenu national." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 623.)

45 "Et, si l'on pense à tant de richesses qui dorment ou se perdent dans le gaspillage, mais qui, remises en circulation, pourraient concourir, par un emploi judicieux et profitable, au bien-être de tant de familles, n'est-ce pas encore servir le bien commun que de contribuer opportunément à faire renaître la confiance, à stimuler le crédit, à décourager l'égoïsme et à favoriser ainsi un meilleur équilibre de la vie économique." (Ibid.)

blind economic forces", he said in preface to his remarks in this connection, "but must be viewed on the level of the national economy."[46] He thus vigorously opposed those who would reject any kind of economic planning on the part of the state as well as those who would support only a planned economy, characterized by a substitution of public authority for "the legitimate self-government of private initiatives" (la légitime autonomie des initiatives privées).[47]

In the 1956 address to the members of the Italian Waterworks Association, the Pope was more vehement in denouncing excessive state control over economic life to the extent of "total planning". "Where this interference is extended to 'total planning'", he said, "certain aims are realized but only at the cost of inestimable losses."[48] He went on to note that this did not mean he was belittling state plans to regulate the goods produced by human industry:

---

46 "[...] pour répondre aux exigences de la vie sociale, elle [une saine distribution] ne saurait être abandonnée au libre jeu des forces économiques aveugles mais doit être envisagée au niveau de l'économie nationale [...]." (Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 622.)

47 Ibid., p. 623.

48 "[...] ove di fatto si è giunti alla completa 'pianificazione', si sono ottenuti alcuni scopi ma il prezzo è stato quello di innumerevoli rovine." (The Christian Aspects of Business, Abbiamo accolto, April 13, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 94.)

> One sometimes hears understandable but scarcely justifiable complaints about certain interventions of the state, which are directed, not towards hindering the productive impulse, but rather towards regulating in a more equitable manner distribution of the goods produced by human industry. Such interventions cannot be called unlawful without some qualifications. Our rejection of totalitarian planning which destroys all individual enterprise does not imply that a regime of absolute freedom in the economic field is acceptable. This would in fact set a premium on indifference to the welfare of others, and would engender contempt for certain indispensable principles dictated by considerations of human and Christian brotherhood.[49]

It was in the 1950 address to the International Congress of Administrative Sciences that Pius XII was at his best in expressing the hopes and fears of economic planning at the state level. "The present era witnesses a luxuriant blossoming of 'plans' and 'unifications'", he noted; "we recognize willingly", he continued, "that within legitimate limits, these can be desirable and even required by circumstances, and, once more, what we condemn is but

---

49 "Capita, talvolta, di udire comprensibili, ma non giustificati lamenti a riguardo di alcuni interventi dello Stato diretti, non a impedire l'impulso della produzione, ma a regolare una distribuzione più equa del benessere che l'industria umana produce. Tali interventi non possono essere senz'altro dichiarati illegittimi. Respinta la 'pianificazione' che distrugge ogni intrapresa individuale, non è detto che si possa accettare il regime della libertà assoluta nelle attività economiche; troppo facile, sarebbe, infatti, la noncuranza e anche il disprezzo di alcune inderogabili e oggi più che mai urgenti norme dettate dalla fraternità umana e cristiana." (The Christian Aspects of Business, Abbiamo accolto, April 13, 1956, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 18, p. 94-95.)

the excessive seizure of power by the state."[50] He went on to express concern at the over-rigidity of plans failing to consider man, his rights and his personal as well as family needs. He used this occasion to make perhaps his most illuminating and explicit statement on the true nature of the state relative to the individual and social lives of its citizens:

> However, who does not realize the damage which would result, under such circumstances, should the last word in affairs of state be reserved to mere organizational technicians? No, the last word belongs to those who see in the state a living being, a normal emanation from human nature. It belongs to those who govern, in the name of the state, not man immediately, but the affairs of the country in such a way that individuals never find themselves, either in their private or social life, submerged under the weight of state administration. The last word belongs to those for whom the natural is more than a purely negative norm, more than a frontier closed to infiltration of positive legislation, and more than a simple technical adjustment to contingencies. It belongs rather to those who respect the natural law as the soul of this positive legislation — a soul which gives it its form, its meaning, its life. May the last word, the decisive word, in the administration of public affairs be the prerogative of such men.[51]

---

50 "L'époque présente assiste à une luxuriante floraison de 'plans' et d''unifications'. Nous reconnaissons volontiers que, dans de justes limites, ils peuvent être désirables et même requis par les circonstances et, encore une fois, ce que Nous rejetons, ce n'est que l'excès d'une mainmise de l'Etat." (The Modern State, A vous Messieurs, Aug. 5, 1950, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 12, p. 160.)

51 "Mais qui ne voit, dans ces conditions, le dommage qui résulterait du fait que le dernier mot dans les affaires de l'Etat serait réservé aux purs techniciens de l'organisation? Non, le dernier mot appartient à ceux qui

Subject to the conditions spelled out in this and the immediately preceding texts, it is pertinent to observe that government legislation to stimulate the productivity of the economy at the national level would be consonant with the true nature of the state such as the Holy Father explains it. To stimulate employment in economically retarded regions of a country would be an example of such enlightened state intervention in economic affairs. The question of unemployment was a concern for Pius XII. Indeed, he associated the right to work immediately and directly with the fundamental right of all to the use of material goods and he assigned to the state a special duty in this connection. "With the use of material goods you, yourselves, dear children, see how labour is connected", he said in the Pentecost message of 1941.[52] "It is necessary",

---

voient dans l'Etat une entité vivante, une émanation normale de la nature humaine, à ceux qui administrent, au nom de l'Etat, non pas immédiatement l'homme, mais les affaires du pays, en sorte que les individus ne viennent jamais, ni dans leur vie privée, ni dans leur vie sociale, à se trouver étouffés sous le poids de l'administration de l'Etat. Le dernier mot appartient à ceux pour qui le droit naturel est autre chose qu'une frontière fermée aux empiétements de la législation positive, âme qui lui donne sa forme, son sens, sa vie. Puisse donc le dernier mot, le mot décisif, dans l'administration de la chose publique, être l'apanage de tels hommes." (The Modern State, A vous Messieurs, Aug. 5, 1950, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 12, p. 161.)

52 "Con l'uso dei beni materiali voi stessi, diletti figli, comprendete come viene a congiungersi il lavoro." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 201.)

he continued, "because without it one cannot secure what is indispensable to life; and man has a natural grave obligation to maintain life."[53] In connection with the duty of the state to assure continuity of work, he said:

> If they [employers and workers, who are primarily responsible to provide work] do not fulfill their functions, or cannot, because of special extraordinary contingencies, fulfill them, then it falls back on the state to intervene in the field of labour and in the division and distribution of work according to the form and measure that the common good, properly understood, demands.[54]

Here it is not just a question of state legislation designed to improve working conditions. The question is whether or not the state is true to its proper mission as custodian of the common good in its duty to provide the conditions that will make for a better distribution of work, when the private sector of the economy fails to do so. In the 1952 Christmas message, devoted in part to the problem of unemployment, the Holy Father was even more specific:

---

53 "[Esso] è necessario, perchè senza di esso non si può procurare ciò che è indispensabile alla vita, mantenere la quale è un dovere naturale, grave, individuale." (The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 201.)

54 "Che se poi essi non adempiano il loro compito o ciò non possano fare per speciali straordinarie contingenze, allora rientra nell'ufficio dello Stato l'intervenire nel campo e nella divisione e nella distribuzione del lavoro, secondo la forma e la misura che richiede il bene comune rettamente inteso." (Ibid.)

> And when the private initiative is inactive or inadequate, the public authorities are obliged to provide employment, so far as possible, by undertaking works of general utility, and to facilitate by counselling and other means the finding of employment for those who seek it.[55]

To conclude this chapter on the role of the state, relative to the diffusion of ownership, Pius XII defined the principles as follows:

1. The right of private property has its origin in nature and not in the state; nonetheless the state has the natural right and duty to regulate the institution of private property so that it may realize its purpose: to make actual the more fundamental right of all to the use of material goods.
2. The common good is the supreme criterion justifying the state's right to intervene in the matter of property rights; this common good in the economic order is none other than the proper arrangement of material conditions necessary for the development of personal and cultural values for all the people.

---

55 "Dove poi la iniziativa privata resta inoperosa o sia insufficiente, i pubblici poteri sono obbligati a procurare, nella maggior misura possibile, posti di lavoro intraprendendo opere di utilità generale, a facilitare col consiglio e con altri aiuti l'assunzione al lavoro per coloro che lo cercano." (Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 40.)

3. The primary mission of the state as custodian of the common good postulates the protection and the enlargement of personal freedom. In the economic order, this means widely distributed private property as the safest guarantee for economic freedom and security.
4. The state's power to regulate property is limited by its own proper mission to serve the common good conceived as complementary to the fulfillment of personal rights.
5. In its deepest meaning the principle of subsidiarity underlines the positive, essential duty of the state to render all the assistance, within its competence, to the individual and social efforts of its citizens engaged in the fulfillment of their legitimate personal rights. In connection with the distribution of property, this means that the state has the duty to aid its citizens to acquire property in a manner conducive to personal development and the common good.

In applying these principles to the form of intervention the state should undertake to decentralize concentrations of ownership, he centered attention on measures to increase the number of actual owners. To this end, he encouraged the enactment of legislation to protect and augment

the number of proprietors in the arts and crafts, in small and medium business and especially in agriculture. The principle of state intervention, he furthermore noted, requires that the state assist the poor and the economically disadvantaged. To this end, Pius XII approved of state participation in social insurance programs designed to aid the indigent and thus reduce the disproportion in wealth between various classes of citizens. Such systems must proceed with caution lest they become too closely identified with political power and lest they endanger private property to the detriment of individuals and families who are the chief architects in providing for their personal security. Another application was the duty of the state to stimulate and to coordinate private and social efforts with a view to increasing production and distributing its fruits equitably. He denounced a totalitarian planned economy where human rights are absorbed by an omnipotent state. But he insisted on economic planning by the state, designed to increase production in a manner that would enable all its citizens to support themselves in dignity. To this end he considered to be paramount remedial legislation to offset the evils of unemployment.[56]

---

56 The question of migration and international trade, involving the world community of states, is another conceivable application of Pius XII's principles governing

state intervention in world wide economic life. To analyze and appraise his documents on this question would take us beyond the scope of this dissertation. Following an exhaustive study of Pius XII's documents on migration and international trade, Anthony F. Zimmerman, in "Overpopulation" (A Study of Papal Teachings on the Problem, with Special Reference to Japan), Washington, D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1957, p. 285, comes to the following conclusion as to Pius XII's role for states in formulating policies of migration and trade that will secure justice for all: "States also have a right to protect their economies and citizens through regulation of migration, but this is not an arbitrary power; States cannot exclude needy but decent people for insufficient reasons; the presumption favors freedom of migration; States must show cause before restricting this natural freedom [...] The pope also declared that the international trade pattern must be restored to its true function, namely that of supplementing the needs of national economies adequately. Unjust and unnecessary hindrances to international trade must be progressively removed while positive planning and development of trade on a regional and world scale is to proceed apace, until all members of the human family enjoy a healthy material existence, and the living standards of different nations approach each other more closely."

CHAPTER VI

PIUS XII'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH ON PROPERTY

The preceding Chapter marked the conclusion of Pius XII's doctrine relating to property. The question now arises: to what extent does he break new ground in his approach to the presentation of this teaching? To clarify the answer and to reach it more effectively, it is significant to note the "unity in diversity" observable in the ensemble of papal doctrine on social and economic problems. There is (a) the permanent element: the nature of man, the purpose of economic activity, the nature and purpose of the state, etc.; (b) the dynamic element: principles are capable of re-formulation and development, principles must be freshly adapted to changing perspectives in the social and political order. Pius XI refers to this dynamic element as he explains the need for a new encyclical forty years after Rerum Novarum:

> Yet, since in the course of these same years, certain doubts have arisen concerning either the correct meaning of some parts of Leo's Encyclical on conclusions to be deduced therefrom, which doubts, in turn, have even among Catholics given rise to controversies that are not always peaceful; and since, furthermore, new needs and changed conditions of our age have made necessary a more precise application of Leo's teaching or even certain additions thereto, We most gladly seize this

> fitting occasion, in accord with our Apostolic Office, through which we are debtors to all, (cf. Romans I.14) to answer so far as in Us lies, these doubts and these demands of the present day.[1]

In his selection of papal documents from Leo XIII to Pius XII, Father Koenig well describes the aspect of "unity in diversity":

> Through the doctrines and pronouncements of the five Popes, there runs an unmistakable oneness in principle; a reiteration of the same basic tenets. Linked with this essential unity, however, is a gradual development, a greater clarification and unfolding, a growth as the principles come to be applied to new issues. The more complete industrialization of modern society, the startling advance of technical science in the past 65 years, the historical evolution of individual nations — these factors raise new moral issues; and the intimate contact of the papacy with the realities of the ever-changing world scene is reflected in the new problems attacked by later Popes.[2]

As our introductory chapter indicated, Pius XII was confronted with the aweful consequences of world-wide

---

1 "Verum, cum, hoc eodem annorum fluxu, et dubia quaedam, de nonnullis Leonianarum partibus recte interpretandis aut de consectariis inde deducendis prodierint, quae inter ipsos catholicos non semper quietis controversiis ansam dederunt; et ex altera parte novae nostrae aetatis necessitates mutataeque rerum condiciones accuratiorem Leonianae doctrinae applicationem vel etiam additamenta quaedam necessaria reddiderint, opportunam perlibenter arripimus occasionem, his dubiis hisque hodiernae aetatis postulationibus pro munere Nostro Apostolico, quo omnibus debitores sumus (cfr. Rom., I, 14), quantum in Nobis est, faciendi satis." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 189-190. English version in KOENIG (ed.), Principles for Peace, Washington, N.C.W.C., 1943, p. 409, No. 928.)

2 KOENIG, op. cit., Introduction, p. xviii-xix.

economic and social disorder. He was faced with new challenges to the right of private property, as the world tried to reconstruct itself from the ruins of global conflict. As spokesman for the moral order, he was expected to present and promote the social doctrine of the Church in the light of changing conditions. In connection with the problem of property and its equitable distribution as vital to world reconstruction, what did he add to the teaching of Leo XIII and Pius XI? To what extent did he influence the thinking of John XXIII? This chapter shall demonstrate that Pius XII made a significant and distinctive contribution to the solution of the property question by emphasizing (a) the primacy of the universal right of use, (b) the necessity of an equitable distribution of private property — at all levels — to provide the material base for personal development and freedom, and (c) the vital role of the forms of property and the role of the state in achieving a just distribution.

I. PRIMACY OF THE UNIVERSAL RIGHT: A NEW APPROACH

It has been the experience of this writer that the content of most literature on the subject of property is largely devoted to a justification of the subordinate right of private ownership according to the social-necessity argument of St. Thomas: the most efficient, orderly and

peaceful use of the world's goods is contingent upon private appropriation of such resources.[3] True though this may be, it is but secondary in St. Thomas' treatment of the whole question of possession and ownership.[4] Father B. W. Dempsey, a prominent American economist and an authority on Catholic social thought, makes the observation that "the modern teaching of the Catholic Church on private property

---

3 Summa Theologiae, II-II, q. 66, a. 2.

4 The fundamental and metaphysical basis for private property is found in II-II, q. 66, a. 1, where St. Thomas answers the question: Whether it is natural for a man to possess external things? For a verification of this thesis see the exhaustive treatise on private ownership in St. Thomas by A. M. CROFTS, Property and Poverty, Dublin, Irish Rosary Office, 1948, p. 38-68. It is Father Crofts' contention that an undue emphasis on the social-necessity argument of Article 2 is a complete misunderstanding of St. Thomas' thought: "The primaeval ordination of earthly creation to man's use and benefit so clearly outlined in the first Article of St. Thomas is of supreme importance in a dissertation on property. The whole question of individual right depends for its solution far more on the proper understanding of the logical implications of this ordination than on the conclusions of the second article. Many summarily dismiss the first article as treating of property in general and seek for a proof of individual right in the second article under the obvious title: 'Whether it is lawful for a man to possess a thing as his own?' In this search they are disappointed. Beyond a 'sed-contra' from the authority of St. Augustine and a simple declaration in the body of the Article, 'it is lawful,' St. Thomas dismisses the question of lawfulness and deals with the necessity of property for the state." (op. cit., p. 58.)

For the secondary nature of private appropriation in relation to the first right of universal use according to St. Thomas, see also Leo S. SCHUMACHER, The Philosophy of the Equitable Distribution of Wealth, Washington, D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1949, p. 13-21.

suffers not only from the fact that it is not widely known and understood but also from the fact that in one particular it is positively misunderstood."[5] He goes on to say that the inviolability of private property is conditioned by its effectiveness to alleviate the needs of the masses; failure to take into account this condition is the source of the misunderstanding:

> The condition, however, has frequently been overlooked, particularly by continental socialists who are eager to misrepresent the position of the Church and who present the proposition merely as though the first and fundamental principle of Christian social reform was the inviolability of private property. Moreover, this proposition was taken to mean private property as it is presently administered and, therefore, to imply unconditional approval of all existing property arrangements.[6]

As to the misunderstandings relative to the primacy of the right of use, Franz Kluber, a German theologian, does not confine his criticism to "continental socialists". He assails Catholic moralists and ethicians for misinterpreting Leo XIII who defended private property for the reason that it is the most apt means to serve the economic needs of all. The Theology Digest summarizes Kluber's critical observation:

---

5 B. W. DEMPSEY, S.J., The Functional Economy, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1958, p. 184.

6 Ibid., p. 184-185.

> Either because they [recent Catholic moralists and ethicians] could not understand the Pope or because they did not wish to understand him they selected for elaboration only the right to private property itself, ignoring the superior natural right — the common use of things — property for all. Hence [...] the right all men have to the use of earthly goods, though it is pre-eminent, was relegated to second place and the sanctity of justly acquired property "rights" became the earmark of Catholic social ethics. Capital owed labor only charity and superfluities. The truth is that the right of common use is absolute — The right to private property is relative.[7]

A careful study of Rerum Novarum substantiates this defence of Leo XIII as we shall presently demonstrate. But the fact remains that subsequent controversies and misunderstandings indicate a lack of completeness and clarity in Leo XIII's presentation of the pre-eminence of the universal right of use. In this respect, Pius XII completed and made explicit Leo's basic doctrine so that no "continental socialist" or "Catholic moralist" could be mistaken as to the primary character of the universal right of use in relation to the right of private property, assuming that they read his Pentecostal message of 1941 and the Christmas address of 1942.

Another prominent moralist, Father Jacques Leclerq, decries the little attention given to the primary right of

---

7 Gerald von ACKEIN, S.J. (ed.), Theology Digest, Vol. 9 (1961), p. 59. (From a digest of an article by Franz Kluber: Deer Ort des privateigentums im System des Natu- riecht die neue Ordnung, 13 (1959), 81-97.)

use and makes an interesting observation as to why this is so:

> Within our lifetime, it [the principle of the right of all to material goods] has been frequently dealt with by the popes, and it has been increasingly emphasized in the course of the present century. Leo XIII made only a passing allusion to it in Rerum Novarum, but Pius XII reverted to it whenever he discussed ownership. Again, it is in connection with ownership that St. Thomas lays down the principle. Nevertheless, this principle is usually dismissed in a sentence, whereas pages are devoted to the question of private property. [...] the general principle is left undiscussed owing to its very obviousness, to which the whole of Christian philosophy bears witness. This is often the fate of self-evident principles: they are thought to require no proof. The reason why fuller treatment is accorded to the right of ownership is that no self-evident principle is here involved, ownership being lawful, only in certain circumstances which require to be defined.[8]

Assuredly, this "passing allusion" to the superiority of the universal right of usage is the statement of Leo XIII in connection with his masterful defence of private property against the socialists:

> And to say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property [...]. Moreover, the earth, though divided among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all.[9]

---

8 Jacques LECLERQ, Christianity and Money, trans. from the French by Eric Eainshaw Smith, New York, Hawthorn, 1959, p. 90.

9 "Quod vero terram Deus universo generi hominum utendam, fruendam dederit, id quidem non potest ullo pacto privatis possessionibus obesse. [...] Ceterum utcumque

This is a clear-cut affirmation that private property is conditioned by and subordinated to the prior right of the human race upon the use of the earth's bounty. It is true that Leo, in concluding his argument for private ownership, affirmed the fundamental and inviolable character of private property, but under the condition that it serves the needs of all. "Our first and fundamental principle," he wrote, "when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses must be the inviolability of private property."[10] To read into this statement the absolute inviolability of private property as such would be to falsify Leo's thought. All it means is that private property is inviolable when it becomes

---

inter privatos distributa, inservire communi omnium utilitati terra non cessat." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in Acta Sanctae Sedis, 23, p. 644. English version in Anne FREMANTLE (ed.), The Social Teaching of the Church, Toronto, The New American Library of Canada Ltd., 1963, p. 24, No. 7.)

Throughout this chapter reference will be made solely to Rerum Novarum, because it is the most comprehensive and classical expression of Leo's social and political philosophy. For the substance of his previous and ensuing writings on the social question, see Franz H. MUELLER, "The Church and the Social Question", in J. N. MOODY and J. G. LAWLER (eds.), The Challenge of Mater et Magistra, Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1963, p. 66-68. See also PIUS XI, Quadragesimo Anno, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 177; English version in KOENIG, Principles for Peace, p. 397-398, No. 924.

10 "Maneat ergo, cum plebi sublevatio quaeritur, hoc in primis haberi fundamenti instar oportere, privatas possessiones inviolate servandas." (LEO XIII, Rerum Novarum, in ASS, 23, p. 647; English version in FREMANTLE, op. cit., p. 28.) Emphasis added.

the instrument to alleviate the condition of the workers. In other words, when private ownership is firmly rooted in the first right of all as a means for making the latter operable, it participates in the inviolable and fundamental character of the right of universal usage. As was stated in the first section of Chapter II,[11] this was precisely the point Pius XII made so much more explicit in the Pentecost message of 1941. Although Leo XIII differs from Pius XII in the use of terms and in the manner of approach to the problem of property, there is no question of a doctrinal conflict between the two.[12] On the contrary, Pius XII stated that the occasion of his 1941 Pentecostal address was to unfold the views of his predecessor and he prefaced his famous statement on the use of material goods with this tribute to Leo's teaching on property:

---

11 See supra, p. 48-52.

12 For the difference of vocabulary between Leo XIII and Pius XII and the reasons to account for it, see J. Y. CALVEZ and Jacques PERRIN, The Church and Social Justice (The Social Teaching of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII), trans. from the French by J. R. Kirwan, London, Burns and Oates, 1959, p. 194-200. They conclude a long and somewhat involved discussion thus: "If there is any difference between the two doctrines it is this: 'the fundamental right to use material goods' [of Pius XII] has a still more general and universal character than the simple fundamental right of ownership. In any case, whether in the vocabulary of Leo XIII and Pius XI, or in that of Pius XII, there is a distinction made between a fundamental right, existent apart from any actual application of it, and its particular determination, private property and the actually existing administration of goods." (Ibid., p. 200.)

