

Degree: B.A.  
Feb. 5, 1949

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPARATIVE STUDY

OF THE PURPOSE OF THE STATE

ACCORDING TO

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS(1224-1274)

AND

POPE LEO XIII(1878-1903)

by

John C. Sherbno

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the College  
Department of St. Meinrad Seminary in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

February 1, 1949

St. Meinrad, Indiana



## O U T L I N E

Title: A Brief Introduction to the Comparative Study of the Purpose of the State according to St. Thomas Aquinas(1224-1274) and Pope Leo XIII(1878-1903).

### I. Introduction.

- A. Field of Philosophy - Political Philosophy.
- B. Purpose.
- C. Limitations and Sources.

### II. Body.

- A. Limitations to the Purpose of the State.
  - 1. Individuality.
  - 2. Individual Rights.
    - a. Liberty of Conscience.
    - b. Liberty of Education.
  - 3. Toleration.
  - 4. Sanctity of the Home.
  - 5. Individual Initiative.
- B. Purpose of the State.
  - 1. General Purpose.
    - a. Common Good.
      - 1. Is the general prupose of the State.
      - 2. Man's natural desires and Common Good.
      - 3. Derinition of the Common Good.
    - b. Fourfold division of the Purpose of the State.
      - 1. Social.
      - 2. Economic.
      - 3. Ethical.
      - 4. Religious.
  - 2. Specific Purpose.
    - a. Social Purpose.
      - 1. Prerequisites.
        - a. Peace.
        - b. Unity.
      - 2. Particular Points.
        - a. Health of citizens.
        - b. Food.
        - c. Commerce.
        - d. Beauty.
        - e. Wealth.
    - b. Economic Purpose.
      - 1. Work.
      - 2. Taxation.
      - 3. Money - conception of by St. Thomas and Pope Leo.
    - c. Ethical Purpose.
      - 1. Other purposes of the State.
      - 2. Rulers, people, and their happiness.
      - 3. Education.
        - a. Parent's right.
        - b. Correct Principles.
        - c. Psuedo-education.
      - 4. Charity.

Outline (continued)

- d. Religious Purpose.
  - 1. State not end in itself.
  - 2. Man's supernatural end.
  - 3. Natural Virtues.
  - 4. Church and State.
    - a. Importance of question.
    - b. Difficulties involved.
    - c. St. Thomas and Pope Leo XIII.
- III. Conclusion.
  - A. Unity of St. Thomas and Pope Leo XIII on the Purpose of the State.
  - B. Teachings of the Church will bring peace to society.

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PURPOSE OF THE STATE ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS AQUINAS(1224-1274) and POPE LEO XIII(1878-1903).

The subject matter of this paper places it in the field of Political Philosophy. Our purpose is to examine the more important writings of St. Thomas Aquinas and Pope Leo XIII endeavoring to compare their thoughts on this subject.

In thus limiting ourselves, we have chosen the following writings from which to select our material:

St. Thomas of Aquin

SUMMA THEOLOGICA  
SUMMA CONTRA GENTILES  
DE REGIMINE PRINCIPUM  
COMMENTARIA IN POLITICA  
COMMENTARIUM IN IV LIBROS SENTENTiarUM MAGISTRI  
PETRI LOMBARDI

Pope Leo XIII(1)

INSCRUTABILI  
ARCANUM  
DIUTURNUM  
IMMORTALE DEI  
LIBERTAS HUMANA  
SAPIENTIAE CHRISTIANAE  
RERUM NOVARUM

In selecting the subject for this paper a very practical purpose was kept in mind. Today, the world is in the midst of a change. The Holy Father himself speaks of a "New Order." We often hear the phrase "Every five hundred years or so history repeats itself."

