

# ORIGINS OF THE ENCYCLICAL *PACEM IN TERRIS* IN THE ENCYCLICALS OF THE LATER 19<sup>TH</sup> AND 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES: A PERSONAL REFLECTION

Martin R. Menke, Ph.D.\*  
Professor of History, Rivier University

When the fourth peace conference held at Rivier was organized, nobody knew that Francis would be Roman Pontiff, but it seems good fortune that a man who, whatever other faults he may have, personally lives a modest life in solidarity with the poor, now leads the Church, because that is really the point of this reflection. Let me begin first with a modesty clause necessary for this personal reflection. I am not a theologian, so those of you expecting to hear the theological genesis of the encyclical *Pacem in Terris*<sup>1</sup> or even the precise history of the encyclical's formation, regrettably will be disappointed. As a German historian interested in primarily in understanding how Catholics reconcile religious identity and religious values with the political circumstances of their times, claims to theological truth would be hubristic. This talk is entitled a personal reflection because it lacks scholarly work necessary to create an academic foundation in history. This reflection is based purely on a close reading of the words themselves, what Germans call *werkimmanent*. While there is scholarship on Leo XIII, Pius X, Pius XI and Pius XII, and increasing scholarship on John XXIII and Benedict XV, much of the historical scholarship may not yet be possible, given that access to the papers of Pius XI, but especially to those of Pius XII and his successors remains restricted, largely for logistical reasons having more to do with Italian "efficiency" than with any desire for secrecy on the part of the Holy See. As yet, historians know too little about the personal thoughts and motivations of twentieth-century popes to arrive at definitive conclusions. John Cornwell's *Hitler's Pope* is an excellent example of how dangerous it is to write history without access to the sources.<sup>2</sup> The historian is bound by a version of the Biblical phrase popularized by Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Sed in primis ad fontes ipsos properandum – first go to the sources*.<sup>3</sup> It is for this reason – that as yet we know too little about the thoughts and motives of our pontiffs, that I have joined much more prestigious colleagues in signing a letter to Benedict XVI to delay or suspend the canonization process of Pius XII until our understanding of him is much more refined.

I came to *Pacem in Terris* while planning a junior year seminar at Rivier. JYS courses are designed to investigate a discipline through the lens of Catholic social teaching and globalism, but also to investigate what a particular discipline brings to our understanding of Catholic social teaching and globalism. In this program, I offer a course on European integration in a global perspective. Students in the course read Fichte and Mazzini on nationalism, Darwin and Pearson on racism, Kipling and Wilhelm II on imperialism, but they also read a letter by a German officer written after the Pentecost Vesper in the Belgian cathedral of Tournai in 1915.<sup>4</sup> In this letter, the officer contemplates the contradiction between the universality of the Faith and its celebration of the Holy Spirit inside the ancient walls of the

---

<sup>1</sup> John XXIII, *Pacem in Terri*. Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_enc\\_11041963\\_pacem\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> John Cornwell, *Hitler's Pope: The Secret History of Pius XII*. New York: Penguin, 1999.

<sup>3</sup> Psalm 42 of the Vulgate.

<sup>4</sup> Philip Funk, "Weltkirche und Vaterland" *Hochland* 15 (Oktober 1917-März 1918).

cathedral and the world war raging beyond its walls. The officer comes to the conclusion that war is the aberration in two thousand years of western culture, not peace.

Forcing the JYS students to read an article in *Foreign Affairs* from the late 1920's on the formation of the international steel cartel is thrilling to all of them, and it helps us begin to discuss the way in which economic cooperation based on national and industrial interests contributed to European integration more generally.<sup>5</sup> Despite the depth of the Nazi abyss, German and French industrialists as well as Christian politicians sought to cooperate during the war by planning for a better future.<sup>6</sup> They recognized that Europeans were too interdependent to continue assailing one another. Eventually, in the context of the Cold War, this led to the ECSC, organized by two men whose Catholic faith tempered their nationalism, Robert Schuman and Konrad Adenauer. Together with Alcide de Gasperi, also Catholic and like the other two from a border region, they became the fathers of European integration. Who would have thought that twelve years after the end of World War II, the European powers – must use this term guardedly – would assemble in Rome to create the European Communities?