> The Encyclical Rerum Novarum expounds on the question of property and man's sustenance, principles which have lost nothing of their inherent vigor with the passage of time, and today, fifty years after, strike their roots deeper and retain their innate vitality.[13]

Historical circumstances account for the difference in approach and terminology between both popes. In 1891, the worker in his impoverished state would be more inclined to accept the socialist contention that the alleviation of his miserable condition rested in the abolition of private property. Who would therefore blame Leo XIII for making the inviolability of private ownership the central issue when he discusses property in Rerum Novarum? Perhaps he did over-stress private property. But it must be recalled that papal documents, which for the most part contain ad hoc pronouncements, have a built-in disadvantage in that, stressing one aspect of doctrine, they are liable to give the impression of de-emphasizing more important aspects of the same doctrine. In 1941, the socialist appeal diminished as the lot of the workers improved; but the absolute concept of private property became institutionalized in a regime of

---

13 "L'Enciclica Rerum novarum esprime sulla proprietà e sul sostentamento dell'uomo principi, i quali col tempo nulla hanno perduto del nativo loro vigore e, oggi dopo cinquant'anni, conservano ancora e profondono vivificante la loro intima fecondità." (PIUS XII, The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199.)

individualist capitalism characterized by huge concentration of power within and between nations. As a consequence, Pius XII — without fear of being identified with the socialist contention — could stress the fundamental character of a universal right to a fair share of the world's wealth and the subordinate, but necessary, role of private property to achieve this end. In doing so, he gave a new dimension to the Church's doctrine of property in our time.

Pius XI gave more prominence than did Leo XIII to the fundamental right of use. Although not in the same terminology as Pius XII, he explicitly affirmed the principle of the subordinate role of private property, as a prerequisite to the understanding of his lengthy discussion on the distribution of wealth:

> [...] the division of goods which results from private ownership was established by nature itself in order that created things may serve the needs of mankind in fixed and stable order. Lest one wander from the straight path of truth, this is something that must be continually kept in mind.[14]

In the earlier part of his encyclical, Pius XI is equally clear as to the subordinate function of private property:

---

14 "[...] ut eam utilitatem res creatae certo firmoque ordine parere possint hominibus, bonorum partitionem, quae per dominia privata fiat, ab ipsa natura esse stabilitam. Id quod ne a recto veritatis tramite aberretur, continenter prae oculis habeatur oportet." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 196. English version in KOENIG, Principles for Peace, p. 416, No. 973.)

> The Creator Himself has given man the right of private ownership, not only that individuals may be able to provide for themselves and their families but also that the goods which the Creator destined for the entire family of mankind may, through this institution, truly serve its purpose.[15]

With the exception of the above rather explicit statements, it seems that Leo XIII and Pius XI presupposed the primacy of the universal right relative to the right of private property and all other rights in the economic order; not so with Pius XII:

> Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has, in fact, from nature the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth. [...] This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed. [...] Undoubtedly, the nature deriving from God demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gifts, as well as the functioning of the State over both these institutions. But all this remains subordinated to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope.[16]

The clarity of this statement speaks for itself. It is, certainly, the most explicit and precise formulation of the

---

15 "[...] sed semper uno ore affirmasse a natura seu a Creatore ipso jus dominii privati hominibus esse tributum, cum ut sibi familiaeque singuli providere possint, tum ut hujus instituti ope, bona quae Creator universae hominum familiae destinavit, huic fini vere inserviant, [...]." (PIUX XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 191.)

16 PIUS XII, The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 199. For Italian original, see supra, p. 114, note 108.

organic subordination of rights respecting man in his relations with the material goods necessary for his development as a man.

The importance that Pius XII attributes to the universal exercise of the right to use is new to the teaching of his predecessors. But it is not new to the teaching of the Church. The idea of personal wealth possessed as a trust to serve the common welfare assumed major proportions in the preaching of the early Fathers of the Church.[17] St. Thomas and the theologians of the Middle Ages re-affirmed this doctrine and gave it a more scholarly foundation, emphasizing that the universal right of use and the right of private property are derived from the natural law but the latter less directly than the first.[18] With Pius XII, this

---

17 See Pierre BIGO, La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, p. 27-34. See also Jacques LECLERQ, Christianity and Money, p. 90, 92. For a more extensive treatment of this subject, see: I. GIORDANI, The Social Message of the Early Christian Fathers, Paterson, N.J., St. Anthony's Guild Press, 1943.

18 See L. DE SOUSBENGHE, S.J., "Propriété [de droit naturel] Thèse néo-scolastique et tradition ecclésiastique", in Nouvelle Revue Théologique, Vol. 72 (1950), p. 580-607. For other references as to the priority of the common right of use in St. Thomas, see this chapter, supra, note 4; see also Pierre BIGO, op. cit., p. 39-41; Jacques LECLERQ, op. cit., p. 92-98; B. W. DEMPSEY, The Functional Economy, p. 164-183.

emphasis and method of approach to the question of ownership experienced a renaissance.[19]

Philip Hughes, the historian, singles out the Pentecost address of 1941 as the most pregnant utterance of the Holy See since Rerum Novarum, for the reason of its forthright and constructive approach to the limitations on the use of the right of ownership:

> For in this address Pius XII, the present Pope, develops constructively in a very bold way, the traditional teaching about the limitations on the use of the right of ownership, and he opens out an indefinitely wide field for new thought by his enuntiation of the principle of man's natural right to the use of material goods. The bold teaching of this letter must play a part in all the coming reconstruction of civilization.[20]

---

19 Father J. B. DEROSIERS, P.S.S., in his work La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise (Montréal, Editions de l'Institut Pie XI, p. 24), observes that Pius XII, in his address of 1941, speaks in a manner reminiscent of the boldness of the ancient Church Fathers. For the observation that Pius XII in his terminology and approach to the question of ownership most closely approximates St. Thomas, see Pierre BIGO, La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, p. 41, 242-243; see also D. DOGNIN, O.P., "Economie et Usage commun des biens", in Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques, Vol. 46 (1962), p. 222-228.

20 Philip HUGHES, The Pope's New Order (A Systematic Summary of the Social Encyclicals and Addresses, from Leo XIII to Pius XII), London, Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1943. Commenting upon the texts of Pentecost 1941 and Christmas 1942 wherein Pius XII attaches unusual importance to the fundamental right common to all men, Father Villain writes: "Il est bien évident que ces affirmations vigoureuses de Pie XII se réfèrent à l'enseignement classique de l'Eglise; toutefois, il ne semble pas que l'existence et les caractères de ce droit fondamental aient été jusqu'ici mis en lumière de façon aussi nette. Ce droit évidemment reconnu

In Mater et Magistra, John XXIII explicitly confirmed the primacy of the universal right of usage over all other rights in the economic order. In summarizing the contribution of Pius XII's 1941 Pentecostal address, Pope John wrote:

> Concerning the use of material goods, our predecessor declared that the right of every man to use them for his own sustenance is prior to all other rights in economic life and, hence, is prior even to the right of private ownership. It is certain, however, as our predecessor noted, that the right of private property is from the natural law itself. Nevertheless, it is the will of God, the Creator that this right to own property should in no wise obstruct the flow of "material goods created by God to meet the needs of all men, to all equitably, as justice and charity require" (AAS, XXXIII (1941), p. 199).[21]

---

par tous, était simplement présupposé dans tout ce qui se disait et s'écrivait sur la propriété et l'usage des biens de la terre. (Voir en particulier R.N. et Q.A.)." (Jean VILLAIN, L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, T. 1, Paris, Spes, 1953, p. 30.)

The originality of Pius XII's approach to the Church's social doctrine by his emphasis on the fundamental right of use is thus expressed by Marcel Clément: "C'était en effet la première fois qu'un document pontifical [Pentecost 1941] formulait, sous ce nom [the right to the use of material goods] pour en éclairer l'ensemble de la doctrine sociale, le droit à l'usage des biens matériels. Sans doute, un tel droit était implicitement présent dans toutes les parties de Rerum Novarum et de Quadragesimo Anno. C'est même, pourrait-on dire, beaucoup en considération de ce droit fondamental déjà établi — mais non point pour la première fois — par saint Thomas d'Aquin que la doctrine sociale de l'Eglise s'est développée. Toutefois, c'est l'un des titres de gloire du Pape Pie XII de lui avoir donné, par l'expression qu'il en a faite, tout son relief doctrinal." (Marcel CLEMENT, Le Travail, Paris, Perrin, p. 51.)

21 "Quod pertinet ad primum [ad usum aspectabilium bonorum], prae se fert Decessor Noster, cuiusvis hominis ius, externa nimirum bona ad victum cultumque suum referendi,

Indeed, the fundamental character of the universal right to use the bounty of the earth for the sustenance of the human race is implicit in all the sections of Pope John's encyclical where he recommends concrete proposals to reduce the imbalances between work and wages, between agriculture, industry and the services, between regions of a single country, and especially between prosperous countries and those of retarded economic growth.[22]

---

pluris quidem faciendum esse quam alia quaecumque iura, quae in re oeconomica versentur, atque adeo pluris etiam quam ius privatim possidendi. Situm est certe quidem, quemadmodum Decessor Noster monet, ius possidendi bona privatim in ipsius iure naturae, sed, Creatore Deo sic volente, ius idem nullo pacto officere potest, 'quominus corporea haec bona, a Deo utilitati omnium hominum creata, ad omnes aequa parte pertineant, perinde ut iustitia pariter et caritas postulant.' (Cfr. A.A.S., XXIII, 1941, p. 199.)" (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 411.) English version in William J. GIBBONS, S.J. (trans.), Mater et Magistra. Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope John XXIII. Christianity and Social Progress, Glen Rock, N.J., Paulist Press, [1961], p. 20, No. 43.

22 This, in substance, is the conclusion of the following commentaries on Mater et Magistra: Jean Yves CALVEZ, The Social Thought of John XXIII (Mater et Magistra), trans. from the French by George J. M. McKenzie, Chicago, Regnery, 1964, p. 21; Marcel CLEMENT, Le Travail, p. 52-53; Pierre BIGO, La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, p. 242-243. In the most thorough paragraph by paragraph commentary on Mater et Magistra appearing — as each section is completed — in consecutive issues of Studia Montis Regii since 1963, Father Paul-Emile BOLLE, P.S.S., in "Mater et Magistra. Introduction, traduction et commentaire" (Vol. 6 (1963), Fasc. 2, p. 152), makes the observation that Pope John quotes much more extensively from Pius XII's Pentecostal message of 1941 than from Leo XIII or Pius XI; every section, he says, contains numerous references to this

To summarize, Pius XII's new approach to the papal doctrine on the rights of property essentially consisted in his frequent and extensive affirmation that the right of all to the use of material goods for sustenance and personal development is first, fundamental, universal and absolutely inviolable. It belongs to each individual and is, therefore, not an abstract general right of the human race or a collectivity. This right is anterior to the right of private property, but demands the latter for its fulfillment. By giving unusual prominence to this distinction, Pius XII restored and applied the traditional doctrine of the Church in terms meaningful for the problems of his time. In doing so, he added precision and more clarity to the teaching of his immediate predecessors, and, in turn, influenced the approach of John XXIII to the solution of economic inequality in his time. In short, he made a contribution by drawing attention to the importance of a principle long overlooked and frequently misunderstood: the primacy of the universal right to the use of material goods.

---

document; quoting commentaries, he states that one of the merits of John XXIII's Mater et Magistra is to have coordinated and systematized the "occasionnel" discourses of Pius XII (ibid., p. 156).

II. THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY: NEW ARGUMENTS - WORLD-WIDE APPLICATION

In his emphasis on the primacy of the right of use, Pius XII by no means underscores the right of private property. On the contrary, as noted in Chapter II,[23] he gave a new perspective to the vital connection which must exist between both rights so as to assure that the goods of earth flow equitably to all in accord with personal dignity. In stressing the connection that must exist between ownership and freedom, he gave a new dimension to the papal arguments for private property. By frequent and extensive pronouncements on the nature, the importance and the international phase of a just diffusion of private property, he went far beyond his predecessors and substantially influenced the social thought of John XXIII. To make good these assertions is our present purpose.

A. The Arguments for private property: Freedom and Dignity -- A new Aspect.

Pius XII was not the first pontiff to draw attention to the personal advantages attached to the right of ownership; Leo XIII based his proof for private property principally on the personal nature of man. In refuting the

---

23 See supra, p. 89-94.

socialists, he pointed to the difference between man and brute creation; because man is a human being and not a mere animal, because he directs his own activities by the use of reason he must have some stability of possession:

> And on this account — viz., that man alone among animals possesses reason — it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary or momentary use, as other living beings have them; but in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those, which, though used, remain for use in the future.[24]

He continues to elaborate on this argument by showing that man, through his reason, is master of his own acts, that he can therefore link the present with the future, guide his life under the protecting power of God and make choices not only in regard to his present welfare but also in matters respecting his welfare in the years ahead; man's needs continuously recur and, hence, his nature demands that he own not only the fruits of the earth but also the earth itself from which the provision for the future is to come:

---

24 "Et ob hanc causam quod solum hoc animal est rationis particeps, bona homini tribuere necesse est non utenda solum, quod est omnium animantium commune, sed stabili perpetuoque iure possidenda, neque ea dumtaxat quae usu consumuntur, sed etiam quae, nobis utentibus, permanent." (Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 643.)

> Nature therefore owes to man a storehouse that shall never fail the daily supply of his daily wants. And this he finds only in the inexhaustible fertility of the earth.[25]

In a second argument, Leo develops the case for ownership based on the idea that a man's labour gives title to material things:

> Now, when man thus spends the industry of his mind and the strength of his body in procuring the fruits of nature, by that act he makes his own that portion of nature's field which he cultivates — that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his own personality; and it cannot be just that he should possess that portion as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation.[26]

In a third argument, he strengthens his case by demonstrating that the right of ownership is natural to man not merely as an individual but more so as the father of a family:

> For it is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessities for those whom he has begotten; and similarly nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, as it

---

25 "Igitur rem quamdam debet homini natura dedisse stabilem perpetuoque mansuram, unde perennitas subsidii expectari posset. Atqui istiusmodi perennitatem nulla res praestare, nisi cum ubertatibus suis terra, potest." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 644.)

26 "Iamvero cum in parandis naturae bonis industriam mentis viresque corporis homo insumat, hoc ipso applicat ad sese eam naturae corporeae partem, quam ipse percoluit, in qua velut formam quamdam personae suae impressam reliquit; ut omnino rectum esse oporteat, eam partem ab eo possideri uti suam, nec ullo modo ius ipsius violare cuiquam licere." (Ibid., p. 644.)

> were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honorably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of profitable property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance.[27]

In the final part of his defence against the socialists, Leo added a fourth argument with a strong implication that private property is necessary as a preservative for social order:

> It [the abolition of private property] would open the door to envy, to evil speaking, and to quarrelling; the sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality of which so much is said would, in reality, be the levelling down of all to the same condition of misery and dishonor. Thus it is clear that the main tenet of socialism, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit; it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth.[28]

---

27 "Sanctissima naturae lex est, ut victu omnique cultu paterfamilias tueatur, quos ipse procrearit; idemque illuc a natura ipsa deducitur, ut velit liberis suis, quippe qui paternam referunt et quodam modo producunt personam, anquirere et parare, unde se honeste possint in ancipiti vitae cursu a misera fortuna defendere. Id vero efficere non alia ratione potest, nisi fructuosarum possessione rerum, quas ad liberos hereditate trasmittat." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 646.)

28 "Aditus ad invidentiam mutuam, ad obtrectationes et discordias patefieret; ademptis ingenio singulorum sollertiaeque stimulis, ipsi divitiarum fontes necessario exarescerent; eaque, quam fingunt cogitatione, aequabilitas, aliud revera non esset nisi omnium hominum aeque misera atque ignobilis, nullo discrimine, conditio. — Ex quibus

The systematic and philosophical development of the above arguments was Leo's major contribution to the doctrine of the Church on ownership. All of his sucoessors, in dealing with the social question, have felt obliged to renew his defence of private property. Pius XI added nothing new to these arguments except to defend Leo against those who misinterpreted his concept of ownership either by confining it to a purely individual function or by going to the other extreme of reducing it to a mere social function.[29] To exclude one or the other would be to distort

---

omnibus perspicitur, illud Socialismi placitum de possessionibus in commune redigendis omnino repudiari oportere, quia iis ipsis, quibus est opitulandum, nocet; naturalibus singulorum iuribus repugnat, officia reipublicae tranquillitatemque communem perturbat." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 647.)

29 Cf. PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 191; English version in KOENIG, Principles for Peace, p. 411, Nos. 962, 963. For the best commentaries on Quadragesimo Anno and Rerum Novarum in English, see Oswald von NELL-BREUNING, S.J., Reorganization of Social Economy, trans. from the German by B. J. Dempsey, S.J., Milwaukee, Bruce, 1936; Raymond J. MILLER, C.S.S.R., Forty Years After, St. Paul, Radio Replies Press, 1947. For a good summary of the views of those who falsified Leo's doctrine intimating that he defended only an individualistic concept of property, see Oswald von NELL-BREUNING, op. cit., p. 95-97, 99-101; Raymond J. MILLER, op. cit., p. 76, 80-82, 86, 91, 96; Jean VILLAIN, L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, T. 1, Paris, Spes, 1953, p. 38-40. The above commentators refer to the "new Vienna movement" which had its origin around 1920 and which consisted of a group of Austrian priests and laymen who defended property rights in terms of social function, so that if this function is not performed, the personal right is abrogated.

the concept of property and lead to either individualism or socialism.[30]

In addition to confirming Leo's arguments, Pius XII emphasized the connection between property and the personal dignity expressed in the freedom which ownership confers. This was but a further development, another aspect of Leo's proof derived, as it was, from the inner nature of the individual person who is destined under God to direct himself. In the address of 1944, Pius XII gave full recognition to the permanent value of Leo's classical justification for private property:

> Our Immortal Predecessor, Leo XIII, in his famous Encyclical Rerum Novarum already established the principle, that for every legitimate economic and social order "there must be laid down as the basic foundation the right of private property".[31]

But in this same address and in his other major pronouncements on private property, Pius XII dwells most insistently on the fact that private ownership, in some form or other, is an essential guarantee to assure man's dignity and

---

30 PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 191-192; English version in KOENIG, Principles for Peace, p. 411, No. 964.

31 "Già il Nostro immortale Predecessore Leone XIII nella sua celebre Enciclica Rerum novarum enunciò il principio che per ogni retto ordine economico e sociale 'deve porsi come fondamento inconcusso il diritto della proprietà privata'." (PIUS XII, The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.)

freedom. As noted in Chapter II,[32] this is central to his justification for private property. He was probably led to make this approach because of the widespread denial of personal liberty in the communist dominated countries where the means of production are largely state-owned. It would be hardly relevant for him to promote private property as the only assurance for civic order and industrial progress, when the Soviet state is lacking in neither, despite the pressure of a prison-like system of regimentation. In the age of Leo XIII, socialism was confined, for the most part, to the sphere of the theoretical. Neither had economic liberalism reached the super-capitalism proportions distinctive to the times of Pius XI and Pius XII. In this context, it comes as no surprise that Pius XII appealed for the widespread distribution of private property to counteract the danger to human liberty inherent in the massive concentration of power consequent upon either state or private control of productive property. What is more, this approach — the diffusion of freedom through the diffusion of property — is consistent with the basic principle of a social philosophy which Pius XII never ceased to proclaim: human personality is the highest value on earth and all social organization is to minister to it. It was for this

---

32 Supra, p. 68-72.

profound reason that he promoted private ownership as the means best calculated to develop human initiative to the full with the maximum degree of independence. In doing so, he gave to the arguments for private property a new direction that would be more meaningful and relevant to an age when freedom reached a peak in the aspirations of nations and individuals alike. One passage from his address of 1944, where freedom is the dominant theme, best illustrates his arguments for private property:

> But the Church aims [...] at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the design of God's wisdom and the disposition of nature: an element of social order, a necessary presupposition to human initiative, an incentive to work to the advantage of life's purpose, here and hereafter, and, hence, of the liberty and dignity of man, created in the likeness of God, who from the beginning, assigned him for his benefit domination over material things.[33]

Another aspect of the dominant-freedom-argument, noted in Chapter II,[34] was the fact that Pius XII frequently stressed the urgency of widespread private property to enable the family to be free and, therefore, to develop itself without submitting to the indignity of being at the complete mercy of outside sources. Concretely he advocated

---

33 PIUS XII, The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 253. For Italian original see supra, p. 64, note 37.

34 Supra, p. 72-79.

"living space" for all families in the form of a home and a plot of land. In doing so, with the accent on freedom for the father of the family, Pius XII amplified the argument of Leo XIII, who was the modern pioneer in advocating family property.

Additional to the labour-argument which Leo developed with consummate skill, Pius XII again emphasized dignity;[35] this time the dignity of labour as a demand not only for a living wage but for the conservation of a social order that would make accessible private ownership, in some form, for all the workers. As to the argument for civic order, neither Leo nor Pius XII gave to it any degree of prominence. Apparently, both wished to convey the idea that a socially responsible human initiative is the most important factor in the common welfare; and that private property as designed to develop that initiative is indispensable for the realization of the true common good.

In respect to the individual and social aspect of private property, to which Pius XI gave the fullest expression in clarifying Leo XIII's doctrine, it seems that Pius XII added further clarification by developing his justification for private ownership within the context of the first

---

35 Supra, p. 79-85.

and universal right to the use of material goods.[36] In doing so, he left no doubt that private property must be conceived and administered in a manner conducive to the universal satisfaction of material needs and the requirements of personal development to which all have a right; he made it crystal clear that the social function is not merely an addition to the right of ownership, but rather an integral part combined with the personal function in an indissoluble vital link.