Five hundred years ago the social, economic, political, ethical and religious life of man was shaken by the Protestant re-

volt, while this same period was also one of the greatest periods of missionary activity on the part of the Church; five hundred years before this there occurred the Photian schism, while this period witnessed the beginning of the Crusades to the East; five hundred years before this Rome was being sacked by Attila and the Church rose up to save Christianity, and did so; five hundred years before this "The Son of God" walked upon and among His creatures. Today, there is again that same opportunity for the Church to rise-up and show herself to be the true and the only "Light of the world:" in the words of the Archbishop of Chicago, that there "...is before us the possibility of a golden age of christian culture and civilization."(2)

Among the great theologians and philosophers of the Church there stands St. Thomas of Aquin, and in keeping with the wishes of the Holy See as well as the trend of Catholic philosophy we have chosen him as one half of the combination to be considered in this study.

In searching for the other half, who else but Pope Leo XIII should be chosen, as it was he who inaugurated the movement of neo-scholasticism as we now see it today.(3) In his encyclical AETERNI PATRIS(4), August 4, 1879, we learn of Leo's respect and love for the writings of St. Thomas; we find there the thoughts of a great teacher speaking like a pupil of his master, in whom he recognizes a leader in his field of thought. One need but read this encyclical to understand what interpretations by others so often miss.(5)

Further, Pope Leo lived during the formation of many of

the causes of our present-day evils. He wrote against those causes and warned the world of the effects which would follow, unless those very fountainheads were destroyed.

Each wrote during a period almost the direct opposite of the other. St. Thomas during a period when Catholicity was a tradition and the Pope was loved. Leo during a period when anti-catholicity was a tradition and the Pope hated.

How then was it possible for their thoughts to be the same, or nearly so, on a question, which was and is held by so many to be one of great flexibility, so flexible in fact that even in principle it changes with the whims of man's mind; and too how could both still remain true to their Faith. Here in this paper we shall seek to bring together these two great minds of the Catholic Church - of the Human Race - with the intention of understanding what they thought of the State, or Civil Authority, and the evils resulting from a misconception of the purpose of the State; and some explanation of what they held to be the true purpose of the State.

#### THE LIMITATIONS OF THE STATE

Before taking up what St. Thomas and Pope Leo XIII considered to be the purpose of the State, it is well to consider the limitations which they placed upon the Civil Authority. By doing this we shall be in a better position to understand and appraise more correctly their doctrine of the Civil Authority.

INDIVIDUALITY. Even though in the past many statesmen and philosophers have committed the error of declaring that man is

from and for the State, and that in more modern times the basic principles of such political parties, as the Nazis, Facists, or the Communists, claim that the State is man's ALL, beyond which there is nothing: both St. Thomas(6) and Pope Leo(7) are realists and refrain from falling into that political cesspool of thought. Man is man before he is citizen; the State came from the mind of man, and is, therefore, from and for man, while the contrary is contradictory to nature.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS. The second limitation which St. Thomas and Pope Leo place upon the State is that of Individual Rights, which are granted by the Natural Law. The State must always act with reference to these rights. It may never interfere, save to define and to defend.(8)

There are two particular rights: liberty of conscience and liberty of education, which both St. Thomas and Pope Leo give special attention. Because of the conditions during his own time, Pope Leo places more stress on them than did St. Thomas.

In regards to the former, i.e., liberty of conscience, both hold that none outside of the fold should be forced into it. The free-will is to be respected: faith involves complete freedom.(9)

Both speak against those who abuse this freedom by using it to spread fallacies among their neighbors.(10) While both admit the freedom of the will, it is that true freedom which permits one to do what one ought and not necessarily what one can or may wish to do.(11)

As to how those who spread such fallacies are to be pun-

ished St. Thomas is sterner than Pope Leo XIII. If we recall to mind the politico-religious conditions of their respective times, the reason for this apparant difference is patent.(12)