So what does this have to do with *Pacem in Terris*? Well, first the students have to understand that an encyclical is the highest teaching document of the Church short of a conciliar resolution or an infallible dogmatic pronouncement by the pope. Then, the realization to which the students come is that European integration did not arise *ex nihilo* or just from the realization after 1945 that the world could not afford another global war. Similarly, reading *Pacem*, one might jump to the conclusion that John XXIII topped his call for the Church's *aggiornamento* with this sudden inspiration to give the modern world its post-war marching orders. Many of his references, such as those to developing countries and to the migration of labor, do seem marked by the *Zeitgeist* of the early 1960's.

Thus, those who lament that the age of Vatican II was an age of confusion and radicalism, might seek to dismiss some of John XXIII's conclusions as time-bound and irrelevant to a larger context. One might be reminded here of George Weigel's attempt to dismiss Benedict XVI's last encyclical as a successful attempt by the radicals in the Pontifical Council for Peace and Justice to "put one over" on the Holy Father.<sup>7</sup> Others, however, might consider John XXIII's encyclical as the welcome return *ad fontes* by which the Church finally returned to its earliest days, which pleased those who found little comfort in the two thousand years of tradition that form the other part of the magisterium. While *Pacem in Terris* is not a conciliar document as such, it certainly forms an integral part of John XXIII's legacy and as a valid encyclical and remains magisterial. In fact, *Pacem in Terris* is a great example of the Church's continuity, ever ancient and ever new.

Since *Pacem in Terris* is an older document to most Christians today, a review of the text might be useful. In the introduction, John XXIII reminded the world of the roots of Catholic moral teaching in natural law and demands that science submits to the law. In the first substantial section, "Order between Men," the Pope reminded the world of Christianity's most basic demands: the right of every human to receive what is needed for survival, the inviolable dignity of every human being, and the right to worship.

On the question of government and the nature of a Christian government, John XXIII developed his ideas at length: He demanded an end to colonialism, proclaimed the equality of all human beings, explained limited government and established a right to resistance. Perhaps most astonishing in the

<sup>5</sup> Walter S. Tower, "The New Steel Cartel" *Foreign Affairs* " 5(1927), 2: 249-266.

<sup>6</sup> John Gillingham, *Industry and Politics in the Third Reich: Ruhr Coal, Hitler, and Europe* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985).

<sup>7</sup> For links to George Weigel's original commentary in *National Review online* and to responses by his critics, see <http://www.firstthings.com/blogs/firstthoughts/2009/07/09/george-weigels-nro-take-on-caritas-in-veritate-etc/>.

modern era, John XXIII rejected the Machiavelli's notion of *ragione dello stato*. Governments are bound by the same moral order that binds individuals, and immoral authority is illegitimate authority. John XXIII also rejected the notion that moral precepts are a human construct by pointing to their transcendent roots in divine law. The purpose of government is to promote personalism, to demand nothing of citizens that might harm their way to salvation. Quite concretely, government must provide infrastructure and facilitate jobs and fair wages, unions, and while taking into account other interest groups. The Holy Father explicitly demanded Christians and Christian governments choose a preferential option for the poor.

Now, one might argue that *Pacem in Terris* was completely novel, a product of the *aggiornamento*, the updating of the Church initiated by John XXIII. But nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, in the Scriptures already, Jesus Himself admonished us to turn the other cheek (Mt 5:39) and warned us that "it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter heaven." (Mk 10:25), not to mention the Beatitudes (Mt 5:1-12). All of which warnings should make most uncomfortable us who live in relative wealth and prosperity.

In the nineteenth century, in regards to the relative position of church and state, Leo XIII already addressed this in his encyclical *Diuturnum* of 1881.<sup>8</sup> He wrote that, in general, it made no difference to the Church who controlled the state as long as all concerned recognized that all power stems from God and that the government merely exercises power in God's name. The citizen should be obedient in almost all circumstances. Leo admitted, however, that people have the right to refuse any order that is "openly repugnant to the natural or divine law, for it is equally unlawful to command to do anything in which the law of nature or the will of God is violated." He admitted that civil power belonged to civil authority, not to the Church. When it became necessary to refuse orders, Christians should do so quietly, "not by means of sedition or tumult." Leo, however, had little use for democracy. He argued that "the will of the people is unsteady and easily swayed, therefore cannot be the basis of law and power." Given the events of the twentieth century, one cannot but agree. Leo's notion that the form of civil government is irrelevant as long as the state observes the moral order and guarantees the rights of the Church is called accidentalism. Given the events of the first half of the twentieth century – or perhaps all through history – an over-reliance on participatory government clearly is dangerous, but so is the absence of freedom and guaranteed rights, which is why John XXIII demanded freedom and equality as well as a constitutional order. He, however, rejected the notion of one best form of government, which, given the need of the faith to endure over millennia, makes sense. Thus, even today, the Church does not demand democracy, but the demands of the Church can be fulfilled best in a democratic form of government.