Pope John reaffirmed Pius XII's argument based on the connection between ownership and freedom. The occasion was his keen discernment of a threefold trend in modern society, which, in the opinion of some Catholic writers, all but rendered obsolete the traditional role of private ownership as vital to the attainment of personal security.[37] The first of these challenges noted by Pope John is a more

---

36 Supra, p. 89-98.

37 Some of the names and the views of Americal Catholics who questioned the relevance of the Church's doctrine on property in the modern framework of social organization are briefly given in John F. CRONIN, The Social Teaching of John XXIII, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1963, p. 38; in a later and more complete commentary on Mater et Magistra: Christianity and Social Progress, Baltimore, Helicon, 1964, p. 68-70, Father Cronin elaborates on these opinions and how Pope John met the challenge. On this question see also Donald R. CAMPION, "The World Wide Response", in J. N. MOODY, J. G. LAWLER (eds.), The Challenge of Mater et Magistra, p. 168-169.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of this study, we believe that Pius XII's teaching on property leads to the following conclusions.

According to the plan of God and nature, the right of every person to the use of material goods is a postulate for the fulfillment of a man's dignity and is, therefore, the supreme principle governing all other rights in the economic order: national and international. The extent to which this principle is operable, is the ultimate criterion to judge the morality and the effectiveness of both the national and the international economy, whatever forms they may assume.

The right of private ownership is another distinct right designed by God and nature to assure that the goods of all reach all more adequately and more effectively in keeping with the demands of personal dignity and freedom. As ministering to the economic needs of all, private property both as a personal right and as an organized system is secondary and subordinate to the first right of universal usage. Conceived as such, private property has an essential social function and an intrinsic limitation. As the material base to assure freedom and dignity to man the worker, and man the father of a family in exercizing his right to

pronounced trend to separate ownership from effective control in corporate property:

> In recent years, as we are all well aware, the role played by the owners of capital in very large productive enterprises has been separated more and more from the role of management.[38]

The second challenge to the traditional concept of ownership is the fact that many persons no longer rely on private property for personal and family security:

> It is also quite clear that today the number of persons is increasing who, because of recent advances in insurance programs and various systems of social security, are able to look to the future with tranquillity. This sort of tranquillity once was rooted in the ownership of property, albeit modest.[39]

The third trend Pope John sees as a progressive development:

> It sometimes happens in our day that men are more inclined to seek some professional skill than possession of goods. Moreover, such men have greater esteem for income from labor or rights arising from labor than for that deriving from capital investment or rights associated therewith.
> This clearly accords with the inherent characteristics of labor, inasmuch as it proceeds directly

---

38 "Quemadmodum fere oculis tenemus, factum est superioribus hisce annis, ut in maximis consociationibus bonis gignendis partes, quae a bona possidentibus agantur, in dies magis a partibus diductae sint, quae societatis moderatores agant." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 16, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 426.) English in GIBBONS, p. 37, No. 104.

39 "Nec minime latet, esse hodie frequentiores, qui ex recentissimis oeconomicis cautionibus ac multiplicibus securitatis socialis rationibus habeant cur tranquillo animo in futurum tempus prospiciant; quae quidem tranquillitas olim in bonorum dominio, etsi modico, posita erat." (Ibid., p. 426-427.) English in GIBBONS, p. 37, No. 105.

> from the human person, and hence is to be thought more of than wealth in external goods. These later, by their very nature, must be regarded as instruments. This trend indicates an advance in civilization.[40]

With the exception of the separation of ownership from effective control, about which he is surprisingly silent, Pope John accepts these trends as justifiable and even desirable; but in these developments he sees no occasion for doubting the importance of private property such as it was firmly enuntiated and defended by his predecessors.[41] He goes on to confirm the right of private property:

> Such a doubt has no foundation. For the right of private property, including that pertaining to goods devoted to productive enterprises, is permanently valid. Indeed, it is rooted in the very nature of things, whereby we learn that individual men are prior to civil society, and hence, that civil society is to be directed toward man as its end. Indeed, the right of private individuals to act freely in economic affairs is recognized in vain, unless they are at the same time given an opportunity of freely selecting and using things

---

40 "Contingit quoque nostris diebus, ut homines potius alicuius artis peritiam quam rerum possessionem excupiant; iidemque pluris faciant reditus, qui ex labore vel ex iuribus cum labore coniunctis oriantur, quam reditus, qui ex pecuniarum capite vel ex iuribus cum hoc coniunctis exsistant.

Quod quidem plane congruit cum nativa laboris indole, qui, cum a persona humana proxime procedat, anteferendus est externorum bonorum copiae, quae suapte natura instrumentorum loco habenda sunt; idque progredientis humanitatis indicium profecto est." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 16, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 427.) English in GIBBONS, p. 37-38, Nos. 106-107.

41 GIBBONS, p. 38, No. 108.

necessary for the exercise of this right. Moreover, experience and history testify that where political regimes do not allow to private individuals the possession also of productive goods, the exercise of human liberty is violated or completely destroyed in matters of primary importance. Thus it becomes clear that, in the right of property, the exercise of liberty finds both a safeguard and a stimulus.

. . . . . .

Accordingly, we make our own the insistence of our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII: "In defending the right of private property, the Church has in mind a very important ethical aim in social matters. She does not, of course, strive to uphold the present state of affairs as if it were an expression of the divine will. And even less does she accept the patronage of the affluent and wealthy, while neglecting the rights of the poor and needy... The Church rather does intend that the institution of private property be such as is required by the plan of divine wisdom and the law of nature." Private ownership should safeguard the rights of the human person, and, at the same time, make its necessary contribution to the establishment of right order in society.[42]

---

42 "Quod dubium inane prorsus est putandum. Siquidem ius privati dominii, etiam quod ad res attinet gignendis bonis tributas, per omne tempus valet, utpote quod in ipsa contineatur rerum natura, qua docemur singulares homines priores esse civili societate, atque adeo civilem societatem ad hominem tamquam ad terminum dirigi oportere. Ceterum nequiquam privatis hominibus ius agendi cum libertate in re oeconomica agnoscitur, nisi ipsis pariter facultas permittitur libere deligendi adhibendique res ad illud ius exercendum necessarias. Praeterea rerum usus temporumque monumenta testantur, ubi populorum regimina privatis hominibus etiam bonorum fructuosorum possessionem non agnoscant, ibi aut violari aut omnino deleri, in praecipuis rebus, humanae libertatis usum; ex quo utique patet libertatis usum a dominii iure pariter tutelam pariter incitamentum repetere.

. . . . . .

Placet igitur Nobis monitis uti, quae de hac re Decessor Noster f.r. Pius XII dedit: 'Ecclesia ius privati dominii tuendo, ad optimum spectat finem moralem in re

In this passage the influence of Pius XII is most in evidence, as John XXIII reaffirms the highlights of his predecessor's doctrine on the right of private property. To be noted specifically is Pope John's appeal to the freedom-argument of Pius XII. Indeed, this argument becomes stronger as Pope John stresses the maintenance of private property as a bulwark of political as well as economic freedom.[43]

---

sociali; scilicet per se minime contendit praesentem rerum servare ordinem, quasi divinae Voluntatis imperium in eo agnoscat; neque magis data opera opulentorum ac praedivitum patrocinium suscipit, pauperum et egenorum iuribus neglectis... Verum Ecclesiae propositum est, ut privatae possessionis institutum tale habeatur, quale et divinae Sapientiae consilium et naturae lex iubeant.' (Nuntius radiophonicus datus die 1 septembris anno 1944; cfr. A.A.S., XXXVI, 1944, p. 253.) Scilicet privata possessio humanae personae libertatis iura in tuto ponat oportet, simulque necessariam suam conferat operam ad rectum instaurandum societatis ordinem." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 16, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 427-428.) English in GIBBONS, p. 38-39, Nos. 109 and 111.

43 That there is no free political regime without provision made for private property is, doubtless, the most novel characteristic of Pope John's teaching on ownership; this is the gist of an observation made by Jean CALVEZ, in The Social Thought of John XXIII, p. 24. Assuredly, this is a justifiable observation, but as noted in Chapter II, p. 60-64, Pius XII in his address of 1944 lamented that political tyranny was the consequence of concentrated ownership and that it was the special role of private property to create for all families "a field in which they may rightly enjoy, not only economic freedom, but political, cultural, and religious freedom as well" — "un campo di giusta libertà, non solo economica, ma anche politica, culturale e religiosa". (PIUS XII, The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252.)

A novel characteristic of Pope John's approach to the question of property is the calm and realistic manner in which he evaluates ownership, labour and social assurance measures as instruments for security and personal development; especially is this the case in the relation between property and labour. Pius XII's ever-recurring insistence on the widespread diffusion of ownership as the central point in the social question and the cornerstone of the social order, at times, leads to the impression that personal ownership of productive property is the unique and chief means to attain security and personal development. It takes a careful reading of an extensive number of his documents to discover that such is not the case and that he attributes to work the personal values which he identifies with private ownership of productive property.[44] But John XXIII, while upholding the importance of private property, welcomed the modern trend whereby men put more confidence in their work

---

44 As noted in Chapter IV (supra, p. 234-239), Pius XII, while holding in high regard small-scale forms of productive property, lauded technical skill and professional competence as a means to live in dignity and security. As noted in Chapter V (supra, p. 296-303), he approved and promoted a state-subsidized social security designed to safeguard and not to destroy human dignity and freedom. A careful reading of Pius XII's numerous "ad hoc" pronouncements reveals a balanced program of reform for the solution of the social question. Nevertheless, his social doctrine is most vulnerable to misinterpretation, for the reason that he never synthesized it in the form of a social encyclical.

and various skills for the assurance of material well-being; "this trend," he writes, "indicates an advance in civilization."[45]

B. Equitable Distribution: A New Emphasis and a World-wide Application.

Coupled with the papal defence of private property are urgent demands that ownership be widely distributed. As noted in Chapter II,[46] these demands assumed an intensive degree of urgency in almost every pronouncement of Pius XII on the social question.[47] That Leo XIII was the pioneer in

---

45 "[...] idque progredientis humanitatis indicium profecto est." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 16, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 427.) In connection with the primacy Pope John attributes to work, Father Jean Yves Calvez makes the observation that Mater et Magistra clarified a frequent source of confusion: "Other popes in the past had solemnly declared — and John XXIII called attention to it — that human work cannot be treated as a commodity (Mater et Magistra, AAS, p. 405, summarizing Quadragesimo Anno) that it has, at one and the same time, an individual and social aspect, (MM, AAS, p. 408, quoting Quadragesimo Anno) that it has both a 'duty and a right' (MM, AAS, p. 411, recalling the teaching of Pius XII) and is, therefore, something quite human. But it seems they never affirmed with such clarity the incontestable primacy that belongs to it nor its intrinsic import. Work is of the person whereas property exists only for the person. Property is an external expression for the person; work however, is both external and internal to the person [...]." (Jean Yves CALVEZ, The Social Thought of John XXIII, p. 30.)

46 Supra, p. 99-104.

47 Father Cronin notes: "there are those who consider that the central point in the social teaching of Pius XII was his urging of the widespread distribution of private

decrying the maldistribution of wealth and the necessity for reform is implicit in all his arguments in defence of private property. Assuredly, he wanted all the advantages of personal property to be made accessible to the masses of propertyless workingmen. This was his answer to the socialists who advocated the abolition of private ownership as a cure for the evil of wealth concentration, the effects of which Leo described in moving terms:

> [...] and, in addition, the whole process of production as well as trade in every kind of goods has been brought almost entirely under the power of a few, so that a very few rich, and exceedingly rich, men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the unnumbered masses of non-owning workers.[48]

As a specific remedy to rectify this injustice, Leo urged that measures be taken to ensure that no class of worker receive wages so low as to leave no margin for the saving

---

property as a defence against concentration of economic and political power." (John F. CRONIN, Christianity and Social Progress, p. 10.) In "Social Economics of Pius XII" (The Catholic Mind, Vol. 49, No. 1066 (Oct. 1951), p. 680), Father Cronin writes: "The present Holy Father may well be called [the pope of private property]. Certainly the diffusion of property-ownership is a central point in his social teaching."

48 "[...] huc accedunt et conductio operum et rerum omnium commercia fere in paucorum redacta potestatem ita ut opulenti ac praedivites perpauci prope servile iugum infinitae proletariorum multitudini imposuerint." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 642.) English in KOENIG, Principles for Peace, p. 53, No. 121.

necessary to acquire ownership.[49] To this end he not only insisted that property be maintained as a social institution; the state should make provision for the multiplication of property owners by awakening, as many as possible, of its citizens to the advantages of ownership:

> We have seen, in fact, that the whole question under consideration cannot be settled effectually unless it is assumed and established as a principle, that the right of private property must be regarded as sacred. Wherefore, the law ought to favour this right and, so far as it can, see that the largest possible number among the masses of the population prefer to own property.[50]

In echoing the pleas of Leo XIII, Pius XI concluded his discussion on property with an extensive statement — vigorous in its criticism of the injustice in the diffusion of ownership.[51] Typical is the following passage:

> Yet while it is true that the status of non-owning workers is to be carefully distinguished from pauperism, nevertheless, the immense multitude of the non-owning workers on the one hand, and the enormous riches of certain very wealthy men on the

---

49 LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 642-663. English in KOENIG, p. 73, No. 160.

50 "Neque enim efficaci ratione dirimi caussam, de qua agitur, posse vidimus, nisi hoc sumpto et constituto, ius privatorum bonorum sanctum esse oportere. Quamobrem favere huic iuri leges debent, et, quoad potest, providere, ut quamplurimi ex multitudine rem habere malint." (ASS, Vol. 23, p. 663.) English in KOENIG, p. 73, No. 160.

51 PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 196-199. English in KOENIG, p. 416-418, Nos. 974-981.

> other, establish an unanswerable argument that the riches which are so abundantly produced in our age of "industrialism", as it is called, are not rightly distributed and equitably made available to the various classes of the people.[52]

To remedy this injustice he exhorted the workers to increase their property holdings by thrift and wise management; he developed Leo's doctrine by calling for a family wage sufficient not only to live but to save:

> As we already indicated, following in the footsteps of Our Predecessor, it will be impossible to put these principles into practice [public order, peace and tranquillity of society] unless the non-owning workers, through industry and thrift, advance to the state of possessing some little property. But except from pay for work, from what source can a man who has nothing else but work from which to obtain food and the necessities of life, set anything aside for himself through practicing frugality?[53]

---

52 "At licet verissimum sit proletariam condicionem a pauperismo esse probe discernendam, ipsa tamen immanis multitudo proletariorum ex altera parte, ex altera vero quorundam praedivitum ingentissimae opes argumento sunt omni exceptione maiori, divitias hac nostra, quam vocant 'industrialismi', aetate tam copiose partas, haud recte esse distributas diversisque hominum classibus haud aeque applicatas." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 198.) English in KOENIG, p. 417, No. 977. See also PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Divini Redemptoris, March 19, 1937, in AAS, 29 (1937), p. 92; English in William J. GIBBONS, S.J. (ed.), Seven Great Encyclicals, Glen Rock, N.J., Paulist Press, p. 196: "Is it not deplorable that the right of private property defended by the Church should so often have been used as a weapon to defraud the workingman of his just salary and his social rights?"

53 "Deduci autem ad effectum non poterunt, nisi sollertia et parsimonia ad modicum aliquem censum proletarii provehantur, quemadmodum iam, Decessoris Nostri vestigiis insistentes, innuimus. Unde vero nisi ex operae mercede

Concluding a lengthy statement on the necessity of a just wage along with a spirit of unity between all social classes, Pius XI gives a brief but classical definition of the nature and purpose of an equitable distribution:

> For then only will the social economy be rightly established and attain its purpose when all and each are supplied with all the goods that the wealth and resources of nature, technical achievement and the social organization of economic life can furnish. And these goods ought, indeed, to be enough to meet the demands of necessity and decent comfort and to advance people to that fuller condition of life, which, when it is wisely cared for, is not only no hindrance to virtue but help it greatly.[54]

In the some twenty major pronouncements on the just distribution of the world's resources — presented and analyzed in Chapter II[55] of this study — Pius XII went far beyond his predecessors in developing this phase of the

---

poterit, parce vivendo, quidquam sibi seponere, qui nihil aliud habeat nisi operam, qua sibi victum et vitae necessaria comparet?" (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 198-199.) English in KOENIG, p. 418, No. 980.

54 "Etenim tum demum res oeconomico-socialis et vere constabit et suos fines obtinebit, si omnibus et singulis bona omnia suppeditata fuerint, quae opibus et subsidiis naturae, arte technica, sociali rei oeconomicae constitutione praestari possunt; quae quidem bona tot esse debent, quot necessaria sunt et ad necessitatibus honestisque commodis satisfaciendum, et ad homines provehendos ad feliciorem illum vitae cultum, qui, modo prudenter res geratur, virtuti non solum non obest, sed magnopere prodest." (AAS, 23, p. 202.) English in KOENIG, p. 421, No. 988.

55 Supra, p. 98-132.

social question. His deepest concern was that the wealth generated by the national economy would reach all in a measure that would make for the satisfaction of material needs and at the same time reach all in accord with the demands of personal dignity and freedom. To this end, he suggested concrete proposals not merely confined to increases in the wage level of workers.[56]

In escalating the papal doctrine on property to include the relations between the nations of the world community, Pius XII made his most original contribution to the solution of the social question.[57] The major area of concern for Leo XIII and Pius XI was how to narrow the wide gap between a relatively small capitalist class and the non-owning workers within nations. This was to be expected for the reason that there was such a high degree of discrepancy in the standard of living between the few who controlled the wealth and the workers who owned scarcely anything; this was the case even in the countries where today the average standard of living has immeasurably improved. Another factor is that in the age of Leo and Pius XI the idea of a world society and a world interdependent economy had

---

56 The originality of these proposals shall be the subject of the following section of this Chapter.

57 Supra, p. 111-135.

not as yet taken root. Pius XII's pontificate correspond to the great advances in transport and communications which, for better or for worse, accounted for an increased awareness of the extremes of wealth and poverty within the "family" of nations.

In the name of justice, charity and prudence, Pius XII condemned these extremes in terms reminiscent of his predecessors' outcry against the imbalance — within a single country — between the opulence of the wealthy and the destitution of the dispossessed. The time was opportune to appeal for world justice in the distribution of God's bountiful earth. Because of the remarkable progress in technology and science, the ideal of everyone's right to a fair share of the earth's resources could be realized; this probably for the first time in history. Pius XII arose to the occasion and broadened the papal perspective of social justice to include the rights and duties of all nations in respect to a more equitable international distribution of world resources.

As a consequence of the primacy he attached to the universal right of use, he broke new ground by proclaiming the principle that property, whether owned by an individual or controlled by the state, is ultimately limited by the common welfare of all mankind, regardless of national boundaries. To make operable these principles he called for an

unselfish policy of international trade and migration. In all these innovations, Pius XII eminently qualifies himself as the pioneer in the field of world justice.[58]

In the section of Mater et Magistra explicitly devoted to the question of property, Pope John deals briefly with the principles basic to an equitable distribution:

> It is not enough, then, to assert that man has from nature the right of privately possessing goods as his own, including those of productive character, unless, at the same time, a continuing effort is made to spread the use of this right through the ranks of the citizenry.[59]

In the statement which follows, the influence of Pius XII is obvious:

> Our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, clearly reminded us that, on the one hand, the dignity of the human person necessarily "requires the right of using external goods in order to live according to the right norm of nature. And to this

---

58 In "Events and Trends" (in World Justice, Vol. 1 (Dec. 1959), p. 234), Father VAN GASTEL pays this tribute to Pius XII: "The great credit for the growing awareness of our international duties and for the flowering of Catholic international thought is due, without doubt, to the great Pope Pius XII." For another high appraisal of Pius XII's contribution in the area of international social justice see: Benjamin L. MASSE, S.J., Justice for All (An Introduction to the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church), Milwaukee, Bruce, 1964, p. 148-151.

59 "Attamen parum est statuere, ius esse homini a natura datum res ut suas privatim possidendi, easque etiam quae ad bona gignenda valeant, nisi pariter omni contentione elaboretur, ut eiusdem iuris usus per omnes civium ordines propagetur." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 428.) English in GIBBONS, p. 39, No. 113.

> right corresponds a most serious obligation, which requires that, so far as possible, there be given to all an opportunity of possessing private property." On the other hand, the nobility inherent in work, besides other requirements, demands "the conservation and perfection of a social order that makes possible a secure, although modest, property to all classes of people.[60]

It must be noted that Pope John's principal area of concern was how to achieve an effective distribution — at all levels of the economy — through practical measures.[61] It seems that he took this approach for the very good reason that Pius XII had already performed the essential function of presenting and developing the principles basic to the equitable distribution of wealth. For example in his extensive discussion on the imbalance in wealth between poor and rich nations, Pope John begins with a single statement of fact which Pius XII demonstrated to be contrary to the moral international order:

---

60 "Quemadmodum enim praeclare monet Decessor Noster f.r. Pius XII, ex una parte ipsa humanae personae dignitas 'ad vivendum secundum rectas naturae normas necessario poscit ius externis bonis utendi; cui quidem iuri officium respondet sane gravissimum, quod requirit ut, quantum fieri potest, omnibus copia detur privata bona possidendi' (Nuntius radiophonicus datus die 24 decembris anno 1942; cfr. A.A.S., XXXV, 1943, p. 17); ex altera vero parte, ipsi labori insita nobilitas praeter alia postulat: 'tuitionem ac perfectionem illius socialis ordinis, qui omnibus cuiusvis classis civibus tutam, etsi modicam, bonorum possessionem permittat' (Cfr. Ibid., p. 20)." (JOHN XXIII, Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 428-429.) English in GIBBONS, p. 40, No. 114.

61 This will become more evident in the following section as we discuss Pius XII's contribution to the Church's practical program for the diffusion of property.