Liberty of education, i.e., the right of the people to truth and to be protected in its possession surpasses the right of individuals to free speech - and, especially during Pope Leo's time, freedom of the press.(13) Education, during the time of St. Thomas and Pope Leo, was becoming more general, but was still not wide spread among the very young. Both St. Thomas and Pope Leo considered it a grave crime to teach error to the youth, and even to uneducated adults, who were more capable of defending themselves against this attack.(14) Yet, it is worth noting here also that this practice continues even to the present day; and as if in complition of a prophetic word, what are the conditions of the world today?(15)

TOLERATION. The State is also limited by toleration. St. Thomas states that God permits evil in the world, lest in preventing the evil, greater good should be sacrificed or worse evil follow.(16) As on the point of liberty of conscience, Pope Leo agrees in kind with St. Thomas, but differs in the degree to which it may be carried.(17) This is due once again to the difference in the politico-religious conditions of their respective times. Some writers believe that if St. Thomas were living in the Nineteenth Century his view would be altered in its degree of sternness.(18)

THE SANCTITY OF THE HOME. The home, the primary unit of society, is most sacred to both St. Thomas and Pope Leo. Contrary



to modern thinkers, both insist that the child belongs to the parents and that for the State to interfere is to violate natural justice. Yet, both admit that if the family is not fulfilling its duties in this regard, the State may - and sometimes is obliged - to step in and aid the family. By doing this, however, the State does not acquire the rights belonging to the family, but it merely aids in the fulfilling of those rights.(19)

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE. Finally, the State is not to crush individual initiative in any respect.(20) For the State to do this is to sow the seeds of its own decay.

In summary, then, the purpose of the State is limited by: Individuality and Individual Rights; Toleration; the Sanctity of the Home, and, finally; Individual Initiative.

#### GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE STATE

To speak of the general purpose of the State is not difficult, as both St. Thomas(21) and Pope Leo(22) agree that the purpose of the State is to attain to and to maintain the general interests of men living under its authority. In a word, the State is to seek the common welfare: the common good. In stating this Saint Thomas(23) and Pope Leo(24) agree that happiness, unalloyed, cannot be found here upon this earth. However, the State has the duty of aiding man to attain to happiness here on earth, in so far as, it is able to do so.(25)

As to what constitutes the civil purpose or the common good neither St. Thomas nor Pope Leo gives a definition in so many words, rather they offer positive acts which will accomplish the

the purpose of the State.

St. Thomas accepts as his focal point the natural desires of man, since the State is for man.(26) Accepting St. Thomas' classification of man's desires, Pope Leo throughout his writings uses it in his own thoughts on the civil purpose. Due to the particular purpose of his writings he never states that he has accepted Saint Thomas' classification of man's desires but it is evident that he makes use of it, as explaining the natural makeup of man.(27)

From this we may advance at this point as a definition of the Common Good, the following: The Common Good is that which alone is able to satisfy man's socio-individuo desires, i.e., those desires which can only be expressed and perfected in a morally united, temporal, and civil organism: namely, the State.

On the basis of this classification of the natural desires mentioned we may now proceed to consider further the treatment of our subject matter of this paper. According to this classification the civil purpose may be divided into four divisions: 1)social, 2)ethical, 3)economic, and, 4)religious. We shall, then follow this more specific division in presenting more fully the subject matter of this paper.

We do not, however, intend to develop each to the same degree of completeness, but to take into consideration those which are stressed most by the Holy Father. For the time of the Pontiff is closer to our own time, and because he dealt with problems which are still influential today.

While Pope Leo most certainly gave considerable attention to the problems in the above four fields, to the writer it seems

that the Pontiff gave very special attention to those arising between the Church and the State: to those of religion. We shall in the course of this paper treat more fully the position of the State in this regards than we shall of the other three divisions.