Four years after *Diuturnum*, Leo XIII developed further his understanding of the Church's teaching on the modern state. In fact, one might want to investigate further the relationship between Leo XIII's explanations and those of John XXIII; one might conclude that John XXIII's encyclicals really are the end of a clarify process, of an *aggiornamento* that began with Leo XIII in order for the Church to unpack the developments of the modern era in the post-Vatican II era. In this second of four encyclicals on the nature of the modern state and modern society, the pope concerned himself with the need to safeguard the primacy of the transcendent and salvific purpose of humanity and the role of government in securing humanity's salvation. In *Immortale Dei* (1885),<sup>9</sup> the Holy Father explained that the purpose and aims of government must never conflict with the Christian goal of salvation. Thus, logically,

<sup>8</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_29061881\\_diuturnum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_29061881_diuturnum_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>9</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_01111885\\_immortale-dei\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

atheism was a public crime, as was revolution. The state must never cause Christians to find themselves in conflict with their obligations to the Church. To exclude the Church from public moral discourse and elevate the freedom of conscience to the ultimate moral arbiter leads to moral peril. The Church is the only true teacher of morals and guide to salvation. Liberty too quickly becomes license. If one considers John Stuart Mill's development of liberalism from something close to the deification of individual freedom to something much more constrained, especially for those with little education, one cannot but think that Leo was not so far removed from some of the most modern thinkers of his time.

More importantly, however, Leo insisted that Catholics must take part in civil society and in national political life. Catholics must do so in order to infuse public life with Christian values. In other words, Christians must leave the Catholic ghetto and engage the world. If one looks forward to Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes* but also to *Pacem in Terris*, that is exactly the argument the supposedly much more "modern" Church of the 1960's made.<sup>10</sup> Could it be that Vatican II merely brought to fulfillment the process of engaging the world that began in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? Leaving the Catholic ghetto for a Catholic milieu and then for the frightening world at large took that long. It is discomfiting for our life and another in public, respecting privately the authority of the Church, but publicly rejecting it."

"In matters merely political" [i.e., not moral, however], it is acceptable to differ from the Church and still be a good Christian. In other words, Leo taught that Christians should be consistent in their actions and beliefs. Being a Christian is not something one can relegate to private life, nor can one insist that politics and moral have nothing to do with one another. Furthermore, Leo was foreshadowing one of the most important demands the current Bishop of New Hampshire, Peter Labasci made before last November's elections: not voting is not a Catholic option. Catholics must engage, but they must engage consistently. How one is to do this in a pluralistic society in which nothing is less consistent than politics and political campaigning remains a different question.

In 1890, Leo again turned to the question of citizenship in the encyclical *Sapientiae Christianae*.<sup>11</sup> In keeping with Christ's admonition to know what choices we make, i.e., to give unto Caesar no more than Caesar is due, Leo warned that Christianity was under attack in the modern world. He reminded the faithful that while certainly Christians must be loyal to and defend the state, natural law demands the devotion to and defense of the Church. When Church and State demands conflict, the faithful must side with the Church, "to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey, a crime." Interestingly enough, the official translation into both English and French (I have not found a Latin original) refer to this transgression as a crime, not as a sin. All Christians are called to defend the faith and its teachings, but must do so in keeping with the Church, and must obey Church teaching, not only in dogma, but in all teaching. In other words, even the slightest breach of Church teaching by the state requires open opposition, to be escalated as needed. Finally, Leo again warned Catholics seeking public office of their obligation to heed and publicly defend Catholic teaching. In 1901, Leo offered his last admonition on civic duty and the nature of the state in *Graves de Communes Re*. He argued that there could be such a thing as a Christian democracy, but that Christian democracy was first and foremost committed to democracy as defined by social justice and Catholic teaching.<sup>12</sup> Social justice in turn was not an economic question but a moral question. Furthermore, Christian democracy stood above politics, given its moral basis.