> Perhaps the most pressing question of our day concerns the relationship between economically advanced commonwealths and those that are in process of development. The former enjoy the conveniences of life; the latter experience dire poverty. Yet, today men are so intimately associated in all parts of the world that they feel, as it were, as if they are members of one and the same household. Therefore, the nations that enjoy a sufficiency and abundance of everything may not overlook the plight of other nations whose citizens experience such domestic problems that they are all but overcome by poverty and hunger, and are not able to enjoy basic human rights. This is all the more so, inasmuch as countries each day seem to become more dependent on each other. Consequently, it is not easy for them to keep the peace advantageously if excessive imbalances exist in their economic and social conditions.[62]

This is a statement typical of Pope John. He succinctly states the problem and in firm, but pastoral, terms reminds the rich nations of their obligations toward the less fortunate. After this brief statement of fact and doctrine,

---

62 "Verum nostris hisce diebus quaestio una fortasse omnium maxima haec affertur, quae nimirum necessitudines civitatibus in re oeconomica progressis cum civitatibus, quarum oeconomicae progressiones sint in cursu, intercedere debeant; quarum alterae vitae commodis fruantur, alterae vero praedura egestate laborent. Siquidem, cum mutua necessitudine homines, qui ubique sunt, ita hodie consocientur, ut in quandam et quasi unam domum insitos sese sentiant, idcirco quibus nationibus saturitas copiaque sit omnium bonorum, ab iis status non est neglegendus aliarum, quarum cives in tantis versentur domesticis difficultatibus, ut egestate fameque paene conficiantur, neve iuribus praecipuis hominum propriis, ut oportet, frui possint; eo vel magis quod, cum civitates videantur cotidie magis aliae ex aliis quodammodo pendere, fieri non potest ut diu utilem pacem eaedem servent, si earum oeconomicae et sociales condiciones nimiopere ab aliarum discrepent." (JOHN XXIII, Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 440.) English in GIBBONS, p. 53, No. 157.

he goes on to make practical application by proposing an extensive series of guidelines to govern the rich nations in fulfilling their obligations to the economically depressed members of the world community.[63]

To summarize the distinctive features of Pius XII's teaching on the justification of private property and its equitable distribution: He not only re-affirmed Leo XIII's classical arguments for private property based on the nature of man as a rational animal, man as a worker, and man as the father of a family; he raised them to a new level by emphasizing the essential connection between private ownership and the maintenance of widespread personal freedom and dignity. Despite trends in an opposite direction, John XXIII, following in the footsteps of Pius XII, defended private property as a natural right indispensable for the assurance of human dignity and especially political freedom. By making the diffusion of private property central in his

---

63 JOHN XXIII, Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 440-445; GIBBONS, p. 53-59. While it is beyond the scope of this study to elaborate on Pope John's doctrine of property, nevertheless, it is pertinent to note how he extended the teaching of Pius XII in respect to the international phase of wealth-distribution by his practical and pastoral approach. In dealing explicitly and extensively with the imbalance in material well-being between agriculture and industry (AAS, 53, p. 440-445; GIBBONS, p. 43-51) and the imbalance between different regions of the same country (AAS, p. 440; GIBBONS, p. 51-52), Pope John updated and amplified the teaching of Pius XII.

socio-economic teaching, by suggesting concrete proposals to effectively distribute wealth, Pius XII approached this question in a more positive manner and with more urgency than did his predecessors. In his application of the principles governing the right and the use of property to the economic relations between nations of the world community, Pius XII broadened the scope of the Church's social teaching to include an area largely left unexplored by his predecessors. Pope John re-asserted the teaching of Pius XII, with the accent on practical measures to right the provoking imbalance in wealth between rich and poor nations, between agriculture and industry, and between regions of a single country.

III. FORMS OF OWNERSHIP AND THE ROLE OF THE STATE: A NEW EMPHASIS

Chapters III, IV and V of this dissertation dealt with Pius XII's teaching on the ways and means best calculated to realize God and nature's plan for a just diffusion of private property. The question now arises: what is proper to Pius XII in his teaching on (1) the forms of ownership; and (2) on the role of the state in the distribution of wealth?

A. The Forms of Property: A New Evaluation.

Pius XII was an insistent promoter of an economy characterized by widespread ownership in the means of production. Toward this end his favorite proposal was the decentralization of concentrated wealth through a multiplication of proprietors in holdings of small-scale dimension. In doing so he added a new chapter to the Church's social teaching. It is true, Leo XIII seems to have specified land as the type of ownership best designed to free the workers from total dependence on their wages.[64] But this was purely incidental to his scholarly defence of private property against the socialists. In Quadragesimo Anno, Pius XI made but a passing allusion to ownership in the form of land when he deplored the impoverished state of rural workers, deprived of the hope of ever acquiring some land of their own.[65]

Apart from the above instances, there is nothing explicit in the teaching of Leo XIII or Pius XI to indicate an evaluation of the forms of property such as we have in Pius XII. To account for this, it must be recalled that

---

64 LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 646-650 and 662-663; KOENIG, p. 56-60, Nos. 129-135, and p. 73-74, Nos. 160-161.

65 PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 197-198, 210; KOENIG, p. 417, No. 976, and p. 429, No. 1007.

both these popes were concerned for the most part with efforts to improve the deplorable lot of urban workers in their time. In 1931, Pius XII wrote Quadragesimo Anno in the midst of a world-wide depression; Leo XIII's principal object was to improve the deplorable condition of the working class. These were such as to necessitate an immediate rescue operation. Papal plans to promote forms of the economy conducive to widespread ownership would have to wait.

With the material conditions of the working class vastly improved, but their freedom imperiled by huge concentrations of power and property, Pius XII urged all agents — responsible for an economy at the service of all — to provide the conditions whereby ownership in small-scale productive property would grow and flourish. This was consistent with his basic justification for widespread private property as the bastion to assure widespread freedom and personal development. It was consistent with his many pronouncements on the true concept of the national economy as the product of the free initiative of all the citizens in their united and organized efforts "to establish in a stable manner for all members of society the material conditions required for the development of their religious and cultural life".[66]

---

66 PIUS XII, Christian Principles of International Trade, Il desidero, March 7, 1948, in Discorsi e Radiomessaggi, Vol. 10, p. 12. For Italian text, see Chapter IV, note 11, p. 205.

Pope John, equally convinced of the connection between ownership and freedom, re-affirmed Pius XII's directive designed to achieve the widest possible diffusion of small-scale productive property in industry, agriculture and the crafts. Calling for structures in economic life that would not compromise but favor human dignity, Pope John recallsthe instructions of his predecessor and adds some practical insights of his own:

> Nor is it possible in economic affairs to determine in one formula all the measures that are more conformable to the dignity of man, or are more suitable in developing in him a sense of responsibility. Nevertheless, our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, appropriately laid down certain norms of action: "Small and medium-sized holdings in agriculture, in the arts and crafts, in commerce and industry, should be safeguarded and fostered. Such enterprises should join together in mutual aid societies in order that the services and benefits of large-scale enterprises will be available to them. So far as these large enterprises are concerned, work agreements should in some way be modified by partnership arrangements." (AAS, 36 (1944), p. 254.)
>
> Wherefore, conformably to requirements of the common good and the state of technology, artisan and farm enterprises of family type should be safeguarded and fostered, as should also cooperatives that aim to complement and perfect such enterprises.[67]

---

67 "Nequit profecto, in oeconomica disciplina, una comprehensione definiri, quaenam rationes magis cum hominum dignitate congruant, quaeve in iisdem hominibus suscepti officii magis convenienter stimulent conscientiam. Nihilominus Decessor Noster f.r. Pius XII has agendi normas opportune tradit: 'Parvae vel mediae bonorum possessiones, quae ad agricolas, ad artifices, ad mercatores et ad operis conductores pertineant, tutandae ac promovendae sunt; iidem

He went on to develop this directive by stressing the urgency of education, technical training and cooperative association for small-scale property holdings if they are to survive and flourish in the modern context of new and large-scale productive methods.[68] In the section devoted totally to the question of property, Pope John again recalls the directive of Pius XII, this time with the accent on the types of ownership he wants to see widely distributed:

> It is especially appropriate that today, more than heretofore, widespread private ownership should prevail, since, as noted above, the number of nations increase wherein the economic systems experience daily growth. Therefore, by prudent use of various divices already proven effective, it will not be difficult for the body politic to modify economic and social life so that the way is made easier for widespread private possession of such things as durable goods, homes, gardens, tools requisite for artisan enterprises and family-type farms, investments in enterprises of medium or

---

praeterea in adiutrices coeant societates, ut commoda utilitatesque maximarum administrationum propria sibi capiant; ad has autem administrationes quod attinet, efficiendum est, ut pactiones operarum cum pactionibus societatis secundum aliqua temperentur.' (Nuntius radiophonicus datus die 1 septembris 1944; cfr. A.A.S., XXXVI, 1944, p. 254.)

Quapropter tuendae promovendaeque sunt, convenienter cum communis boni necessitatibus cumque artium progressibus, sive procurationes ab artificibus vel a singulis agricolarum familiis gestae, sive incepta oeconomica consociata, eo etiam spectantia, ut easdem procurationes compleant atque perficiant." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 422.) English in GIBBONS, p. 32-33, Nos. 84-85.

68 JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 422-423; English in GIBBONS, p. 33, Nos. 86-90.

> large size. All of this has occurred satisfactorily in some nations with developed social and economic systems.[69]

In connection with the family-type farm, honorable mention should be attributed to Pius XII for his frequent reference to the problems of agriculture, as noted in Chapters IV and V.[70] Indeed, he was the first pope to shift some of the emphasis in the Church's social teaching from industrial to rural problems. With Pope John, this teaching was expanded and systematized as he became the first pope to devote a major part of a social encyclical to the rural question.[71]

---

69 "Privatum bonorum dominium latius obtineat oportere, si alias umquam, hodie est potissimum profitendum, cum, ut commemoravimus, numero augescant nationes, quarum oeconomicae rationes maiora in dies capiant incrementa. Quare, variis prudenter adhibitis artibus, quas usus comprobavit, haud difficile negotium erit civitatibus oeconomicam et socialem rem ita temperare, ut facilior fiat et quam latissime pateat aditus ad privatum possidendas huius exempli res: bona usu haud statim peritura; domum; praedium; supellectilem procurationi, sive ab artificibus sive a singulis agricolarum familiis gestae, necessariam; syngraphas pecuniae in administrationibus medii vel magni ordinis collocatae; quod quidem felici exitu in nonnullas nationes invectum est, provectioribus in re oeconomica et sociali rationibus instructas." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 429.) English in GIBBONS, p. 40, No. 115.

70 Supra, p. 230-231, 280-284.

71 For Pope John's program of rural regeneration see Mater et Magistra, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 431-438; GIBBONS, p. 43-51, Nos. 122-149.

Unquestionably, Pius XII favors extensive ownership in property of a smaller, more humane dimension as the most effective means to decentralize wealth in a manner conducive to the widespread development of personal values. But this is not to be equated with outright disapproval of the larger unit of production. On the contrary, Pius XII regards the large enterprise as a legitimate form of private property and, indeed, necessary to assure a high level of productivity in the economy; but it can serve the cause of an equitable distribution in its deepest meaning only when the wage level is sufficient to enable the workers to acquire property in their own right and only when the workers are afforded the opportunity to realize the personal benefits from some form of co-partnership in the business. The question of wages was a re-assertion of his predecessor's constant plea. But in the matter of co-partnership, Pius XII made a distinctive contribution by clarifying what was to be desired and what was to be rejected in proposals to implement Pius XI's somewhat cautious and timid suggestion for structural reform in the industrial enterprise. In this connection Pius XI wrote:

> First of all, those who declare that a contract of hiring and being hired is unjust of its very nature, and, hence, a partnership contract must take its place, are certainly in error [...] We consider it more advisable, however, in the present condition of human society, that, so far as is possible, the work-contract be somewhat modified by a

> partnership-contract, as is already being done in various ways and with no small advantage to workers and to owners. Workers and employers thus become sharers in ownership of management or participate in some fashion in the profits received.[72]

As noted in Chapter III,[73] Pius XII re-affirmed this suggestion in much stronger terms; at the same time he clarified its meaning by a stern reminder that the worker, as a wage-earner in the property of another, had no strict right in commutative justice to any form of co-partnership inclusive of co-management. But this denial in defence of the rights of ownership, and the controversy over it, should not obscure the fact that Pius XII was a pioneer in appealing for some form of co-partnership whereby the worker as a person could fulfill his right to self development at the very scene of his work. This was as far as he would go; but he said sufficient to make it obvious that employers have a grave responsibility to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the workers in their quest for self fulfillment. Surely, the implication is that the employer's responsibility to be just is not restricted merely to the area of wages and adequate working conditions.

---

72 PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 199; for Latin original see Chapter III, note 54; English in KOENIG, p. 418, No. 981.

73 Supra, p. 174-196.

Pope John followed in the main stream of Pius XII's teaching on the feasibility of co-partnership as a means to make widespread the personal benefits attached to ownership. Without any direct reference to the controversy over forced co-partnership, he points out that the workers are justified in seeking an active part in the affairs of the enterprise where they work; like Pius XII, he does not indicate what form this co-participation should take; nor does he assume that it precludes in any way the necessary and efficient unity of direction in the enterprise. The following is both an endorsement and a development of Pius XII's positive teaching on co-partnership:

> Furthermore, as did our predecessors, we regard as justifiable the desire of employees to be partners in enterprises with which they are associated and wherein they work. We do not think it possible, however, to decide with certain and explicit norms the manner and degree of such partnerships, since this must be determined according to the state of the individual productive enterprise. For the situation is not everywhere the same, and, in fact, it can change suddenly within one and the same enterprise. Nevertheless, we do not doubt that employees should have an active part in the affairs of the enterprise wherein they work, whether these be private or public. But it is of the utmost importance that productive enterprise assume the character of a true human fellowship whose spirit suffuses the dealings, activities, and standing of all its members.
>
> This requires that mutual relations between employers and directors on the one hand and the employees of the enterprise on the other, be marked by mutual respect, esteem, and good will. It also demands that all collaborate sincerely and harmoniously in their joint undertaking, and that they perform their work not merely with the objective of

> deriving an income, but also of carrying out the role assigned them and of performing a service that results in benefit to others. This means that the workers may have a say in, and may make a contribution toward, the efficient running and development of the enterprise. Thus, our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, clearly indicated: "The economic and social functions which everyone aspires to fulfill, require that efforts of individuals be not wholly subjected to the will of others." Beyond doubt, an enterprise truly in accord with human dignity should safeguard the necessary and efficient unity of administration. But it by no means follows that those who work daily in such an enterprise are to be considered merely as servants, whose sole function is to execute orders silently, and who are not allowed to interject their desires and interests, but must conduct themselves as idle stand-bys when it comes to assignment and direction of their tasks.[74]

---

74 "Praeterea, haud secus atque Decessores Nostri, persuasum habemus, opifices merito expeteres, ut in partem vocentur vitae societatis bonis procreandis, cui addicti sint et in qua suam ponant operam. Quas partes, quales esse oporteat, decerni certis definitisque regulis non opinamur posse, cum id potius ex singularum societatum bonis gignendis statu sit constituendum; qui nempe tantum abest ut sit idem omnibus, ut saepe in una eademque societate penitus ac repente commutetur. Non dubitamus tamen, quin opificibus actuosae partes sint attribuendae in negotiis societatis, cui navent operam, sive haec privatorum sive reipublicae sit; quod nimirum eo spectare utcumque debet, ut societates bonis gignendis perfectam induant humanae consortionis speciem, cuius afflatu singulorum necessitudines, munerum officiorumque varietates penitus afficiantur.

Hoc vero flagitat, ut mutuae quae operarum conductoribus ac moderatoribus cum eiusdem societatis operariis intercedunt rationes, ad mutuum obsequium, ad existimationem et benevolentiam conformentur; flagitat insuper, ut omnes, tamquam ad commune opus, sincera praesentique virium concordia conspirent, atque operam, quam ponunt, non eo tantum consilio ponant, ut inde lucrum faciant, verum etiam ut munus sibi creditum exsequantur, et officium praestent, quod ad aliorum etiam utilitatem conducat. Quo fit ut, ad negotia expedienda societatisque incrementum quod attinet, opportune admodum audiantur opificum optata eorumque socia

In this direct statement, Pope John demonstrates his ability to cope with a controversial issue in a manner both pastoral and persuasive. He goes on to add practical insights of his own to the effect that the demands of such intelligent participation should evoke a policy favoring more and better general education as well as technical training in behalf of the workers concerned, with the result that they will be better qualified for responsibility in their own sphere of employment and they will be better equipped for and more aware of their responsibilities to the common good.[75] He continues with an important statement on the necessity of intelligent and widespread worker

---

advocetur opera. Haec namque praeclare Decessor Noster f.r. Pius XII monebat: 'Partes, quas in rebus oeconomicis atque socialibus unusquisque appetit, vetant quominus singulorum industria alieno arbitrio prorsus regatur.' (Allocutio habita die 8 octobris anno 1956; cfr. A.A.S., XLVIII, 1956, pp. 799-800.) Nemo sane dubitat quin societas, quae hominis dignitati apprime consulat, tueri quidem debeat necessariam efficientemque sui regiminis unitatem; sed exinde nullo modo sequitur, ut qui in eam cotidie suam conferant operam, ii solummodo administrorum loco ducantur, ad iussa tacite exsequenda natorum, quibus optata sua rerumque usum interponere non liceat, sed inertes se gerere debeant, cum de ipsorum locanda moderandaque opera consilia sint capienda." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 423-424.) English in GIBBONS, p. 34-35, Nos. 91-92.

75 JOHN XXIII, AAS, 53, p. 424-425; GIBBONS, p. 35, Nos. 93-96.

participation at all levels of the economy and in workers' associations both national and international.[76]

On the question of co-partnership, to be noted is the firmness with which Pope John states that the large productive enterprise is a community of human fellowship, where the workers have the right to seek a more active part in that community, if they so decide. From this it would surely follow that labour is free to negotiate with management for that type of contract which would give them a greater share in "the efficient running and development of the enterprise". Pius XII never denied labour such a right. What he did deny was the contention that the right of co-management is axiomatic and can be enforced regardless of the existence of any contract.

Another innovation of Pius XII's doctrine on large-scale property was his firm and explicit repudiation of individualist capitalism as a philosophy governing economic life. The capitalism he condemned is that system which arrogates to itself an unlimited right over property without any subordination to the common good. With this approach, he left no doubt as to the immorality of a capitalism which would deny in practice the social function of private

---

76 JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 425-426; English in GIBBONS, p. 35-37, Nos. 97-103.

property. In doing so, he indicated approval for that type of socially orientated capitalism which is governed by the demands of the common good. Although Leo XIII and Pius XI rejected selfish capitalism and approved a system of socially inspired free enterprise they rarely used the term "capitalism".[77] Leo never used it but assuredly condemned economic liberalism which is none other than industrialist capitalism. Pius XI stated his own views and those of Leo XIII on the prevailing economic systems of their day, distinguishing between what was to be approved and what was to be condemned:

> With all his energy Leo XIII sought to adjust this economic system according to the norms of right order; hence, it is evident that this system is not to be condemned in itself. And surely it is not of its own nature vicious. But it does violate right order when capital hires workers, that is, the non-owning working class, with a view to and under such terms that it directs business and even the whole economic system according to its own will and advantage, scorning the human dignity of the workers, the social character of economic activity and social justice itself, and the common good.
> .....

---

77 Father MASSE in his work Justice for All, p. 169, suggests two plausible reasons why Leo and Pius XI avoided using the word "capitalism": "One is that the Popes wished to avoid any identification of their criticism of the contemporary economic order with the structures of Karl Marx. This might have led the unwary to believe [...] that the founder of communism and the heads of the Catholic Church were saying much the same thing [...] In the second place both Leo XIII and Pius XI must have been aware of the lack of precision in the meaning and usage of the word "capitalism". To this day, it suffers from ambiguity."

> But, with the diffusion of modern industry throughout the whole world, the "capitalist" economic regime has spread everywhere to such a degree, particularly since the publication of Leo XIII's Encyclical, that it has invaded and pervaded the economic and social life of even those outside its orbit and is unquestionably impressing on it its advantages, disadvantages and vices, and, in a sense, is giving it its own shape and form.[78]

Pius XII not only endorsed his predecessor's evaluation of the prevailing economic system, but by frequent and open use of the word "capitalism" in connection with the concept of unlimited property, he added some clarity to a long-standing confusion as to what is morally acceptable or not in the modern economic regime of private enterprise.

Pope John seems to have ended the confusion. Mater et Magistra, in keeping with its dominantly affirmative approach, never mentions "capitalism" or "economic liberalism".

---

78 "Hanc autem oeconomiae rationem ad recti ordinis normam componere Leo XIII totis viribus contendit: unde patet per se ipsam non esse damnandam. Et sane suapte natura vitiosa non est; sed tunc rectum ordinem violat, quando res operarios seu proletariam classem eo fine, eaque condicione conducit, ut negotia atque adeo res oeconomica tota ad sui ipsius nutum et commodum vertantur, humana operariorum dignitate, sociali oeconomiae indole ipsaque iustitia sociali ac bono communi contemptis.

. . . . . .

Ast 'capitalisticum' oeconomiae regimen, cum industriae usus toto orbe terrarum dilatatus sit, plurimum et ipsum post Leonis XIII Encyclicas Litteras datas quaquaversus est dilapsum adeo, ut etiam eorum, qui extra eius ambitum versantur, oeconomicam et socialem condicionem invaserit, eamque suis sive commodis sive incommodis et vitiis, vere afficiat et quodammodo informet." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 210.) English in KOENIG, p. 428-429, Nos. 1006, 1008.

The primacy of private initiative in economic affairs plus state intervention to prevent exploitation and to promote social progress is Pope John's answer to the problem of justice for all in the organization of the national economy.[79]

B. The Role of the State: A More Specific Application.

With Pius XII, the state's duty to actively create the climate conducive to the diffusion of ownership is given a new emphasis and many specific applications are urged. Confronted with a changing perspective in the national economy, he brings traditional teaching into sharper focus. Leo XIII, faced with the arguments of the socialists, who would destroy the right of private property, naturally centered his attention on the state's duty to protect private ownership rather than to regulate and diffuse it:

> The capital point is this, that private property ought to be safeguarded by the sovereign power of the State and through the bulwark of its laws. And especially, in view of such a great flaming up of passion at the present time, the masses ought to be kept within the bounds of their moral obligations.[80]

---

79 JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 413-415; English in GIBBONS, p. 23-25, Nos. 51-58.

80 "Caput autem est, imperio ac munimento legum tutari privatas possessiones oportere. Potissimumque, in tanto iam cupiditatum ardore, continenda in officio plebs." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 659.) English in KOENIG, p. 69, No. 151.

Leo's sole direct reference to the state's role in favoring the distribution of property was in connection with the function of wages as an instrument to enable the workers to acquire personal property:

> We have seen, in fact, that the whole question under consideration cannot be settled effectually unless it is assumed and established as a principle, that the right of private property must be regarded as sacred.[81]

The danger of becoming identified with a total state-controlled economy of socialism certainly accounted for Leo XIII's reluctance to elaborate the role of government in regulating the diffusion of private property. Another factor could well have been that he wrote Rerum Novarum against a background of laissez-faireism — dedicated to the principle that the best government is the one which governs least.[82]

When Pius XI wrote Quadragesimo Anno in 1931, the climate had changed: government assumed more and more

---

81 "Neque enim efficaci ratione dirimi caussam, de qua agitur, posse vidimus, nisi hoc sumpto et constituto, ius privatorum bonorum sanctum esse oportere." (LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 663.) English in KOENIG, p. 73, No. 160.