#### PREREQUISITES TO THE SOCIAL PURPOSE

The attainment of the social purpose requires two necessary prerequisites, which are peace and unity. However, this peace which St. Thomas and Pope Leo speak of is not concord, but true peace. For where there is peace, there is concord; but where there is concord, there is not necessarily peace.(28) This peace which they speak of entails not only assent but consent; not only conviction but also persuasion; not only mind and will but also the heart. Charity is the force that will bring peace; charity is the force that will bring unity of man with his neighbor; charity will bring its own reward: happiness unalloyed.(29)

#### THE SOCIAL PURPOSE

Due to the end in mind, the treatment of this point by both St. Thomas and Pope Leo is somewhat different. St. Thomas, writing a type of "text book" for rulers, in general proceeds in a speculative manner, covering almost every possible situation that could arise. However, Pope Leo, writing merely to explain particular points, at times refers only indirectly to a point which may be thoroughly treated with by St. Thomas. We must remember not only the conditions of their respective times but also the end which each has in mind for their work. We shall mention the points which both St. Thomas and Pope Leo touched upon. We shall not speculate as to what the Pontiff may or may not have accepted had he written

with the same end in mind as St. Thomas. Further the government St. Thomas had in mind is more of the medieval city-state type of government than the larger national government with which the Pontiff had to deal.(30)

Both St. Thomas(31) and Pope Leo(32) realized that the State must look after the health of its citizens. The looks of the people are the index of a State.

They consider the necessity of food to be one of the most important considerations for the State. The State should promote in the people the love of the land, so as to insure a plentiful food supply, and so that they may come in contact with the wonders of God.(33)

Both accept commerce. St. Thomas due, perhaps, to some of the ill influences of the Crusades, does not place too much of a stress upon the importance and value of commerce, but believes that a State should be self-sufficient, if possible. That is, of course, to avoid evils, not that he is opposed to commerce itself. He realizes its necessity and accepts its good qualities.(34) Pope Leo on the other hand living at a time when commerce was one of the chief arteries of many nations, due in part, no doubt, to the "Industrial Revolution," accepts its place, stating at the same time that it must be carried on with Christian charity and justice.(35)

St. Thomas mentions in detail what the State should do in regards to the beauty of the State(36), whereas Pope Leo merely mentions that a State should be solicitous about the arts.(37)

There is also the question of wealth, which the State is

to prevent from becoming a burden to some citizens because a few possess all or a greater portion of it.(38)

#### THE ECONOMIC PURPOSE

Here, by his Encyclical RERUM NOVARUM, Pope Leo XIII has made a very worthy contribution to the field of economics.

Both St. Thomas(39) and Pope Leo(40) state that since work is a necessity to man man therefore has the right to work. What a man earns by his labor becomes his, for he has given, as it were part of himself in return for his wage. Man has also the right the right to possess property.

Concerning taxation, St. Thomas(41) and Pope Leo(42) both agree that the State may not and must not exact more than that which it needs for operation. If a State exacts more than necessary restitution is to be made. In general, conditions of the times govern the laws of taxation, but, always, justice must prevail.

Money to St. Thomas was primarily an instrument of exchange(43), whereas, today it is in itself productive of more money.(44) As to usury, both St. Thomas(45) and Pope Leo(46) were against excessive interest, for it is against the natural law to demand more than one is entitled to. Here the difference in the conception of the use of money causes some variances in their writings.(47)

Again, St. Thomas goes more into speculative detail on this question of economy than does Pope Leo: such points as just price, fraud, kinds of fraud, etc., which Pope Leo, being mainly interested in the present condition of the laboring man, does not mention. We shall, however, content ourselves with the points we

have mentioned and enter into consideration of our next division.

#### ETHICAL PURPOSE

It is evident throughout the writings of St. Thomas and Pope Leo that the State also has an ethical purpose. There never could be either peace or unity if the hearts of men were severed. The State's social and economic purposes could not be carried out if there <sup>were</sup> not present the principles of charity and justice.