<sup>10</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_cons\\_19651207\\_gaudium-et-spes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>11</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_10011890\\_sapientiae-christianae\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_10011890_sapientiae-christianae_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>12</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_18011901\\_graves-de-communi-re\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18011901_graves-de-communi-re_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

Democracy could never lead to disobedience against the magisterium. Leo's definition of democracy was and is intrinsically but not intransigently conservative. He understood it less in terms of rights and more in terms of obligations and duties. Taking into consideration the Church's conflicts with Italy – remember the *non expedit* – and with France's laicist trends as well as the nascence of modernism in the Church in America, Leo's admonitions remain surprisingly topical in an age in which much pre-Vatican II modern Church teaching is dismissed as misguided or at least antiquated and superseded. While few of us would want to return to the Tridentine world, to use a buzz phrase, it seems perhaps a careful review of the Church's historic and historically consistent teachings on church and state might be useful every once in a while.

In addition to Church-state relations, another great concern John XXIII expressed in *Pacem in Terris* was the fear of war. The advent of nuclear weapons had not only put paid to the notion of all science and technology as inevitable progress, but also had put a quasi-eschatological end to humanity in human hands. John again reminded the faithful that states were bound by the same rules as individuals, and that those with more power bore greater responsibility. Just as among individuals, justice and freedom were also the basis of international relations. This in turn made chauvinism and exploitation of others impossible. In particular, John decried the arms races of his day as a horrible concern that produced constant fear. The arms race had to come to an end for three reasons: the principles of right reason, the desire to be rid of the threat of war, and an end to the arms race would bring advantages everywhere. The Church and the faithful must commit themselves to make an all-out effort for peace.

While Leo XIII and later Pius X had little to say about war and peace, Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII faced horrific conflicts to which they saw themselves compelled to respond. Three months after the outbreak of hostilities in 1914, Benedict XV issued his encyclical *ad Beatissimi Apostolorum* in which he appealed for peace, but more importantly, he offered an explanation of the war's causes from the Church's perspective, one that saw the roots of war deep in contemporary society.<sup>13</sup> The lack of brotherly love, a lacking respect for authority, social injustice, and crass materialism had to be remedied before there could be lasting peace. Each of these causes of international discord can be found again in *Pacem in Terris*. Even the admonition to obey the Church was not a goal for its own sake, but Benedict believed that only adherence to Christian teaching could restore the peace.

Consequently, once the weapons finally fell silent, Benedict issued an encyclical, *Quod Iam Diu* to demand public prayers be ordered throughout the Catholic world for the success of the peace conference.<sup>14</sup> While the Paris Treaty system was anything but a Christian document, Benedict persevered. In May 1920, the Holy Father became the first pope of the modern era to formulate something akin to a Christian doctrine of international relations in *Pacem, Dei Munus Pulcherrimum*.<sup>15</sup> First and foremost, Christian charity and mutual consideration must be the basis of peace. Christians must grant pardon, forgive enemies, and treat them with perfect kindness. Like his predecessors had argued concerning private individuals and public figures, Benedict insisted

“The Gospel has not one law of charity for individuals, and another for States and nations, which are indeed but collections of individuals. The war being now over, people seem called to a

<sup>13</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_ben-xv\\_enc\\_01111914\\_ad-beatissimi-apostolorum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xv_enc_01111914_ad-beatissimi-apostolorum_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>14</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_ben-xv\\_enc\\_01121918\\_quod-iam-diu\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xv_enc_01121918_quod-iam-diu_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>15</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_ben-xv\\_enc\\_23051920\\_pacem-dei-munus-pulcherrimum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xv_enc_23051920_pacem-dei-munus-pulcherrimum_en.html), March 27, 2013.

general reconciliation not only from motives of charity, but from necessity; the nations are naturally drawn together by the need they have of one another, and by the bond of mutual good will, bonds which are to-day strengthened by the development of civilization and the marvelous increase of communication.”

Thus, if the Ten Commandments and the Great Commandment applied to individuals, they also applied to peoples and states and their relationship with one another. This teaching, too, *Pacem in Terris* includes and proclaims again to Christians around the globe.