82 Despite this background of extremes in the form of socialism and laissez-faireism, Leo XIII was the pioneer in formulating the principle of government intervention in economic life when he called for a variety of laws to protect workers against exploitation. (Cf. Rerum Novarum, in ASS, Vol. 23, p. 657-659; KOENIG, p. 67-69, Nos. 148-151.)

responsibility in regulating economic life to serve the general welfare. Under such favorable condition he clarified and developed the principles underlying the state's duty toward the fulfillment of its essential mission to serve the common good. Specifically he pinpointed the state's duty to regulate private property so as to assure the fulfillment of its social function:

> It follows from what We have termed, the individual and at the same time social character of ownership, that men must consider in this matter not only their own advantage but also the common good. To define these duties in detail, when necessity requires and the natural law has not done so, is the function of those in charge of the State. Therefore, public authority, under the guiding light always of the natural and divine law, can determine more accurately upon consideration of the true requirements of the common good, what is permitted and what is not permitted to owners in the use of their property.[83]

Nor does government go counter to the right of property when it discharges its supervisory and regulatory function; on the contrary, it ministers to this right as Pius XI so indicates:

---

83 "Re vera hominibus hac in re non solum sui proprii commodi, sed etiam communis boni esse rationem habendam, ex ipsa dominii quam diximus indole individuali simul et sociali deducitur. Officia vero haec singillatim definire, ubi id necessitas postulaverit neque ipsa lex naturalis praestiterit, eorum est qui rei publicae praesunt. Quapropter quid, considerata boni communis vera necessitate, eis qui possident liceat, quid illicitum sit in suorum bonorum usu, publica auctoritas, lege naturali et divina semper praelucente, sciscere potest accuratius." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 193.) English in KOENIG, p. 412, No. 967.

> Yet, when the State brings private ownership into harmony with the needs of the common good, it does not commit a hostile act against private owners but rather does them a friendly service; for it thereby effectively prevents the private possession of goods, which the Author of nature, in His most wise providence, ordained for the support of human life, from causing intolerable evils and thus rushing to its own destruction; it does not destroy private possessions, but safeguards them; and it does not weaken private property rights, but strengthens them.[84]

Neither does this government intervention exclude limited public ownership; on the contrary, Pius XI states that certain types of property must be owned by the state:

> For certain kinds of property, it is rightly contended, ought to be reserved to the State since they carry with them a dominating power so great that it cannot, without danger to the general welfare, be entrusted to private individuals.[85]

Another significant innovation proper to Pius XI's teaching is his explicit formulation of the famed principle of subsidiarity, namely, that the function of government in any

---

84 "Cum vero res publica dominia cum boni communis necessitatibus componit, non heris privatis inimicam sed amicam operam praestat; etenim hac ratione valide obstat, quominus privata bonorum possessio, quam ad vitae humanae subsidium providentissimus naturae Auctor decrevit, intolerabilia gignat incommoda, atque ita in exitium ruat: neque possessiones privatas elidit, sed tuetur; privataque dominia non debilitat, sed roborat." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 194.) English in KOENIG, p. 413, No. 967.

85 "Etenim certa quaedam bonorum genera rei publicae reservanda merito contenditur, cum tam magnum secum ferant potentatum, quantus privatis hominibus, salva re publica, permitti non possit." (Quadragesimo Anno, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 214.) English in KOENIG, p. 432, No. 1018.

sphere of economic activity must be limited to a subsidiary role — to the extent of helping groups and individuals to help themselves and thereby leaving the state free to perform the function proper to it alone:

> [...] Thereby it will more freely, powerfully and effectively do all those things that belong to it alone because it alone can do them: directing, watching, urging, restraining, as occasion requires and necessity demands.[86]

To these principles, so succinctly enuntiated by his predecessor, Pius XII added nothing substantially new. Nonetheless, as noted in Chapter V,[87] he contributed toward their clarification by elaborating on the state's positive responsibility — in the economic order — to secure the common good properly conceived as the conditions whereby all citizens may readily realize their personal rights to self development in the economic process. In the practical area, he made a specific application of these principles to the problems proper to the years of his pontificate.[88] He called for state measures to protect and to assure the

---

86 "[...] quo fiet, ut liberius, fortius et efficacius ea omnia exsequatur, quae ad ipsam solam spectant, utpote quae sola ipsa praestare possit: dirigendo, vigilando, urgendo, coercendo, prout casus fert et necessitas postulat." (PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 203.) English in KOENIG, p. 422-423, No. 992.

87 Supra, p. 256-276.

88 Supra, p. 276-305.

growth of small-scale industry and agriculture. To reduce the imbalance in wealth between various classes of citizens, he encouraged state participation in social insurance plans, when not detrimental to personal dignity and freedom. To reduce wealth imbalance between nations, he appealed for a trade and migration policy designed to make the bounty of the earth available — in just measure — to all nations. He insisted upon the state's duty to initiate a form of economic planning designed not to destroy but to stimulate personal initiative, not merely to increase production but to distribute its fruits more equitably. He was the first pope to emphasize that it was the duty of the state to provide jobs when private enterprise fails to do so. In all these instances, Pius XII broke new ground by giving to the principle of subsidiarity its deepest meaning: the state must provide for the common good of the economic order regardless of the success or failure of private enterprise.

As to outright public ownership, Pius XII's tone was severe, no doubt because of the surge of nationalization confronting him in post-war Europe. He rightly viewed indiscriminate nationalization of industry as a distortion of the principle of subsidiarity, in that it threatened to restrict rather than to expand the area of personal freedom. He, nevertheless, re-affirmed Pius XI's principle to the effect that the common good, at times, demands that certain

forms of property be publicly owned. It is unfortunate that historical circumstances prevented Pius XII from paying more attention to this principle, with the result that he leaves the impression that any kind of nationalization is to be viewed with alarm. An integration of his abundant pronouncements on socio-economic life would serve to erase such misunderstandings. In other words, a social encyclical from the pen of Pius XII toward the end of his pontificate would have left the Church's social doctrine all the richer.

In matters pertaining to the state, relative to widespread ownership, Pope John followed in the tradition of Pius XII, with a significant addition of specific proposals for government in its duty to right the imbalance in wealth between all levels of the economy. After summarizing the previous papal teaching in the area of state intervention in economic activity, Pope John notes two specific functions which he regards to be of the highest importance: reducing imbalances and the smoothing of the business cycle together with the prevention of mass unemployment. He wrote:

> Indeed, as is easily perceived, recent developments of science and technology provide additional reasons why, to a greater extent than heretofore, it is within the power of public authorities to reduce imbalances, whether these be between various sectors of economic life, or between peoples of the world as a whole. These same developments make it possible to keep fluctuations in the economy within bounds, and to provide effective measures for

> avoiding mass unemployment. Consequently, it is requested again and again of public authorities responsible for the common good, that they intervene in a wide variety of economic affairs, and that, in a more extensive and organized way than heretofore, they adapt institutions, tasks, means and procedures to this end.[89]

Throughout Mater et Magistra, Pope John gives innumerable vivid examples of the government intervention, he regards as necessary, for equilibrium in wealth distribution among all levels. Typical is the following:

> To achieve orderly progress in various sectors of economic life, it is absolutely necessary that, as regards agriculture, public authorities give heed and take action in the following matters: taxes and duties, credit, insurance, prices, the fostering of requisite skills and, finally, improved equipment for rural enterprises.[90]

---

89 "Sane, quod facile est pervidere, recentiora doctrinarum incrementa opumque augendarum provectiores rationes id efficiunt, ut, multo magis quam antea, in civitatis moderatorum potestate sit, tum discrepantias imminuere, quae inter varios rei oeconomicae campos, vel inter diversas regiones eiusdem nationis, ac vel etiam inter diversos totius orbis terrarum populos intercedant; tum certis finibus perturbationes continere, quae ex ancipiti rerum oeconomicarum cursu oriri solent; tum denique efficacia praebere remedia, ne contingat, ut hominum ingentes multitudines ab opere vacare cogantur. Quare a publicae rei moderatoribus, quorum est communi bono consulere, etiam atque etiam postulatur, ut multiplicem in rem oeconomicam impendant operam, eamque ampliorem quam antea ordinatioremque; utque instituta, officia, instrumenta, agendique rationes huic efficiendo proposito congruenter accommodent." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 414.) English in GIBBONS, p. 24, No. 54.

90 "Ut autem in variis oeconomicarum provinciis ordinata progressio habeatur, necesse omnino est rerumpublicarum auctoritates, agrorum cultura spectata, ad haec curam prudentiamque suam intendant: ad tributa aut vectigalia, ad

With regard to public ownership the teaching of Pope John is substantially the same as that of Pius XII; but the difference in style and approach is striking. Times had changed. The fear of a totalitarian control of the economy was eased as private enterprise continued to thrive along with extensive public ownership. Against this background Pope John accepts limited public ownership as a natural outcome of the complexity of modern society:

> Obviously, what we have said above does not preclude ownership of goods pertaining to production of wealth by States and public agencies, especially "if these carry with them power too great to be left in private hands, without injury to the community at large."
>
> It seems characteristic of our times to vest more and more ownership of goods in the State and in other public bodies. This is partially explained by the fact that the common good requires public authorities to exercise ever greater responsibilities. However, in this matter, the principle of subsidiarity already mentioned above, is to be strictly observed. For it is lawful for States and public corporations to expand their domain of ownership only when manifest and genuine requirements of the common good so require, and then with safeguards, lest the possession of private citizens be

---

creditam pecuniam, ad civilium praesidiorum cautiones, ad rerum pretium, ad artes provehendas complementi rationem habentes, denique ad rusticarum procurationum apparatus perficiendos." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 433-434.) English in GIBBONS, p. 46, No. 131. For Pope John's specific examples of the government's duty in rectifying economic imbalances on the national and international levels see GIBBONS, Mater et Magistra, Nos. 88, 127, 134, 135, 137, 147, 150, 151, 161, 165, 202; see also Pacem in Terris, No. 64.

> diminished beyond measure, or, what is worse, destroyed.[91]

To conclude this discussion, relative to Pius XII's contribution to the Church's practical program for widespread ownership: (1) He was the first pope to make explicit the distinction between property of small and large-scale dimension, in terms of evaluating the efficacy of each type as instruments in realizing the ideal of an effective distribution. He ranked efforts to preserve and to increase productive property of small-scale proportion as number one in any proposal to decentralize wealth and to distribute it in a manner consonant with personal dignity. Pope John re-asserted this preference and amplified it to include a re-emphasis in the promotion of family-type farms and cooperative associations.

---

91 "Manifestum omnino est, quae exposuimus, ea minime prohibere, quominus etiam civitates ceteraque publica instituta iure res possideant, quae ad opes parandas pertineant; si praesertim 'tam magnum secum ferant potentatum, quantus privatis hominibus, salva re publica, permitti non possit.'

Nostrae huius aetatis ea esse indoles videtur, ut ampliores usque bonorum possessiones tum civitati, tum ceteris publicis institutis attribuantur. Cuius rei causa in hoc etiam quaerenda est, quod commune bonum exigit, ut maiora usque munera publicae auctoritati demandentur. Attamen hac etiam in re subsidiarii officii principium, de quo iam mentionem fecimus, omnino servandum est; scilicet tum tantum licere civitatibus ac publicis institutis dominii sui fines amplificare, cum manifesta ac vera communis boni necessitas id postulat, depulso periculo, ne privatorum possessiones praeter modum extenuentur aut, quod deterius est, plane evertantur." (JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 429.) English in GIBBONS, p. 40-41, Nos. 116-117.

(2) By clarifying what was to be avoided and what was to be pursued — on the part of the workers — as a legitimate objective in Pius XI's mild suggestion for reform in the structure of the large business enterprise, Pius XII raised the concept of co-partnership to a new level of importance and gave to it official status as an integral part of the Church's practical program for social reform. Pope John re-affirmed the teaching and gave it a new impetus by stressing the urgency of worker-owner co-participation at all levels of economic organization. Pius XII's explicit condemnation of individualistic capitalism and his approval of private enterprise — subject to the demands of the common good — was more to the point and somewhat clearer than that of his predecessors.

(3) In the sphere of governmental activity to effect widespread ownership, Pius XII updated the principles of his predecessors by specifying the precise role of the state, as custodian of the common good in such areas as social security associations, economic planning, trade and migration, unemployment, small-scale ownership in industry and agriculture, all with a view to securing an effective distribution of the world's resources. Pope John multiplied the instances where the state must intervene to remedy imbalances in wealth at all levels of the national and international economy.

the use of the world's goods, private property has an essential personal function inseparable from its social function.

The personal and social necessity of private property demands that it be justly distributed within and between countries, and that each nation of the world community has access to sufficient wealth to enable its citizens to fulfill their right to the use of the world's goods, given by God for the welfare of all. The moral order of justice, charity and prudence demands an equitable international distribution of the world's resources.

Individualist capitalism, indiscriminate nationalization and the proposal to reform the structure of the large enterprise by compulsory co-partnership between owners and workers, all gravely imperil the effective distribution of private property; capitalism, when it attaches to itself an absolute concept of private property and indiscriminate nationalization, favors the concentration rather than the diffusion of productive property; forced co-partnership belittles the personal right of property, reducing it to a mere social function.

To effectively distribute private ownership in the means of production, all responsible agents in the economy must work to preserve and to increase the number of small and medium-sized holdings in agriculture, in the arts and

trades, in commerce and industry. This is the form of property best calculated to assure the personal and social values inherent in private ownership. A socially responsible system of large scale industrial proprietorship is a valid form of property and it has a vital function to assure that the productivity of the economy meets the increasing needs of all. As such, large scale property under a system of socially orientated capitalism can qualify as an effective instrument for the diffusion of wealth, assuming that the workers involved receive sufficient wages to have access to private property and assuming that they are given the opportunity to aspire to a form of co-partnership which will provide the security and personal development attached to private ownership of smaller dimension.

The principle of subsidiarity prescribes that the state refrain from undue interference with personal and group efforts to better their economic lot. In its deepest meaning, this principle enjoins upon the state, as custodian of the common good, the positive essential duty to create the economic climate whereby its citizens may acquire property in a manner conducive to the realization of personal values and thereby the common good. To this end, the state should (a) enact legislation to protect and augment the number of small-scale property holders; (b) participate in social insurance programs to aid the economically

disadvantaged; (c) stimulate and co-ordinate private and group efforts with a view to increasing production and distributing its fruits equitably; (d) intervene to provide for a more just sharing of employment opportunities when private enterprise fails to do so; (e) adopt a policy of international trade and migration that will not frustrate but rather favor the implementation of all individuals and nations to a fair share of the earth's resources.

By drawing attention to the supremacy of the universal right to the use of material goods over the right to private property and other rights in the economic order, Pius XII added precision and clarity to the property-doctrine of his predecessors, and substantially influenced the approach of John XXIII to the solution of economic inequality in his time.

Pius XII raised Leo XIII's arguments for private property to a new dimension by emphasizing the connection between ownership and the maintenance of widespread personal freedom — an approach consistently adopted by Pope John. In applying the principles governing the right and the use of property to the economic relations between the world family of nations, Pius XII added a new chapter to the social doctrine of the Church. Pope John applied this teaching by his appeal for practical measures to right the

imbalance in wealth between all levels of the economy, both national and international.

As the first pope to make explicit the distinction between property of small and large-scale dimension, in terms of realizing an effective distribution, Pius XII attributed primary importance to the necessity of providing for the maintenance and increase in the number of smaller units of productive property as the most effective means to remedy the evils of centralized ownership. Of all the popes he made the most explicit condemnation of capitalistic forms of large scale property when governed by an unlimited concept of private ownership. He was the first pope to stress the justice and the urgency of co-partnership between owners and workers in the large industrial enterprise. Pope John re-affirmed and elaborated upon these directives in the area of the practical. Pius XII went beyond his predecessors in pinpointing specific areas for the state to exercise its duty towards the common good in supervising the whole regime of private property. Pope John updated and multiplied the instances calling for remedial measures on the part of government to effect a balanced distribution in the national and international economy.

Pius XII, like the popes of the social encyclicals before him, developed and re-formulated the principles of the natural law and applied them to the concrete

socio-economic problems of his time through an appeal primarily directed to the light of human reason. His radio-broadcasts and his great Christmas messages on the social and economic problems of the day were addressed to the whole world. The profundity of these discourses with their universal appeal to human reason was perhaps the dominant factor to account for the reason that Pius XII was the first of the modern popes to be recognized as the principal spokesman for world-wide moral order. His doctrine on property and its equitable distribution — rooted, as it was, in the natural law — had this universal appeal. It was not a Catholic or even a Christian doctrine, in the restricted, sectarian sense of the word. Accordingly his contribution to the Church's social teaching on widespread ownership is, at the same time, a contribution to the development of social philosophy, regardless of any creed. No philosophical study on man in his relation to material goods, as a means for sustenance and development, would be complete without reference to what was specific to Pius XII in his teaching on <u>ownership for all</u>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCE DOCUMENTS OF PIUS XII

Abbreviations used:

AAS : Acta Apostolicae Sedis.

CM : The Catholic Mind.

DR : Discorsi e Radiomessaggi di Sua Santita Pio XII.

TPS : The Pope Speaks.

Easter Message of Peace, Quoniam Paschalia, April 9, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 145-151; CM, 37 (1939), p. 649-656.

Encyclical Letter Summi Pontificatus, Oct. 20, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 413-453; English, ibid., p. 538-564.

Encyclical Epistle Sertum Laetitiae, Nov. 1, 1939, in AAS, 31 (1939), p. 635-644; English, Nov. 25, 1939, ibid., p. 645-656.

Appeal for a Just Peace, Il Vangelo, Nov. 24, 1940, in AAS, 32 (1940), p. 531-536; CM, 58 (1940), p. 521-529.

Christmas Message, Grazie, Venerabili, Dec. 24, 1940, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. [5]-14; CM, 39 (1941), p. 1-6.

The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum, La solennità, June 1, 1941, in AAS, 33 (1941), p. 195-205; English, ibid., p. 216-227.

Christmas Message, Nell'alba e nella luce, Dec. 24, 1941, in AAS, 34 (1942), p. 10-21; CM, 40 (1951), p. 1-20.

Christmas Message, Con sempre nuova, Dec. 24, 1942, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 9-24; CM, 41 (1943), p. 45-60.

The Church and Labor, La vostra gradita, June 13, 1943, in AAS, 35 (1943), p. 171-179; CM, 41 (1943), p. 1-9.

Christmas Message, Ancora una quinta, Dec. 24, 1943, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 11-24; CM, 42 (1944), p. 65-76.

The Fifth Year of the War, Oggi, al compiersi, Sept. 1, 1944, in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 249-258; CM, 42 (1944), p. 577-586.

Christmas Message, Benignitas et Humanitas, Dec. 24, 1944, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 10-23; CM, 43 (1945), p. 66-77.

The Future of Trade Unions, Il Nostro Predecessore, March 11, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 68-72; CM, 45 (1947), p. 707-711.

Letter to Mr. Charles Flory, Nous avons pris, July 14, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 210-212; CM, 43 (1945), p. 618-619: Extract.

Victories that Statesmen Must Win, Even Here, Aug. 27, 1945, in DR, Vol. 7, p. 159-162.

Woman's Duties in Social and Political Life, Questa grande, Oct. 21, 1945, in AAS, 37 (1945), p. 284-295; CM, 43 (1945), p. 705-716.

Industrial Relations, La vostra presenza, Jan. 24, 1946, in DR, Vol. 7, p. 349-351. French in UTZ and GONER, Relations humaines, Vol. 2, p. 1659-1661.

Liberty as the Foundation for Community Life and the Danger of Indiscriminate Nationalization, C'est un geste, July 10, 1946, in AAS, 38 (1946), p. 315-318; CM, 44 (1946), p. 673: Extract and Summary.

The Life of the Farmer, Al particolare, Nov. 15, 1946, in AAS, 38 (1946), p. 426-437; CM, 48 (1950), p. 442-446.

Fundamental Questions of the Economic Order, Nous avons lu, July 18, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 444-447; CM, 45 (1947), p. 681-684.

Now is the Time for Action, Conforto, letizia, Sept. 7, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 423-431; CM, 45 (1947), p. 641-648.

Papal Directives for the Woman of Today, Vous vous présentez, Sept. 12, 1947, in AAS, 39 (1947), p. 480-488; National Catholic Welfare Council, Washington, D.C., Pamphlet 12.

Christian Principles of International Trade, Il desidero, March 7, 1948, in DR, Vol. 10, p. 9-13; CM, 46 (1948), p. 421-424.

Fundamentals of Private Law, Soyez les bienvenus, May 20, 1948, in DR, Vol. 10, p. 89-93; UTZ, Relations humaines, Vol. I, p. 177-183.

The Approaching Holy Year, Per la decima, in DR, Vol. 10, p. 113-122.

Christian Principles in Labor, Eccovi ancora, June 29, 1948, in AAS, 40 (1948), p. 331-337; CM, 46 (1948), p. 609-616.

Address to Young Men, Nel vedere, Sept. 12, 1948, in AAS, 40 (1948), p. 409-414; CM, 47 (1949), p. 51-55.

Justice and Morals in Public Finance, En nous procurant, Oct. 2, 1948, in DR, Vol. 10, p. 237-241; CM, 47 (1949), p. 380-381.

Letter to Archbishop McNicholas, Dec. 24, 1948, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 69-71.

Christmas Message, Gravi ed ad, Dec. 23, 1948, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 5-15; CM, 47 (1949), p. 179-187.

Housing Problems, Voyez Messieurs, March 25, 1949, in DR, Vol. 11, p. 17-21; UTZ, Relations humaines, Vol. II, p. 1691-1693.

Common Interests of Employer and Employee, Avec une égale, May 7, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 283-286; CM, 47 (1949), p. 445-448.

Woman's Apostolate, Per quanto legittima, July 24, 1949, in AAS, 41 (1949), p. 415-421; CM, 47 (1949), p. 695-690.

Workers' Organizations, Soyez les bienvenus, Sept. 11, 1949, in AAS, 31 (1949), p. 547-561; CM, 48 (1950), p. 58-61.

Christmas Message, Non mai forse, Dec. 23, 1949. in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 121-133; N.C.W.C. Pamphlet; also in YZERMANS, V.A. (ed.), The Major Addresses of Pope Pius XII, Vol. II. Christmas Messages, St. Paul, North Central Publishing, 1961, p. 128-138.

Social Function of Banking, Ci torna, April 25, 1950, in DR, Vol. 12, p. 37-41; CM, 48 (1951), p. 331-333.

Vocation of Businessmen, Nous avons grande joie, April 27, 1950, in DR, Vol. 12, p. 43-46; CM, 48 (1950), p. 510-511.

Production for Human Needs, Nous vous adressons, June 3, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 485-488; CM, 48 (1950), p. 507-510.

The Modern State, A vous Messieurs, August 5, 1950, in DR, Vol. 12, p. 157-161; CM, 49 (1951), p. 460-462.

Apostolic Exhortation Menti Nostrae, Sept. 23, 1950, in AAS, 42 (1950), p. 657-702; CM, 49 (1951), p. 37-69.

Christmas Message, Un anno, Dec. 23, 1950, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 49-59; CM, 49 (1951), p. 201-208.

Church's Concern for Economic Life, Amadísimo hijos, March 11, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 213-216; CM, 49 (1951), p. 706-708.

The Bank: Servant of the People, Dalla sua, March 18, 1951, in DR, Vol. 13, p. 9-12; UTZ, Relations humaines, Vol. I, p. 1265-1267.

Catholic Action, Diletti figli, May 3, 1951, in DR, Vol. 13, p. 65-72; CM, 49 (1951), p. 524-528.

Rural Life Problems, Soyez ici, July 2, 1951, in AAS, 43 (1951), p. 554-557; CM, 49 (1951), p. 708-711.

Function of Bankers, Votre démarche, Oct. 24, 1951, in DR, Vol. 13, p. 321-325; CM, 52 (1954), p. 121-122.

The Catholic Employer, Di tutto cuore, Jan. 31, 1952, in DR, Vol. 13, p. 461-466; CM, 50 (1952), p. 569-572.

Problems of the Just Distribution of Goods, Dans la tradition, July 7, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 619-624; Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, Huntingdon, Ind., Our Sunday Visitor, 1953, p. 21-28.

To Austrian Catholics, Mit Freuden Kommen, Sept. 14, 1952, in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 789-793; CM, Vol. 51 (1953), p. 48-53.

Christmas Message, Levate capita vestra, Dec. 24, 1952, in AAS, 45 (1953), p. 33-46; CM, 51 (1953), p. 111-122.

Need for Housing Projects, De gran cuore, Nov. 21, 1953, in DR, Vol. 15, p. 475-480; CM, 52 (1954), p. 309-311.

Social Aspects of the Food and Agriculture Organization, Depuis plusieurs, Dec. 8, 1953, in DR, Vol. 15, p. 493-497; N.C.W.C., Washington, D.C., News Service.

Christmas Message, Il popolo, Dec. 24, 1953, in AAS, 46 (1954), p. 5-16; CM, 52 (1954), p. 174-183.

Roots of Civil Crisis, En ouvrant à Rennes, July 14, 1954, in AAS, 46 (1954), p. 482-487; TPS, II (1954), p. 221-226.

To a Group of Spanish Workers, Hijos amadísimos, Nov. 1, 1954, in DR, Vol. 16, p. 231-234; TPS, I (1954, No. 4), p. 372-373.

Christmas Message, Ecce ego, Dec. 24, 1954, in AAS, 37 (1955), p. 15-28; TPS, II (1954, No. 1), p. 3-16.

The Christian Way of Life, Poco più, May 1, 1955, in DR, Vol. 17, p. 69-76; TPS, II (1955), p. 147-153.

Farming: A Model of Human Effort, Eccoci convenuti, May 18, 1955, in AAS, 47 (1955), p. 497-500; TPS, II (1955, No. 2), p. 173-176.

The Catholic Employer, Avete tenuto, June 7, 1955, in DR, Vol. 17, p. 117-123; TPS, II (1955, No. 2), p. 154-158.

Aid to Better Understanding, Des efforts, Sept. 18, 1955, in AAS, 47 (1955), p. 691-694; TPS, II (1955, No. 2), p. 231-234.

Christmas Message, Col cuore aperto, Dec. 24, 1955, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 26-41; TPS, II (1955, No. 3), p. 301-314.

Business and the Common Good, Or sono dieci, Feb. 17, 1956, in DR, Vol. 17, p. 543-549; TPS, III (1956, No. 1), p. 45-49.

The Farmer's Three Duties. Vi siamo grati, April 11, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 277-282; TPS, III (1956, No. 2), p. 169-174.

The Christian Aspects of Business, Abbiamo accolto, April 13, 1956, in DR, Vol. 18, p. 91-96; TPS, III (1956), p. 180-183.

The Christian Labor Movement. Vivo e gradito, May 1, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 287-292; CM, 54 (1956), p. 403-408.

To the Italian Co-operative Confederation, Vi accogliamo, May 10, 1956, in UTZ, Relations humaines, Vol. III, p. 3494-3495.

To the Organization for Improvement of the Fucino. Siamo ben lieti, May 25, 1956, in DR, Vol. 18, p. 245-249; French in UTZ, Relations humaines, Vol. III, p. 3200-3203.

Economics and Man. A l'occasion, Sept. 9, 1956, in AAS. 48 (1956), p. 670-674; TPS, III (1956, No. 3), p. 241-243.

Taxes, Parmi les nombreux, Oct. 3, 1956, in DR, Vol. 18, p. 505-510; TPS, IV (1957, No. 1), p. 77-80.

Small Business in Today's Economy, Soyez les bienvenus, Oct. 8, 1956, in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 798-801; TPS, III (1957, No. 4), p. 405-409.

The Middle Class. En accueillant, Oct. 25, 1956, in DR, Vol. 18, p. 601-605; TPS, III (1957, No. 4), p. 401-403.

Christ's Kingdom and the World of Labor, Nel darvi, Oct. 28, 1956. in AAS, 48 (1956), p. 819-824; TPS, III (1957, No. 4), p. 411-416.

Economics, the State and the Value of Man, Con vivo, March 7, 1957, in DR, Vol. 19, p. 25-31; TPS, IV (1957, No. 1), p. 88-89.

The Family of Nations, Your Association, June 27, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 632-633.

Problems of Rural Life, Al vivo, Sept. 18, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 830-836; TPS, IV (1958), p. 455-462.

The Farm Problem, Nous avons, Nov. 9, 1957, in AAS, 49 (1957), p. 1023-1024; TPS, IV (1958, No. 4), p. 442.

France and Africa, C'est une joie, April 13, 1958, in DR, Vol. 20, p. 93-94; TPS, V (1958, No. 1), p. 39-40.

II. OTHER PAPAL DOCUMENTS QUOTED OR CITED

JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Mater et Magistra, May 15, 1961, in AAS, 53 (1961), p. 401-464.
English version: GIBBONS, William J., S.J., Christianity and Social Progress, Glen Rock, N.J., Paulist Press, 1961, 112 p.

JOHN XXIII, Encyclical Letter Pacem in Terris, April 11, 1963, in AAS, 55 (1963), p. 257-304.
English version: Peace on Earth, Addressed to all Mankind, With Discussion Outline, N.C.W.C. translation, St. Paul Editions, 48 p.

LEO XIII, Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum, March 15, 1891, in Acta Sanctae Sedis, Vol. 23, p. 641-670.
English version: GIBBONS, William J., S.J., Seven Great Encyclicals, Glen Rock, N.J., Paulist Press, 1963, p. 1-30.

PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, May 15, 1931, in AAS, 23 (1931), p. 177-228.
English version: KOENIG, H.C., Principles for Peace, Washington, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943, p. 397-446.

PIUS XI, Encyclical Letter Divini Redemptoris, March 19, 1937, in AAS, 29 (1937), p. 65-106.
English version: KOENIG, H.C., Principles for Peace, p. 510-535.

III. COLLECTIONS OF PIUS XII'S DOCUMENTS AND PRONOUNCEMENTS ON SOCIAL DOCTRINE

CLEMENT, Marcel, L'Economie sociale selon Pie XII, Vol. II: Documents Pontificaux, Paris, Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1953, 327 p. (From July 1939 to June 1953)

FREMANTLE, Anne, ed., The Social Teachings of the Church, [Toronto], The New American Library of Canada Ltd., 1963, 320 p. (Key pronouncements of the Catholic Church on social issues from Leo XIII to Paul VI.)

KOENIG, Harry C., Principles for Peace. Selections From Papal Documents, Leo XIII to Pius XII, Washington, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943, xxv-894 p.

KOTHEN, Robert, L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, Louvain, Warny, 1949, xi-519 p.

POWERS, Francis J., Papal Pronouncements on the Political Order, Westminster, Md., Newman, 1952, xii-246 p.

UTZ, A., O.P., and GONER, J.F., O.P. (eds.), Relations humaines et Société contemporaine, Fribourg, Suisse, 1956-1963, 3 vols. (1310, 2381, 3831 p.) (Most comprehensive and complete in French.)

YZERMANS, Vincent A., ed., The Major Addresses of Pope Pius XII, St. Paul, The North Central Publishing Co., 1961, 2 vols. (Vol. I. Selected Addresses, 473 p.; Vol. II. Christmas Messages, 309 p.)

ZIZZAMIA, Alba, "Catholicism and Internationalism. A Papal Anthology," in Thought, Vol. 28,3 (1953-1954), p. 485-528.

IV. GUIDES TO THE SOURCES, COMMENTARIES AND TRANSLATIONS OF PIUS XII'S SOCIAL DOCUMENTS

CARLEN, Sister M. Claudia, Dictionary of Papal Documents Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1957, New York, Kennedy and Sons, 1958, 216 p.

--------, Guide to the Documents of Pius XII, 1939-1949, Westminster, Md., Newman, 1951, 229 p.

PILOTE, George R., Guide de consultation des discours du Pape Pie XII, Ottawa, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1963, xix-340 p.

VITO, Francesco, Introduzione alle Encicliche e ai Messaggi Sociali da Leone XIII a Giovanni XXIII, Milano, Società Ed. Vita e Pensiero, 1962, p. 1*-53* (Repertorio Chronologico dei Documenti Pontifici sui

problemi sociali) The best guide to the primary sources of Pius XII's social documents.

V. SUPPLEMENTARY LITERATURE PERTINENT TO THE DISSERTATION

1. Books.

BERLE, Adolphe A. (Jr.), Power Witnout Property, New York, Harcourt, 1959, 184 p.

BERLE, A.A., and G.C. MEANS, The Modern Corporation and Private Property, New York, Macmillan, 1933, xviii-396 p.

BIGO, Pierre, La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, 540 p.

BRUEHL, C., The Pope's Plan for Social Reconstruction, New York, Bevin-Adair, 1939, xii-353 p.

CALVEZ, J.Y. and Jacques PERRIN, The Church and Social Justice, The Social Teaching of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII, trans. from the French by J.R. Kirwan, London, Burns and Oates, 1959, xvi-466 p.

CALVEZ, J.Y., The Social Thought of John XXIII (Mater et Magistra), trans. from the French by George J.N. McKenzie, Chicago, Regnery, 1964, xi-126 p.

CIRILLO, R.R., ed., Catholic Social Thought, Malta, Aquilina, 1956, vii-229 p.

CLEMENT, Marcel, L'Economie sociale selon Pie XII, Paris, Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1953, 2 vols. (Vol. I. Synthèse doctrinale; Vol. II. Documents pontificaux)

--------, Le Travail, Paris, Librairie Académique Perrin, 1962. 334 p.

COADY, M.M., Masters of Their Own Destiny, New York, Harper, 1939, x-170 p.

CONNELL, F.J., Outlines of Moral Theology, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1953. xii-247 p.

CROFTS, A.M., O.P., Property and Poverty, Dublin, Irish Rosary Office, 1948, 269 p.

CRONIN, John F., Catholic Social Principles, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1950, 803 p.

--------, Social Principles and Economic Life, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1959, xxiii-436 p.

--------, The Social Teaching of John XXIII, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1963, ix-83 p.

--------, Christianity and Social Progress. A Commentary on Mater et Magistra, Baltimore, Helicon, 1964, 223 p.

CRONAN, Edward P., The Dignity of the Human Person, New York, Philosophical Library, 1955, xvi-208 p.

DALPATHADO, J.Kingsley, O.M.I., Current Trends in Trade Unionism, Papal Teaching, Maggona, Ceylon, St. Vincent's Press, 1956, ix-165 p.

DEMPSEY, Bernard W., S.J., The Functional Economy, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1958, 514 p.

DESQUEYRAT, A., La propriété. Ce qu'elle est. Ce qu'elle doit être, Paris, Spes, 1939, 96 p.

DESROSIERS, J.B., P.S.S., La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, Montreal, Editions de l'Institut Pie XI, Vol. VII of L'Eglise, Corps Mystique et sa Doctrine sociale, 1956, 441 p.

DIRKSEN, Cletus, Catholic Social Principles, St. Louis, Herder, 1961, xviii-247 p.

EBERDT, Mary Lois and J. Gerald SCHNEPP, Industrialism and the Popes, New York, Kennedy, 1953, xxii-245 p.

EPPSTEIN, J. (ed.), Code of International Ethics. trans. from the French, Westminster, Md., Newman, 1953, xiv-256 p.

FALLON, Valere, S.J., Principles of Social Economy. trans. by Rev. John McNulty, New York, Benziger, 1953, xxii-576 p.

GALBRAITH, J.K., The Affluent Society, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1960, xiv-368 p.

GEORGE, Henry, Progress and Poverty, New York, The Modern Library, [circa 1905], x-406 p.

GILSON, Etienne, ed., The Church Speaks to the Modern World. The Social Teachings of Leo XIII, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1954, viii-348 p.

GIORDANI, I., The Social Message of the Early Christian Fathers, Patterson, N.J., St. Anthony's Guild Press, 1944, x-356 p.

GONELLA, Guido, A World to Reconstruct, trans. by T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., Milwaukee, Bruce, 1944, xxx-335 p.

GRACE, Frank, The Concept of Property in Modern Christian Thought, University of Illinois Press, 1953, Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-2, 210 p.

GUERRY, Mgr Emile, L'Eglise et la communauté des peuples, Paris, Bonne Presse, 1959, 347 p.

--------, The Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church, trans. from the French by Miriam Hederman, New York, St. Paul's Publications, 1961, 287 p.

HARTE, Thomas J., Papal Social Principles, A Guide and Digest Gloucester, Mass., Petersmith, 1960, ix-207 p.

HIERARCHY OF QUEBEC, Pastoral Letter, The Problem of the Worker in the Light of the Social Teaching of the Church, trans. from the French, Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1959, 83 p.

HUGHES, Philip, The Pope's New Order, A Systematic Summary of the Social Encyclicals and Addresses from Leo XIII to Pius XII, London, Burns, Oates and Washbourn, 1942, 232 p.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF SOCIAL STUDIES, A Code of Social Principles, 3rd ed., trans. from the French by E. De Carson, Oxford, Catholic Social Guild, 1952, No. 179, 88 p.

LAIDLAW, A.F., Campus and the Community. The Global Impact of the Antigonish Movement, Montreal, Howest House, 1961, ix-171 p.

LECLERQ, Jacques, La Philosophie morale de saint Thomas devant la pensée contemporaine, Paris, Vrin, 1955, 469 p.

--------, Les droits et devoirs individuels. Deuxième partie. Travail. Propriété, Louvain, Société d'études morales, sociales et juridiques, 1954, 380 p.

--------, Les grandes lignes de la philosophie morale, Louvain, Institut supérieur de philosophie; Paris, Vrin, 1946, 456 p.

--------, Christianity and Money, trans. from the French by Eric Earnshaw Smith, New York, Hawthorn, 1959, 126 p.

LIPPMANN, Walter, Essays in the Public Philosophy, Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1945, 180 p.

McCORMACK, Arthur, ed., Christian Responsibility and World poverty. A Symposium, Montreal, Palm, 1963, xii-314 p.

--------, World Poverty and the Christian, New York, Hawthorn 1963, 158 p.

MASSE, ed., The Church and Social Progress. Background Readings for Pope John's Mater et Magistra, Milwaukee Bruce, 1966, viii-248 p.

--------, Justice for All. An Introduction to the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1964, 196 p.

MARITAIN, Jacques, Freedom in the Modern World, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936, viii-235 p.

--------, The Person and the Common Good, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947, 73 p.

--------, The Rights of Man and the Natural Law, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947, 119 p.

MESSNER, Johannes, Social Ethics, St. Louis, Herder, 1949, 1018 p.

MILLER, Raymond J., C.SS.R., Forty Years After. Pius XI and the Social Order, Radio Replies Press, St. Paul, Minn., 1947, xvii-332 p.

MOODY, J.M., and J.G. LAWLEOR, eds., The Challenge of Mater et Magistra, Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1963, 275 p.

MORAL, Gonsalez I., S.J., Philosophia Moralis, Santander, Editiones Sal Terrae, 1952, 670 p.

MULCAHEY, Richard E., S.J., ed., Readings in Economics, Westminster, Md., Newman, 1959, xi-356 p.

NELL-BREUNING, Oswald von, S.J., Reorganization of Social Economy, trans. from the German by B.W. Dempsey, S.J. Milwaukee, Bruce. 1936, 480 p.

NEWMAN, Jeremiah, Co-Responsibility in Industry, Westminster, Md., Newman, 1955, xxiii-187 p.

RYAN, John A., Distributive Justice, New York, Macmillan, 1942. xi-357 p.

SCHUMACHER, Leo S., The Philosophy of the Equitable Distribution of Wealth, Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1949, ix-138 p.

STABB, Giles J., O.F.M.Cap., The Dignity of Man in Modern Papal Doctrine, Leo XIII to Pius XII, Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press. 1957, v-154 p.

VAN GESTEL, C., O.P., La Doctrine sociale de l'Eglise, Bruxelles, La Pensée Catholique, 1957; 2nd ed. 457 p. Revised edition (3rd), 1964, 527 p.

VILLAIN, Jean, S.J., L'Enseignement social de l'Eglise, Paris, Spes, 1954, 3 vols. Vol. 1, 237 p.; Vol. 2, 248 p.; Vol. 3, 349 p.

WATT, Lewis, S.J., A Handbook to Rerum Novarum, Oxford, Catholic Social Guild, 1944, 2nd ed., 1949. 61 p.

ZIMMERMANN, Anthony F., "Overpopulation" A Study of Papal Teachings on the Problem, with Special Reference to Japan, Washington, D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1951, xi-328 p.

2. Articles.

A. Important Commentaries on Pius XII's Property-Doctrine.

CRONIN, John F., "The Social Economics of Pius XII," in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 49 (1951), p. 674-693.

DERMINE, J., "Le Droit de propriété et les documents récents du Saint Siège," in Revue Diocésaine de Tournai, 1947, p. 120-127.

DOLBERLE, J., "Pius' Basic Social Address," in Social Order, Vol. 2 (1952), p. 397-403.

GUNDLACH, Gustavus, S.J., "Annotationes" (Allocutio Radiophonica Pii XII ad Commemorandum 50um Anniversarium Rerum Novarum), in Periodica, 1941, Roma. Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, p. 242-250.

MARCO. A., "En marge de la XXXIII^{e} Semaine Sociale de France: nationalisation ou corporatisme?", in La Documentation catholique, Vol. 43 (1946), col. 1057-1070. (Trans. from the Italian by L. Thomas d'Hoste.)

MASSE. B.J., "Pope Pius XII on Wealth and Poverty." in America, Vol. 87, No. 22 (1952), p.515-517.

--------, "Holy See on Co-Management," in America, Vol. 88 (1952), p. 273-274.

MILLER, R.J., "Papal Teachings and International Economic Relations" in Catholic Mind, Vol. 51 (1953), p. 479-485.

MONTINI, Msgr. J.B., Letter to the Archbishop of Genoa, Sept. 22, 1952, in Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, 1953, p. 34-40.

TIMASHEFF, N.S., "Nationalization in Europe and Catholic Social Doctrine," in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 46 (1948) p. 17-35.

VACCARI, Vittorio, "Le message social de Pie XII," in Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa, Vol. 26 (1956), p. 401-418.

WATT, Lewis, S.J., "Pope Pius XII on Nationalization," in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 46 (1948), p. 132-142.

B. Significant Articles on the Problem of Widespread Ownership in the Papal and non-Papal Context.

BOLTE, Paul-Emile. P.S.S., "Mater et Magistra" (Introduction, Traduction et Commentaire), in Studia Montis Regii, Vol. 6 (1963). p. 153-251.

--------, "Theologians on the Right to Property," in Social Justice Review. St. Louis, Vol. 43 (1950). p. 40-43, 78-82.

COLLY, L., "Private Property, a Moral Right. Review of Private Property and the Natural Law by D. Mac Laren", in Blackfriars, Vol. 30 (1949), p. 377-380.

DE SOUSBENGHE, I., S.J., "Propriété de droit naturel. Thèse néo-scolastique et tradition ecclésiastique," in Nouvelle Revue Théologie Catholique, Vol. 72 (1950), p. 580-607.

DION, Gerard. "Property and Authority in Business Enterprise" in Relations industrielles, Quebec, Laval University, Vol. 16 (1961), p. 30-48.

DOGNIN, D., O.P., "Economie et usage commun des biens," in Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques, Vol. 46 (1962), p. 217-240.

DOOLAN, A., "Social Function of Property," in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 43 (1947), p. 50-52.

DUFF, Edward, S.J., "The Social Significance of Wealth Distribution in the United States," in Review of Social Economy, Vol. 20 (1962), p. 47-68.

--------, "Property in the American Environment," in Social Order, Vol. 9 (1959), p. 1-31.

ELLER, Cornelius E., S.J., "Moral Judgements in Welfare Analysis," in R.E. Mulcahey, S.J., ed., Readings in Economics, 1959, p. 285-297.

HARBRECHT, Paul, S.J., "Property in Transition," in Social Order, Vol. 8 (1958), p. 50-58.

HIERARCHY OF AUSTRALIA, Pastoral Letter, "Socialization," 1948, in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 47 (1949), p. 305-320.

JANSSENS, Louis. "International Social Justice," trans. from the French by R.M. Bethell, in Arthur McCORMACK, ed., Christian Responsibility and World Poverty, p. 273-292.

JEBB, R., "Private Property and the Distributist Thesis," in Blackfriars, Vol. 31 (1950), p. 324-330.

KLUBER, Franz, Digest of Article: Deer Ort des privateigentums im System des Naturiecht die neue Ordnung, 13 (1959), 81-97, in Theology Digest, Vol. 9 (1961), p. 59-61.

LAUER, J.F., S.J., "Co-Management in Germany," in Social Order, Vol. 1 (1951), p. 11-22.

MERTENS DE WILMARS, Jacques, "The Economics of Aid to Less Developed Countries," trans. from the French by R.M. Bethell, in Arthur McCORMACK, ed., Christian Responsibility and World Poverty, p. 179-200.

SCHALL, James V., S.J., "Liberty and Property," in Social Order, Vol. 3 (1953), p. 441-445.

SMYTH, Msgr. Francis J., "Credit Unions and Co-operatives," in Arthur McCORMACK, ed., Christian Responsibility and World Poverty, p. 150-161.

SUHARD, Card. Emmanuel, "The Church on Private Property," Lenten Pastoral Letter, 1945, trans. by Louis J. Pritz, C.S.C. and Vincent J. Giese, in The Church Today, The Collective Writings of Emmanuel Cardinal Suhard, Chicago, Fides, 1953.