Two years later, Pius XI succeeded Benedict and devoted his two first encyclicals, both of which appeared on the same day, to the maintenance of peace. In *Fin dal Primo Momento*, he began his campaign to promote the Kingship of Christ as the answer to the problems of the modern world<sup>16</sup> and in *Ubi Arcano Dei Consilio*, he focused on the role Christianity should play in restoring and maintaining peace.<sup>17</sup> The Church, he argued, was the only true teacher of all truths that lead to peace. He identified social tensions within states and even within the family as part of the larger complex of conflict-threatening conditions. At the foundation of all peace lay spiritual peace and the “mutual affection which is born of brotherly love.” Only if “governments and nations follow in all their activities, whether they be national or international, the dictates of conscience grounded in the teaching, precepts, and examples of Jesus Christ, . . . then only can we have faith in one another’s word and trust in the peaceful solution of the difficulties and controversies which may grow out of differences in point of view or from clash of interests.”

Throughout his pontificate, Pius XI continued to apply the broader principles of Catholic teaching on peace and non-violence. His criticisms of Spain, Mexico, Soviet Russia, and Nazi Germany not only emphasized freedom of religion and the rights of the Church to guide the Faithful toward salvation, but also increasingly emphasized freedom of religion as part of the larger scope of civic freedoms. By the late 1930’s, the Church understood that a defense of religious freedom and liberty was best secured, even in countries with strong Catholic ties and traditions, by a defense of civic freedom and liberty. As papal nuncio in Poland during the Polish-Russian War and during the Upper Silesian partition, he had experienced the effect of violence and repression on the faithfuls’ ability to fulfill their religious obligations, but also on the faithfuls’ ability to live securely.

Unfortunately, as has been discussed almost *ad nauseam*, in the early years of his pontificate, Pius XII rarely addressed the burning concerns of the day head on the way his predecessor had done. In October 1939, in *Summi Pontificatus*, Pius identified as cause of the new world war “the nefarious efforts of not a few to dethrone Christ; the abandonment of the law of truth which He proclaimed and of the law of love which is the life breath of His Kingdom.”<sup>18</sup> and as solution the acceptance that in “the recognition of the royal prerogatives of Christ and in the return of individuals and of society to the law of His truth and of His love lies the only way to salvation.” Pius was not willing to identify the secular source of evil, and he would refuse to do so throughout the war. Three weeks before the war in Europe ended, Pius asked the faithful to dedicate the month of May 1945 to prayers for peace. In *In Communion*

---

<sup>16</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19221223\\_fin-dal-primo-momento\\_it.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19221223_fin-dal-primo-momento_it.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>17</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19221223\\_ubi-arcano-dei-consilio\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19221223_ubi-arcano-dei-consilio_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>18</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xii\\_enc\\_20101939\\_summi-pontificatus\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20101939_summi-pontificatus_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

*Interpretes Dolorum*, Pius again emphasized that the larger solution to all the world's ills began with the recognition of humanity's weakness:<sup>19</sup>

We know that the human mind, especially when hate and rivalry have blinded it, cannot easily determine a just and equitable solution of affairs along with a fraternal agreement. It is therefore necessary to implore the Father of light and mercy [1] repeatedly. He alone, in the midst of such violent disturbances and tumults, can persuade those concerned that too many catastrophes and devastations have been piled up in a fearful mass, that too many tears have been shed, and that too much blood has been spilled. Therefore divine and human rights demand unequivocally that such hideous slaughter cease as soon as possible.

In later years, for reasons scholars should continue to explore, Pius more directly confronted the evils threatening world peace. After 1949, he wrote several encyclicals demanding freedom of religion in China and encouraging Chinese Catholics to remain in union with Rome rather than join the communist-sponsored national Chinese church. In the years of the Palestinian partition, Pius issued three encyclicals in which he primarily concerned himself with safeguards for Christian holy sites in the British mandate and its successors, but he also urged the world community to guarantee peace in the region, in part by subjecting Jerusalem to a regime of international control. In 1956, the Holy Father repeatedly used the “big gun” of encyclical to call for support of the Polish revolts, of the Hungarian uprising and later of its victims, but also of efforts to maintain peace in the Middle East in the wake of Suez. Interestingly enough, however, at no time did Pius offer guidance on the new threat of nuclear war.