VIGILLINO, A., I.M.C.; "The Social Function of Property and its Metaphysical Foundation," in Theology Digest, Vol. 1 (1953), p. 164-168.

VITO, Francesco M., "Towards a Reformation of the Subject Matter of Economics," in R. CIRILLO, ed., Catholic Social Thought, p. 16-30.

WOOD, B., "Private Property and Public Good," in The Catholic Mind, Vol. 43 (1945), p. 148-152.

APPENDIX

FOUR MAJOR PRONOUNCEMENTS OF PIUS XII ON OWNERSHIP FOR ALL

I. Discourse La Solennità della Pentecoste

Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Encyclical Rerum Novarum of Pope Leo XIII

June 1, 1941[1]

The feast of Pentecost, that glorious birthday of the Church of Christ, is to Our mind, dear children of the whole world, a welcome and auspicious occasion and one full of high import, on which to address to you, in the midst of the difficulties and strife of the present hour, a message of love, encouragement and comfort. We speak to you at a moment when every energy and force, physical and intellectual, of an ever-increasing section of mankind is being strained, to a degree and intensity never before known, beneath the iron, inexorable law of war; and when from other radio aerials are going forth words full of passion, bitterness, division and strife.

But the aerials of the Vatican Hill, of that ground dedicated to be the uncontaminated source of the Good Tidings and of their beneficent diffusion throughout the world from the place of martyrdom and tomb of the first Peter, can transmit only words animated with the consoling

---

1 This is Pius XII's basic and most celebrated document on socio-economic problems. We present here the complete English text as found in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 33 (1941), p. 216-227; original Italian, ibid., p. 195-205.

spirit of that preaching with which on the first Pentecost Day as it came from the lips of St. Peter, Jerusalem resounded and was stirred. It is a spirit of burning apostolic love, a spirit which is conscious of no more vivid desire, no holier joy than that of bringing all, friends and enemies, to the feet of the Crucified One of Calvary, to the tomb of the Glorified Son of God and Redeemer of the human race, to convince all that only in Him, and in the truth taught by Him, and in the love which He, doing good to all and healing all, taught by His example even to sacrificing Himself for the life of the world, can there be found true salvation and lasting happiness for individuals and for peoples.

In this hour, pregnant with events that are known only to the divine counsels which rule the story of nations and watch over the Church, it is for us, beloved children, a source of sincere joy and gratification in letting you hear the voice of your Common Father, to call you together, so to speak, in a worldwide Catholic meeting, so that you may experience and enjoy in the bond of peace that <u>one heart</u> and <u>one soul</u> (cfr. Act., IV,32) which held together under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, the faithful of Jerusalem on Pentecost Day. As the circumstances created by the war make direct, living contact between the Supreme Pastor and His flock in many cases difficult, We greet with all the more gratitude this most expedite bridge which the inventive genius of our age throws across the ether in a flash, to unite across mountains, seas and continents every corner of the earth. And thus what for many is a weapon of war becomes for Us a heaven-sent means of patient, peaceful apostolate which realises and gives new significance to the words of Holy Scripture: <u>Their sound hath gone forth unto all the earth; and their words unto the ends of the world</u>

(Psal. XVIII,5; Rom., X,18). Thus does it seem as if were renewed the miracle of Pentecost, when the different peoples who had assembled in Jerusalem from regions speaking various languages, heard the voice of Peter and the Apostles in their own tongue. With genuine delight We today make use of so wonderful an instrument, in order to call to the attention of the Catholic world a memory worthy of being written in letters of gold on the Calendar of the Church: the fiftieth anniversary of the publication, on May 15, 1891, of the epoch-making social Encyclical of Leo XIII, the Rerum novarum.

It was in the profound conviction that the Church has not only the right but even the duty to make an authoritative pronouncement on the social question, that Leo XIII addressed his message to the world. He had no intention of laying down guiding principles on the purely practical, we might say technical side of the social structure; for he was well aware of the fact—as Our immediate predecessor of saintly memory Pius XI pointed out ten years ago in his commemorative Encyclical, Quadragesimo anno—that the Church does not claim such a mission. In the general framework of labour, to stimulate the sane and responsible development of all the energies physical and spiritual of individuals and their free organisation, there opens up a wide field of action where the public authority comes in with its integrating and coordinating activity exercised first through the local and professional corporations, and finally in the activity of the State itself, whose higher moderating social authority has the important duty of forestalling the dislocations of economic balance arising from plurality and divergence of clashing interests individual and collective.

It is, on the other hand, the indisputable competence of the Church, on that side of the social order where

it meets and enters into contact with the moral order, to 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, that two-fold manifestation to which Leo XIII appeals in his Encyclical. And with reason: for the dictates of the Natural Law and the truths of Revelation spring forth in a different manner, like two streams of water that do not flow against one another but together, from the same divine source; and the Church, guardian of the supernatural Christian order in which nature and grace converge, must form the consciences even of those who are called upon to find solutions for the problems and the duties imposed by social life. From the form given to Society, whether conforming or not to the divine law, depends and emerges the good or ill of souls, depends, that is, the decision whether men, all called to be revived by the grace of Christ, do actually in the detailed course of their life breathe the healthy vivifying atmosphere of truth and moral virtue or the disease-laden and often fatal air of error and corruption. Before such a thought and such an anticipation, how could the Church, loving Mother that she is, sollicitous for the welfare of her children, remain an indifferent onlooker in their danger, remain silent or feign not to see or take cognisance of social conditions which, whether one wills it or not, make difficult or practically impossible a Christian life, in conformity with the precepts of the Divine Lawgiver?

Conscious of such a grave responsibility, Leo XIII addressing his Encyclical to the world pointed out to the conscience of Christians the errors and danger of the materialist Socialism conception, the fatal consequences of economic Liberalism so often unaware, or forgetful, or contemptuous of social duties; and exposed with masterly

clarity and wonderful precision the principles that were necessary and suitable for improving—gradually and peacefully—the material and spiritual lot of the worker.

If, beloved children, you ask Us today, after fifty years from the date of publication of the Encyclical, to what extent the efficacy of his message corresponded to its noble intentions, to its thoughts so full of truth, to the beneficent directions understood and suggested by its wise author, We feel that We must answer thus: It is precisely to render to Almighty God from the bottom of Our heart, Our humble thanks for the gift which, fifty years ago, He bestowed on the Church in that Encyclical of His Vicar on earth, and to praise Him for the lifegiving breath of the Spirit which through it, in ever growing measure from that time on, has blown on all mankind, that We on this feast of Pentecost, have decided to address you.

Our Predecessor Pius XI has already exalted, in the first part of his commemorative Encyclical, the splendid crop of good to which the Rerum novarum like a fertile sowing had given rise. From it sprang forth a Catholic social teaching which gave to the children of the Church, priests and laymen, an orientation and method for social reconstruction which was overflowing with good effects; for through it there arose in the Catholic field numerous and diverse beneficent institutions that were flourishing centres of reciprocal help for themselves and others. What an amount of well-being, material and natural, what spiritual and supernatural profit has come to the workers and their families from the Catholic unions! How efficacious and suited to the need has been the help afforded by the Syndicates and Associations in favour of the agricultural and middle class to relieve their wants, defend them from

injustice, and in this way, by soothing passion, to save social peace from disorder!

Nor was this the whole benefit. The Encyclical Rerum Novarum, coming down to the people and greeting them with esteem and love, went deep into the hearts and esteem of the working class, and inspired it with a sense of Christian sentiment and civil dignity; indeed its powerful influence came, with the passage of the years, to expand and spread to such an extent that its norms became almost the common property of all men. And, while the State in the nineteenth century, through excessive exaltation of liberty, considered as its exclusive scope the safeguarding of liberty by the law, Leo XIII admonished it that it had also the duty to interest itself in social welfare, taking care of the entire people and of all its members, especially the weak and the dispossessed, through a generous social programme and the creation of a labour code. His call evoked a powerful response; and it is a clear duty of justice to recognise the progress which has been achieved in the lot of workers through the pains taken by civil authorities in many lands. Hence was it well said that the Rerum novarum became the "Magna Charta" of Christian social endeavour.

Meanwhile there was passing a half century which has left deep furrows, and grevious [grievous] disturbance in the domain of nations and society. The questions which social and especially economic changes and upheavals offered for moral consideration after the Rerum novarum, have been treated with penetrating acumen by Our immediate Predecessor in the Encyclical Quadragesimo anno. The ten years that have followed it have been no less fraught with surprises in social and economic life than the years before it, and

have finally poured their dark and turbulent waters into the sea of a war whose unforeseen currents may affect our economy and society.

What problems and what particular undertakings, some perhaps entirely novel, our social life will present to the care of the Church at the end of this conflict which sets so many peoples against one another, it is difficult at the moment to trace or foresee. If, however, the future has its roots in the past, if the experience of recent years is to be our guide for the future, We feel We may avail Ourselves of this commemoration to give some further directive moral principles on three fundamental values of social and economic life; and We shall do this, animated by the very spirit of Leo XIII and unfolding his views which were more than prophetic, presaging the social evolution of the day. These three fundamental values, which are closely connected one with the other, mutually complementary and dependent, are: the use of material goods, labour and the family.

Use of Material Goods

The Encyclical Rerum novarum expounds, on the question of property and man's sustenance, principles which have lost nothing of their inherent vigour with the passage of time, and today, fifty years after, strike their roots deeper and retain their innate vitality. In Our Encyclical Sertum laetitiae directed to the bishops of the United States of America We called the attention of all to the basic idea of these principles which consists, as We said, in the assertion of the unquestionable need "that the goods, which were created by God for all men, should flow equally to all, according to the principles of justice and charity."

entirely personal duty to preserve and order to perfection his material and spiritual life, so as to secure the religious and moral scope which God has assigned to all men, and has given them as the supreme norm obliging always and everywhere, before all other duties.

To safeguard the inviolable sphere of the rights of the human person and to facilitate the fulfilment of his duties should be the essential office of every public authority. Does not this flow from that genuine concept of the common good which the State is called upon to promote? Hence it follows that the care of such a common good does not imply a power so extensive over the members of the community that in virtue of it the public authority can interfere with the evolution of that individual activity which We have just described, decide directly on the beginning or —excepting the case of legitimate capital punishment—the ending of human life, determine at will the manner of his physical, spiritual, religious and moral movements in opposition to the personal natural rights to material goods. To deduce such extension of power from the care of the common good would be equivalent to overthrowing the very meaning of the word common good, and falling into the error that the proper scope of man on earth is society, that society is an end in itself, that man has no other life which awaits him beyond that which ends here below.

Likewise the national economy, as it is the product of the men who work together in the community of the State, has no other end than to secure without interruption the material conditions in which the individual life of the citizens may fully develop. Where this is secured in a permanent way, a people will be, in a true sense, economically rich because the general well-being, and consequently

the personal right of all to the use of worldly goods is thus actuated in conformity with the purpose willed by the Creator.

From this, beloved children, it will be easy for you to conclude that the economic riches of a people do not properly consist in the abundance of goods, measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members. If such a just distribution of goods were not secured, or were effected only imperfectly, the real scope of national economy would not be attained; for, although there were at hand a lucky abundance of goods to dispose of, the people, in not being called upon to share them would not be economically rich but poor. Suppose on the other hand that such a distribution is effected genuinely and permanently and you will see a people even if it disposes of less goods, making itself economically sound.

These fundamental concepts regarding the riches and poverty of peoples, it seems to Us particularly opportune to set before you today, when there is a tendency to measure and judge such riches and poverty by balance sheets and by purely quantitative criteria of the need or the redundance of goods. If instead, the scope of the national economy is correctly considered, then it will become a guide for the efforts of statesmen and peoples, and will enlighten them to walk spontaneously along a way which does not call for continual exactions in goods and blood, but will give fruits of peace and general welfare.

Labour

With the use of material goods you yourselves, dear children, see how labour is connected. The Rerum novarum teaches that there are two essential characteristics of human labour: it is personal and it is necessary. It is personal, because it is achieved through the exercise of man's particular forces; it is necessary, because without it one cannot secure what is indispensable to life; and man has a natural grave individual obligation to maintain life. To the personal duty to labour imposed by nature corresponds and follows the natural right of each individual to make of labour the means to provide for his own life and that of his children; so profoundly is the empire of nature ordained for the preservation of man.

But note that such a duty and the corresponding right to work is imposed on and conceded to the individual in the first instance by nature, and not by society, as if man were nothing more than a mere slave or official of the community. From that it follows that the duty and the right to organise the labour of the people belongs above all to the people immediately interested; the employers and the workers. If they do not fulfil their functions or cannot because of special extraordinary contingencies fulfil them, then it falls back on the State to intervene in the field of labour and in the division and distribution of work according to the form and measure that the common good properly understood demands.

In any case, every legitimate and beneficial interference of the State in the field of labour should be such as to safeguard and respect its personal character, both in the broad outlines and, as far as possible, in what concerns its execution; and this will happen, if the norms of

the State do not abolish or render impossible the exercise of other rights and duties equally personal; such as the right to give God His due worship; the right to marry; the right of husband and wife, of father and mother to lead a married domestic life; the right to a reasonable liberty in the choice of a state of life and the fulfilment of a true vocation; a personal right, this last, if ever there was one, belonging to the spirit of man, and sublime when the higher imprescriptible rights of God and of the Church meet, as in the choice and fulfilment of the priestly and religious vocations.

The Family

According to the teaching of the Rerum novarum, nature itself has closely joined private property with the existence of human society and its true civilisation, and in a very special manner with the existence and development of the family. Such a link appears more than obvious. Should not private property secure for the father of a family the healthy liberty he needs in order to fulfil the duties assigned him by the Creator regarding the physical, spiritual and religious welfare of the family?

In the family the nation finds the natural and fecund roots of its greatness and power. If private property has to conduce to the good of the family, all public standards, and especially those of the State which regulate its possession, must not only make possible and preserve such a function—a function in the natural order under certain aspects superior to all others—but must also perfect it ever more.

A so-called civil progress, would, in fact, be unnatural, which—either through the excessive burdens imposed, or through exaggerated direct interference—were

to render private property void of significance, practically taking from the family and its head the freedom to follow the scope set by God for the perfection of family life.

Of all the goods that can be the object of private property, none is more conformable to nature, according to the teaching of the Rerum novarum, than the land, the holding in which the family lives, and from the products of which it draws all or part of its subsistence. And it is in the spirit of the Rerum novarum to state that, as a rule, only that stability which is rooted in one's own holding, makes of the family the vital and most perfect and fecund cell of society, joining up in a brilliant manner in its progressive cohesion the present and future generations. If today the concept and the creation of vital spaces is at the centre of social and political aims, should not one, before all else, think of the vital space of the family and free it of the fetters of conditions which do not permit even to formulate the idea of a homestead of one's own?

Our planet, with all its extent of oceans and seas and lakes, with mountains and plains covered with eternal snows and ice, with great deserts and tractless lands is not, all the same, without habitable regions and vital spaces, now abandoned to wild natural vegetation, and well suited to be cultivated by man to satisfy his needs and divil activities; and more than once it is inevitable that some families, migrating from one spot or another, should go elsewhere in search of a new homeland. Then, according to the teaching of the Rerum novarum the right of the family to a vital space is recognised. When this happens, emigration attains its natural scope, as experience often shows; We mean the more favourable distribution of men on the earth's surface, suitable to colonies of agricultural workers; that surface which God created and prepared for

the use of all. If the two parties, those who agree to leave their native land, and those who agree to admit the newcomers, remain anxious to eliminate as far as possible all obstacles to the birth and growth of real confidence between the country of emigration and that of immigration, all those affected by such a transference of people and places will profit by the transactions: the families will receive a plot of ground which will be native land for them in the true sense of the word: the thickly inhabited countries will be relieved, and their peoples will acquire new friends in foreign countries; and the states which receive the emigrants will acquire industrious citizens. In this way the nations which give and those which receive will both contribute to the increased welfare of man and the progress of human culture.

These are the principles, concepts and norms, beloved children, with which We should wish even now to share in the future organisation of that new order which the world expects and hopes will arise from the seething ferment of the present struggle, to set the peoples at rest in peace and justice. What remains for us but, in the spirit of Leo XIII and in accordance with his advice and purpose, to exhort you to continue to promote the work which the last generation of your brothers and sisters has begun with such staunch courage? Do not let die in your midst and fade away the insistent call of the two Pontiffs of the social Encyclicals, that voice which indicates to the faithful in the supernatural regeneration of mankind the moral obligation to cooperate in the arrangement of society, and especially of economic life, exhorting those who share in this life to action no less than the State itself. Is not this a sacred duty for every Christian?

Do not let the external difficulties put you off, dear children; do not be upset by the obstacle of the growing paganism of public life. Do not let yourselves be misled by the manufacturers of errors and unhealthy theories, those deplorable trends not of increase but of decomposition and of corruption of the religious life; currents of thought which hold that since redemption belongs to the sphere of supernatural grace, and is therefore exclusively the work of God, there is no need for us to cooperate on earth. Oh lamentable ignorance of the work of God! Professing themselves to be wise they became fools. (Rom. I,22) As if the first efficacy of grace were not to cooperate with our sincere efforts to fulfil every day the commandments of God, as individuals and as members of society; as if for the last two thousand years there had not lived nor persevered in the soul of the Church the sense of the collective responsibility of all for all; so that souls were moved and are moved even to heroic charity, the souls of the monks who cultivated the land, those who freed slaves, those who healed the sick, those who spread the faith, civilisation and science to all ages and all peoples, to create social conditions which alone are capable of making possible and feasible for all a life worthy of a man and of a Christian. But you, who are conscious and convinced of this sacred responsibility, must not ever be satisfied with this widespread public mediocrity, in which the majority of men cannot, except by heroic acts of virtue, observe the divine precepts which are always and in all cases inviolable.

If between the ideal and its realisation there appears even now an evident lack of proportion; if there have been failures, common indeed to all human activity, if divergencies of view arose on the way followed or to be followed, all this should not make you depressed or slow up

your step or give rise to lamentations or recriminations; nor can it make you forget the consoling fact that the inspired message of the Pope of the Rerum novarum sent forth a living and clear stream of strong social sense, sincere and disinterested; a stream which if it be now partly perhaps covered by a landslide of divergent and overpowering events, to-morrow, when the ruin of this world hurricane is cleared, at the outset of that reconstruction of a new social order, which is a desire worthy of God and of man, will infuse new courage and a new wave of profusion and growth in the garden of human culture. Keep burning the noble flame of a brotherly social spirit which fifty years ago, was rekindled in the hearts of your fathers by the luminous and illuminating torch of the words of Leo XIII; do not allow or permit it to lack for nourishment; let it flare up through your homage; and not die, quenched by an unworthy, timid, cautious inaction in face of the needs of the poor among our brethren, or overcome by the dust and dirt carried by the whirlwind of the anti-Christian or non-Christian spirit. Nourish it, keep it alive, increase it; make this flame burn more brightly; carry it wherever a groan of suffering, a lament of misery, a cry of pain reaches you; feed it ever more with the heat of a love drawn from the Heart of your Redeemer, to which the month that now begins is consecrated. Go to that divine Heart meek and humble, refuge of all comfort in the fatigue and responsibility of the active life; it is the Heart of Him who to every act genuine and pure done in His name and in His spirit, in favour of the suffering, the hard-pressed, of those abandoned by the world, or those deprived of all goods and fortune, has promised the eternal reward of the blessed: you blessed of my Father! What you have done to the least of my brethren, you have done it to me!

II. Extract from Christmas Address

Con Sempre Nuova, The Fundamental Principles Concerning the Internal Order of States and Peoples

Dec. 24, 1942[2]

In one field of social life, where for a whole century there was agitation and bitter conflict, there is to-day a calm, at least on the surface. We speak of the vast and ever-growing world of labor, of the immense army of workers, of breadwinners and dependents. If we consider the present with its wartime exigencies, as an admitted fact, then this calm may be called a necessary and reasonable demand; but if we look at the present situation in the light of justice, and with reference to a legitimately regulated labor movement, then the tranquillity will remain only apparent, until the scope of such a movement be attained. Always moved by religious motives, the Church has condemned the various forms of Marxist Socialism; and she condemns them to-day, because it is her permanent right and duty to safeguard men from currents of thought and influences that jeopardize their eternal salvation. But the Church cannot ignore or overlook the fact that the worker, in his efforts to better his lot, is opposed by a machinery which is not only not in accordance with nature, but is at

---

2 This extract contains the strongest of all papal statements on the necessity of widespread ownership within and between nations. English version, Harry C. KOENIG, Principles for Peace, Washington, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943, p. 797-798, Nos. 1839, 1840; p. 801-802, Nos. 1850, 1851, 1852; Italian original, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 35 (1943), p. 16-17, 20-21.

variance with God's plan and with the purpose He had in creating the goods of earth. In spite of the fact that the ways they followed were and are false and to be condemned, what man, and especially what priest or Christian, could remain deaf to the cries that rise from the depths and call for justice and a spirit of brotherly collaboration in a world ruled by a just God? Such silence would be culpable and unjustifiable before God, and contrary to the inspired teaching of the Apostle, who, while he inculcates the need of resolution in the fight against error, also knows that we must be full of sympathy for those who err, and open-minded in our understanding of their aspirations, hopes and motives.

When He blessed our first parents, God said: Increase and multiply and fill the earth, and subdue it. (Gen. I,28) And to the first father of a family, He said later: In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread. (Gen. III,19) The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all. Positive legislation regulating private ownership may change and more or less restrict its use. But if legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community, it must prevent the worker, who is or will be a father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person. Whether this slavery arises from the exploitation of private capital or from the power of a State, the result is the same. Indeed, under the pressure of a State which dominates all and controls the whole field of public and private life, even going into the realm of ideas and beliefs and of conscience, this lack of

liberty can have more serious consequences, as experience shows and proves...

.....

Third: He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over society should give to work the place assigned to it by God from the beginning. As an indispensable means toward gaining over the world that mastery which God wishes for His glory, all work has an inherent dignity and at the same time a close connection with the perfection of the person; this is the noble dignity and privilege of work which is not in any way cheapened by the fatigue and the burden, which have to be borne as the effect of original sin, in obedience and submission to the Will of God.

Those who are familiar with the great Encyclicals of Our Predecessors and Our Own previous messages knew well that the Church does not hesitate to draw the practical conclusions which are derived from the moral nobility of work, and to give them all the support of her authority. These exigencies include, besides a just wage which covers the needs of the worker and his family, the conservation and perfection of a social order which will make possible an assured, even if modest, private property for all classes of society, which will promote higher education for the children of the working class who are especially endowed with intelligence and good-will, will promote the care and the practice of the social spirit in one's immediate neighborhood, in the district, the province, the people and the nation, a spirit which, by smoothing over friction arising from privileges or class interests, removes from the workers the sense of isolation through the assuring experience of a genuinely human, and fraternally Christian, solidarity.

The progress and the extent of urgent social reforms depend on the economic possibilities of single nations. It is only through an intelligent and generous sharing of forces between the strong and the weak that it will be possible to effect a universal pacification in such wise as not to leave behind centers of conflagration and infection from which new disasters may come. There are evident signs which go to show that, in the ferment of all the prejudices and feelings of hate, those inevitable but lamentable offspring of the war psychosis, there is still aflame in the peoples the consciousness of their intimate mutual dependence for good or for evil, nay, that this consciousness is more alive and active. Is it not true that deep thinkers see ever more clearly in the renunciation of egoism and national isolation, the way to general salvation, ready as they are to demand of their peoples a heavy participation in the sacrifices necessary for social well-being in other peoples? May this Christmas Message of Ours, addressed to all those who are animated by a good-will and a generous heart, encourage and increase the legions of these social crusades in every nation. And may God deign to give to their peaceful cause the victory of which their noble enterprise is worthy.

III. Extract: "Some Aspects of the Economic and Social Question", from Oggi, Al Compiersi, on the Occasion of the Fifth Anniversary of the Outbreak of War in Europe Sept. 1, 1944[3]

After bitter years of want, restrictions and especially of anxious uncertainty, men expect, at the end of the war, a far-reaching and definite betterment of these unfortunate conditions.

The promises of statesmen, the many plans and proposals of experts and specialists have given rise in the victims of an unhealthy economic and social order to illusory hopes of a complete re-birth of the world and to an over-enthusiastic expectation of a millenium of universal happiness.

Such a disposition offers fertile ground for propaganda of the most radical programs, disposes men's minds to a very understandable but unreasonable and unjustified impatience, which looks for nothing from organic reforms and puts all its hopes in upheavals and violence.

Confronted with these extreme tendencies, the Christian who meditates seriously on the needs and misfortunes of his time, remains faithful, in his choice of remedies, to those standards which experience, right reason, and Christian social ethics indicate as the fundamentals of all just reforms.

---

3 The general theme is the reconstruction of the world on a true Christian foundation. This is Pius XII's most extensive statement specifically on private property and the means to realize its widespread diffusion. The English version is from The Catholic Mind, 42 (Oct. 1944), p. 579-582; Italian original in AAS, 36 (1944), p. 252-555.

Our immortal predecessor Leo XIII in his famous Encyclical Rerum Novarum already established the principle, that for every legitimate economic and social order "there must be laid down as the basic foundation the right of private property."

If it be true that the Church has always recognized "the natural right to property and of the hereditary transmission of one's own goods" (Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno), it is not less certain that this private property is in a special manner the natural fruit of labor, the product of an intense activity on the part of the man who acquires it through his energetic will to ensure and improve, by his own forces, his own living conditions and those of his family, to create for himself and those dear to him a field in which they may rightly enjoy not only economic freedom, but political, cultural and religious freedom as well.

The Christian conscience cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders impossible or nugatory in practice, the natural right to property whether over consumptive goods or the means of production.

But neither can it accept those systems which recognize the right to private property according to a completely false concept of it and which are therefore opposed to a true and healthy social order.

Accordingly where, for instance, "Capitalism" is based on such false concepts and arrogates to itself an unlimited right over property, without any subordination to the common good, the Church has condemned it as contrary to the natural law.

In fact, We see the ever increasing ranks of the workers frequently confronted with this excessive concentration of economic goods which, often hidden under

anonymous titles, are successfully withdrawn from contributing, as they should, to the social order and place the worker in a situation where it is virtually impossible for him effectively to acquire private property of his own.

We see the small and medium holdings diminish and lose their value in human society, and constrained to join in a conflict ever more difficult and without hope of success.

DEFENSE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

On the one side, We see immense riches dominating public and private economic life and often even civil life; on the other, the countless number of those who, deprived of every direct or indirect security of their own livelihood, take no further interest in the true and higher values of the spirit, abandon their aspiration to genuine freedom, and throw themselves at the feet of any political party, slaves to whoever promises them in some way bread and security; and experience shows of what tyranny, under such circumstances, human nature is capable even in our times.

In defending, therefore, the principle of private property, the Church pursues a high ethico-social purpose. She does not intend to defend absolutely and simply the present state of affairs, as if she saw in it the expression of God's will, nor to defend as a matter of principle the rich and the plutocrat against the poor and the indigent. Far from it! Right from the beginning she has been the defender of the oppressed against the tyranny of the powerful, and has always sponsored the just claims of all classes of workers against every injustice. But the Church aims rather at securing that the institution of private

property be such as it should be according to the designs of God's wisdom and the dispositions of nature; an element of social order, a necessary pre-supposition to human initiative, an incentive to work to the advantage of life's purpose here and hereafter, and hence of the liberty and the dignity of man, created in the likeness of God, Who, from the beginning, assigned him for his benefit domination over material things.

Take away from the worker the hope of acquiring some goods as personal property, and what other natural incentive can you offer him to make him work hard, to save, to live soberly, when not a few men and peoples today have lost all and have nothing left but their capacity to work? Or perhaps men want to perpetuate the economic conditions of wartime by which, in some countries, the public authority has control of all means of production and provides for everybody and everything, but with the lash of a severe discipline? Or perhaps they want to lie down before the dictatorship of a political group which will, as the ruling class, dispose of the means of production, and at the same time of the daily bread and hence of the will to work of individuals?

The social and economic policy of the future, the controlling power of the State, of local bodies, of professional institutions cannot permanently secure their end, which is the genuine productivity of social life and the normal returns on national economy, except by respecting and safeguarding the vital function of private property in its personal and social values. When the distribution of property is an obstacle to this end—which is not necessarily nor always an outcome of the extension of private inheritance—the State may, in the public interest, intervene by regulating its use or even, if it cannot equitably meet the

situation in any other way, by decreeing the expropriation of property, giving a suitable indemnity.

For the same purpose, small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades, in commerce and industry should be guaranteed and promoted; cooperative unions should ensure for them the advantages of big business; where big business even today shows itself more productive, there should be given the possibility of tempering the labor contract with a contract of co-ownership (Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno).

And it should not be said that technical progress is opposed to such a scheme, and in its irresistible current carries all activity forward toward gigantic business and organizations, before which a social system founded on the private property of individuals must inevitably collapse. No. Technical progress does not determine economic life as a fatal and necessary factor. It has indeed too often yielded timidly to the demands of rapacious, selfish plans calculated to accumulate indefinitely; why should it not then yield also to the necessity of maintaining and ensuring private property for all, that cornerstone of social order? Even technical progress, as a social factor, should not prevail over the general good, but should rather be directed and subordinated to it.

At the end of this war, which has upset all the activities of human life and has turned them into new channels, the problem of the future shaping of the social order will give rise to a fierce struggle between the various policies. In this struggle the Christian social idea has the arduous but noble mission of bringing forward and demonstrating theoretically and in practice to the followers of other schools, that in this field, so important for the peaceful development of relations between men, the

postulates of true equity and the principles of Christianity can be united in close wedlock and bring forth security and prosperity for all those who can lay aside prejudice and passion and give ear to the teaching of truth. We are confident that our faithful sons and daughters of the Catholic world, as heralds of the Christian social idea, will contribute—even at the price of considerable sacrifices—to progress toward that social justice after which all true disciples of Christ must hunger and thirst.

IV. The Complete Text of a Letter Addressed to the Thirty-Ninth "Social Week" at Dijon, France: Dans la tradition (The Just Distribution of Wealth) July 7, 1952[4]

To our beloved son, Charles Flory, President of "The Social Weeks" of France:

In accord with the tradition of the lofty economic and social themes which have been studied in your annual sessions, the "Thirty-ninth Social Week," which will soon convene at Dijon, has the intention of coming to grips with one of the problems on which, without any doubt, social and international peace depend today. That contrast between wealth and poverty, which is intolerable to the Christian conscience, has been brought home to you most forcibly by the picture of present conditions in the world. And, in the coming sessions, you will be searching for a remedy for the problem through the increase and the better distribution of national income.

The question is not new. As early as 1931 Our immediate Predecessor, reiterating the doctrine of Leo XIII, wrote as follows: "Each one must be given his due share, and the distribution of created goods must be brought back

---

4 This is Pius XII's most comprehensive statement on the role of the national economy and the state in the diffusion of wealth; it includes the Pope's teaching on the Christian attitude towards riches. English version: Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, Huntingdon, Indiana, Our Sunday Visitor Press, [1953], p. 21-28; French original in AAS, 44 (1952), p. 619-624.

into conformity with the norms of the common good or of social justice. For the flagrant contrast between the handful of those who hold excessive wealth and the multitude of those who live in utter destitution gives witness, in the mind of every sincere observer, to the serious disorders which exist today in this matter" (Acta Apostolicae Sedis XXIII, 1931, page 197).

This consideration led Pius XI to urge all responsible parties "to leave no stone unturned" in attempting to see to it that the riches created in such great abundance in our period of industrialism might be more equitably divided. To be sure, We gladly recognize the fact that, for the past several decades, thanks to persevering efforts and to progress in social legislation, this disparity in economic well-being has been rather considerably reduced—indeed, at times, to a very notable degree. And yet, since the last war this problem has become even more acute. It now presents itself on a worldwide scale with contrasts which are still startling; and the problem is further aggravated by the new yearnings which are being awakened in the minds of the masses by a more vivid realization of the economic inequalities existing between nations, between classes, and even between members of the same social class.

We Ourselves have also, on several recent occasions, deplored the intolerable increase in luxury spending and in superfluous and unreasonable expenditures which contrast sharply with the misery of a great many people, whether in the ranks of the urban or rural working-class, or among the throng of those little people who are usually categorized as the "economically weak." "The goal toward which you can and must aim," today just as much as yesterday, "is a more equitable distribution of wealth. This is and remains a basic point of the program of Catholic social doctrine"

(Discourse of September 7, 1947, to the men of Italian Catholic Action).

For this reason, one can only encourage the "Social Week of Dijon" to come to grips realistically with a problem of such gravity, and to study, both on the economic and social as well as on the national and international levels, its possible and prudent solutions in the light of the doctrine of the Church. This it will do in that university city of ancient renown, thanks to the convening there of experienced authorities; nor will this assembly lack prudent counsel from the Shepherd of that diocese which has welcomed this meeting.

In approaching this question of wealth and poverty, could one possibly fail to recall to mind the unforgettable lessons of Sacred Scripture regarding those who possess earthly riches and who are so easily tempted to take delight in them and to abuse them? The entire Gospel urges men to detachment from earthly possessions as a condition for eternal salvation. And the true follower of Jesus learns from the Gospel to consider worldly goods as being adapted for the life of the spirit and for a higher perfection. There can be no worse misery for man than to place his hopes in the possession of such perishable treasures: "With what difficulty will they that have riches enter the kingdom of God... Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God... But woe to you that are rich! for you are now having your consolation" (Luke XVIII,24 and Luke VI, 20,24).

What should we say, then, of those rich oppressors against whom Saint James thunders forth his solemn maledictions: "Behold, the wages of the laborers who have reaped your fields, which by fraud have been kept back by you, cry out; and their cry has entered into the ears of the

Lord of Hosts" (Saint James V,4).

Such teachings of the Gospel raise the discussion to a distinctly higher level. Whatever be the subject under consideration, the Catholic thinker is confirmed in a supreme spiritual independence with regard to the prestige given by riches—both those actually possessed, and those which are longed for. The Catholic thinker openly admits his esteem for Christian poverty; he professes that respect for and that service to the poor which honors Jesus Christ. He guards himself against the seduction of a false pretension that all men are economically equal; but at the same time, heeding the counsel of Saint James, he is careful never to show partiality toward persons simply because of their financial status (Saint James II,1).

Nor does he forget that, in the Christian view of a society wherein wealth would be better distributed, there would still always be a place for renunciation and for suffering, (man's inevitable but fruitful heritage in this life), which a materialistic conception of life, or the illusion of perfect justice during this earthly pilgrimage, tries in vain to erase from man's sight.

Finally, at the sight of the vast number of poverty-stricken whose distress cries to Heaven, the urgent appeal of Saint John delineates for the Catholic thinker his duty: "He who has the goods of this world and sees his brother in need, and closes his heart to him, how does the love of God abide in him?... Let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and in truth" (I St.John III,17-18).

How, then, in this modern world of ours, can we sculpture this effective and efficacious charity into the economic and the social order? How, in the first place, can we translate it into terms of justice, since, in order to be genuinely true, charity must always take into account

the justice which must be established, and must never satisfy itself with disguising the disorders and the deficiencies of an unjust situation.

The purpose of economic and social organization, to which we must here refer, is to obtain for its members and their families all the goods which the resources of nature and of industry, as well as a social organization of economic life, are capable of obtaining for them. As the Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno" states in this matter: "These goods ought to be abundant enough both to satisfy the demands of a decent subsistence and to raise people to that degree of the comforts of life which, provided it be wisely employed, is no hindrance to virtue, but, on the contrary, greatly facilitates its exercise" (Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Vol. XXII, 1931, page 202).

Now then, if it is true that the best and the most natural means of satisfying this obligation is to increase the available goods by means of a healthy development of production, still it is also necessary, in pursuing this effort, to have care to distribute justly the fruits of the labor of all. "If such a just distribution of goods should not be realized or were only imperfectly assured, the true aim of the national economy would not be realized, since, however affluent the abundance of available goods might be, if the people were not allowed to share in them, they would still be not rich but poor" (Radio Message, June 1, 1941).

This basic distribution is originally and normally brought about by virtue of the continuous dynamism of the social economic process which We have just recalled; and this process is, for a great many men, the source of their wages as recompense for their work. But we must not lose sight of the fact that, from the point of view of the national economy, these wages represent the income realized

by the worker. Executives of industry and workers are here cooperators in a common task; both of them are called upon to derive their livelihood from the net and gross profits of the economy. And from this point of view, their mutual relations do not in any way render the one subservient to the other. In Our discourse of May 7, 1949, We said: "To receive a return for one's work is a prerogative deriving from the personal dignity of anyone who, in one way or another ... contributes effectively to the output of the national economy."

But since all are "eating at the same table", so to sepak, it would seem fair that—while respecting differences in functions and responsibilities—the shares given to each should conform to the common dignity which they have as men, and that, in particular, these shares should permit a greater number of persons both to attain that independence and security which comes from possession of private property, and to participate with their families in the spiritual and cultural goods to which earthly goods are ordained.

Furthermore, if both the owners and the workers have a common interest in the healthy prosperity of the national economy, why would it not be legitimate to give to the workers a just share of responsibility in the organization and development of that economy? That observation which We made not long ago in Our address of May 7, 1949, is it not now all the more opportune when, under the difficulties, the insecurities and joint and separate liabilities which are part of the present time, decisions of an economic order are at times being imposed upon a country which involve the whole future of that national community, and often even the future of the whole family of nations?

These few reflections suffice to show the difficulty involved in a sound distribution of earthly goods.

To meet the demands of the social life, such a distribution cannot be left to the free play of blind economic forces, but must be viewed on the level of the national economy, since it is on that level that one gets a clear picture of the aim which should be pursued in the service of the common temporal good. Whoever considers the problem in this fashion is led to question himself concerning the normal, even though restricted, functions which are vested in the State in these matters.

First of all, the duty of increasing production and of adjusting it wisely to the needs and the dignity of the man places in the foreground the question as to how the economy should be regulated insofar as production is concerned. Now, although the public authorities should not substitute their tyrannical omnipotence for the legitimate self-government of private initiatives, these authorities have, nonetheless, in this matter, an undeniable role of coordination, which is made even more necessary in the confusion of present conditions, especially present social conditions. Specifically, without the cooperation of the public authorities it is not possible to formulate a concerted economic policy which would promote active cooperation on the part of all, and the increase of industrial production, the direct source of the national income.

Now if we think of the many riches which are lying dormant or being squandered in useless spending, but which if put back into circulation could contribute, through judicious and profitable use, to the welfare of so many families, could not these riches still serve the common good by opportunely helping to restore men's confidence, by stimulating credit, by checking egoism, and by promoting in this way a better balance in the economic life?

But it also devolves upon the state to see to it that the very poor people are not unjustly wronged. On this point, the doctrine of Our predecessors is explicit wherein they teach that in the protection of private rights, the authorities should have particular concern for the weak and the needy: "The wealthy class," as Leo XIII observed, "constructs for itself, as it were, a bulwark out of its wealth, and has less need of governmental protection. But the needy masses, on the contrary, without the means to protect themselves, rely especially upon the protection of the State" (Encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno," citing "Rerum Novarum," Acta Apostolicae Sedis, XXXIII, 1931, page 185).

It is for this reason that, in the face of the increased insecurity of many families whose precarious condition threatens to jeopardize their material, cultural and spiritual interests, some institutions have been endeavoring now for several years to correct the most flagrant evils which result from an over-mechanical distribution of the national income. While leaving due liberty to private factors of responsibility operating in the economic life, these institutions, remaining themselves adequately independent of the political power, can become for the low-income masses and for the poor of every category an indispensable remedy for the evils caused by the present economic or monetary disorder. However, the various forms and methods of such institutions should be studied with great care, and one could not possibly commit oneself unreservedly to a course wherein excessive taxes might threaten the rights of private property and wherein abuses of collective security might infringe upon personal or family rights.

So the Church, taking a position midway between the errors of liberalism and statism, invites you to pursue your investigations along the course that she has many times

set forth for you. "The great misery of the social order," as We said recently, "is that it is neither deeply Christian nor truly human, but only technical and economic. It is not at all built on what should be its basis and the solid foundation of its unity—viz., the character common to men of being men by reason of their nature, and also sons of God by reason of the grace of divine adoption" (Discourse of January 31, 1952, to the Italian Catholic Association of Owner-Managers).

May the studies of this Social Week cast a peaceful light on this group of grave problems. May God avert from the wealthy the spiritual perils which accompany riches, and from the laboring class the inhuman trials of want. May He draw both to the evangelical spirit of poverty and of service, and allow all to carry out, under better balanced conditions of the economic and social life, their one necessary work, namely, their salvation. It is with this prayer that, from a fatherly heart, We call down upon the forthcoming sessions of your social University a generous outpouring of Divine graces, and that We impart to you and to all the teachers and the auditors of this "Social Week" Our Apostolic Blessing.

SUMMARY OF DISSERTATION

Ownership for All

A Study in the Social Philosophy of Pius XII

by C.W. MACDONALD

The purpose of this study is to collect, analyze, appraise and to make readily available Pius XII's philosophical doctrine on the question of property and its equitable distribution. The lack of widespread, effective ownership within affluent countries plus the all-too-obvious imbalance between the exuberant prosperity of a few nations and the destitution of most was the occasion for Pius XII's some 75 pronouncements on the urgency of securing the widest possible diffusion of effective ownership both within and between the nations of the world community. This is the dominant feature of our first and introductory chapter which examines the problem of property in its historical context with special reference to the times of Pius XII according to his own observations.

The second chapter deals, at length, with the principles basic to the rightful distribution of ownership. Supreme, in Pius XII's development and reformulation of these principles, is the absolutely inviolable and universal right of all to the use of material goods. The right of private ownership is another right distinct from and subordinate to the first and fundamental right of all to an

equitable measure of the earth's goods. With Pius XII the fundamental justification for private property consists in the fact that it is the most effective instrument to realize the first and fundamental right, in a manner consistent with the dignity and freedom to which all men aspire. Conceived as such, private property has an essential social aspect and an intrinsic limitation. As the guarantee for personal dignity and freedom, ownership must be made accessible in just measure to all individuals and nations alike. The moral order of justice, charity and prudence demands an equitable distribution of the world's resources.

The third chapter shifts the emphasis to Pius XII's application of the above principles to existing patterns of ownership threatening to distort the Christian concept of property. Individualist capitalism, with its absolute concept of ownership, indiscriminate public ownership of productive property and proposals to give juridical status to a forced and centralized system of co-partnership between workers and owners in the enterprise, assumed major proportions during the pontificate of Pius XII. He repudiated them, and in doing so, he defended the institution of private property only when its personal and its social aspect are indissolubly linked to achieve an effective distribution consonant with the canons of dignity and freedom.

The fourth chapter is a further application of principles to the role of the national economy and the forms of property best calculated to assure effective distribution. This and the subsequent chapter constitute Pius XII's positive program to achieve ownership for all. A democratic national economy for all and by all is an indispensable factor in the equitable distribution of wealth. To this end, he favors property of small-scale dimension, without denying the validity of the large-scale enterprise as a legitimate form of private ownership. The latter can qualify as an effective instrument for the diffusion of wealth, when the wage level is just and when the workers are afforded the opportunity to aspire to a form of co-partnership designed to provide the security and personal development attached to private property of smaller dimension.

The fifth chapter examines Pius XII's concept of the state's role in creating the climate whereby its citizens may be enabled to acquire property in a manner conducive to the realization of personal values and the attainment of the common good. To attain the objective, he calls upon the state to enact legislation favorable to the growth of small-scale proprietorship, to participate in social insurance programs for the economically disadvantaged, to stimulate and co-ordinate private and group efforts designed to increase and better distribute the fruits of the economic

process, and to adopt a policy of international trade and migration favorable to a more just sharing of the earth's resources among the nations of the world community.

The final and concluding chapter is an appraisal of Pius XII's distinctive contribution to the doctrine of the Church on widespread ownership. A comparison is made between his teaching and that of Leo XIII, Pius XI and John XXIII. The conclusion is that Pius XII added clarity and precision to the doctrine of his predecessors and substantially influenced the approach of John XXIII to the problem of economic inequality in his time. This is most noticeable in three broad areas: 1) by the primacy he attributed to the universal right to the use of material goods, Pius XII drew attention to a principle long overlooked and frequently misunderstood; 2) by his emphasis on the essential connection between private ownership and the maintenance of widespread personal freedom and dignity, he gave to the arguments for private property a new dimension more meaningful for his time; by making the diffusion of private property central in his socio-economic teaching, by suggesting concrete proposals to effectively distribute wealth and by broadening the scope of the Church's social doctrine to include international economic relations, he included an area largely left unexplored by his predecessors; 3) by favoring widespread ownership in property of small-scale dimension

without belittling the effective role of the large-scale enterprise, Pius XII was the first Pope to make explicit the distinction between the forms of private property in terms of their efficacy in realizing an effective distribution; by specifying the precise role of the state in providing for the conditions conducive to effective distribution in certain defined areas, he updated the principles of his predecessors and gave impetus to Pope John's extensive program for the state in righting the imbalance in wealth at all levels of the national and international economy.