Since time is running short, let me only briefly discuss the way in which the Church has addressed social and economic justice. Jesus Christ Himself spoke clearly of the preferential option for the poor. It has always been striking that the first people to worship the newborn Lord were the poorest of the poor, the least respected: shepherds. Christ Himself died with common criminals. Leo XII, in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, was not only responding to socialism, but also was summarizing Catholic teaching that had evolved since the days of the apostles. Leo argued that Christian calls for moderation laid the foundation for prosperity on Earth, that the Church had always demanded charity, but also that the Church saw workers and employers in mutual obligation. Leo demanded that all workers receive a living wage and that workers be permitted to form associations to promote the self-betterment of workers and the proper treatment of workers. In 1931, Pius XI issued *Quadragesimo Anno*, which should be required reading in every Catholic seminary, high school, and university. Pius XI argued that all property has two-fold purposes, one as private property, and one as social property. While Pius presumably did not read Carnegie's *Gospel of Wealth*, they both demanded the same stewardship of wealth. “A person's superfluous income, that is, income which he does not need to sustain life fittingly and with dignity, is not left wholly to his own free determination. Rather the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church constantly declare in the most explicit language that the rich are bound by a very grave precept to practice almsgiving, beneficence, and munificence.” Furthermore, “Expending larger incomes so that opportunity for gainful work may be abundant, provided, however, that this work is applied to producing really useful goods, ought to be considered, as We deduce from the principles of the Angelic Doctor, an outstanding exemplification of the virtue of munificence and one particularly suited to the needs of the

---

<sup>19</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xii\\_enc\\_15041945\\_communion-interpretes-dolorum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_15041945_communion-interpretes-dolorum_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

times. Pius XI and Pius XII already expanded this notion to the relationship among states. Pius XI condemned racism by missionaries and demanded equal treatment for people in mission countries. Pius XII demanded the free development of all countries in the world, by which he meant former colonies. John XXIII then argued that since human dignity must be the goal of all human development, less-developed countries should be free to develop their own development initiatives, but that the highly-developed countries must assist their former colonies and all poor countries to develop.

In other words, rather than a revolutionary document, much less a departure from the faith, *Pacem in Terris* represented a coherent and consistent summary of not only a century's Catholic teaching, but of that of two millennia applied to the contemporary world. What then, can one conclude from this brief review of Catholic encyclicals in light of John XXIII's *Pacem in Terris*? First and foremost, the Church has always defined all problems of the world as moral problems. Moral choices are choices for or against God and God's teachings. The Church has always acknowledged war and inequality, suffering and poverty to be the results of immoral actions, of sin. Furthermore, in recognition of original sin, the Church has always accepted that humans, left to their own devices, must fail to resolve all conflicts. All humanity is God-directed by nature of the Church's eschatology.

Succeeding pontiffs built on John's work to remind us of the demands of a Christian life in the modern world. Already in *Populorum Progressio*, Paul VI demanded continued attention to the cause of world peace and to equal human development.<sup>20</sup> John Paul II, whom nobody can accuse of being a leftist, in *Laborem Exercens* offered a penetrating critique of triumphant capitalism after the fall of the communist bloc.<sup>21</sup> Similarly, Benedict XVI in *Caritas in Veritate* demanded a much greater emphasis on the human responsibility to care for all of God's creation, human and other. Finally, in the homily at his installation mass, our current Holy Father, Francis, admonished us to take much greater care of the environment and of one another. It also meant that the condemnation of war, the rejection of communism and liberation theology as rooted in ideals fundamentally incompatible with Catholic faith, or any faith at that, the continued emphasis on the need to "live simply so others might simply live," are in keeping with Scripture and the Catholic tradition of the last two millennia. Similarly, however, as Benedict XVI argued in *Caritas in Veritate*, charity without Truth is sentimentality. The ultimate Truth is found in salvation, which means that, at least for Catholics, nothing on this Earth matters if it does not advance the salvation of individuals and of all of humanity.

---

\* **MARTIN MENKE**, Ph.D., is Professor of History at Rivier University. Having earned his Ph.D. at Boston College, he researches modern German political Catholicism and particularly the relationship between national and religious identities. He has published in *Catholic Historical Review*, *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte*, *Journal of Church and State*, and *Insight: Rivier Academic Journal*. Most recently, Martin participated in International Catholicism Week at DePaul University.

---

<sup>20</sup> Online [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_26031967\\_populorum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.

<sup>21</sup> Online: [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_enc\\_14091981\\_laborem-exercens\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_14091981_laborem-exercens_en.html), accessed March 27, 2013.