<sup>being</sup> Moral itself, the State must strive to render and keep the people moral. The ruler is to be virtuous(48) and is, as the Apostle St. Paul tells us, to lead the people "by good example." External goods are essential to happiness but only in moderation (49), for what gives true happiness is perfect virtue and perfect exercise of virtue(50). In this process of instilling virtue, education of the people, especially the young, is most important.(51)

That education is within the providence of the State and preeminently the Church, both St. Thomas(52) and Pope Leo(53) admit, although, both agree that the parents have this right first of all. But education is so important that, where the other institutions are unable to supply it fully, the State has the right and the duty to step in, in order to supplement, rather than assume or supplant the right of the parents.(54)

It <sup>is</sup> <sup>as</sup> important for the State to be imbued with correct principles of education as <sup>it is for it to</sup> (that it should) be interested in education at all. Neither St. Thomas nor Pope Leo XIII would have the State rule the mind of the people, any more than trammel their bodies; but direction of the welfare of thought is important, and is to be directed for the welfare of the whole, as is the direction of the wel-

fare of the body.

It is wrong for governments to encourage systems which sacrifice to a pseudo-liberty what Revelation has to offer.(55) The position of moral training is of great importance in their concept of the State.

Civil justice, while it is important in the State(56), deals with only the external relations of men(57) but since these are so frequently influenced by the internal dispositions of the individual, the requirements of charity ~~is~~ evident. Justice pertains to the will of the individual(58) but love perfects volitions. Charity then must be encouraged by the State.(59)

The ethical purpose of the State according to St. Thomas and Pope Leo is, of course, very Christian. It is St. Thomas who develops it speculatively, whereas, Pope Leo, thoroughly grounded in Thomas' teaching, makes their practical application to the ills of his own time.

#### THE RELIGIOUS PURPOSE

The State cannot be an end in itself. If man, whose welfare is the object of the State, had only an earthly destiny, then the State would constitute that end. However, man, possessing a soul, has also another destiny which is superior to that of the earthly destiny. "If the end of man were earth, and the purpose of the State itself, ethics might be rightly repudiated, for certainly it is something of a hamper in the struggle for existence."(60) But this fallacy, as we have seen above, is denied by both St. Thomas and Pope Leo.

Neither will natural virtue be sufficient in guiding

man. Supernatural virtue is necessary for natural virtues cannot be the end of man, any more than the State.(61) If men could gain heaven merely through human effort, it would be the duty of the State to direct them to it.(62) But a supernatural object necessitates a supernatural guide. Here the State cannot guide, but must itself be guided.(63)

We now shall treat of a matter which, we believe, will aid in the understanding of one of the most important questions of not only Pope Leo's time, but of our own time also.

The question of Church and State has at different times in history proven to be one most complicated, however, under the guidance of St. Thomas and Pope Leo the question resolves itself into quite a simple one. They simply seek the end of the State, of the Church, and of man who is at the one and the same time, though in different respects, the subject of both the Church and the State.

During the time of St. Thomas there was not the widespread influence of false interpretations of these three terms, as there was during the time of Pope Leo. It took a great mind, a great heart, and a great will to write amid this storm of prejudice, ignorance, and deceit.

Today, the story of the Church and the State is passing through a most important chapter; a chapter upon the completion of which will determine in a great measure the kind of future society we shall live in. Our leaders would do well to listen to the wise words of St. Thomas and Pope Leo.

"Aquinas would have the people secure from tyranny of



rulers by subjecting them to the principle of justice"(64) and, also:

"It is in this sense that we must interpret such assertions of St. Thomas as: 'nisi forte potestati spirituali etiam saecularis potestatis apicem tenet, sc. spiritualis et saecularis, hoc illo disponente qui est sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech...' (Sent., Lib. II, dist. 44, 4um.) Aquinas admitted temporal rulers. His De Regimine is a paternal instruction to one of them. The leadership which he claims for the Church is essentially moral; if material, it is so per accidens. The Church represents morality, to which the State, whether it recognizes the Church or not is always subordinate. If his sentences are some times too strong for the modern sense, it is because he writes, at time, more from fact than from theory. De facto, the Church was mighty in both orders during the twilight of Europe's emergency. She had to be. Civil society was in the throes of formation and reformation, while ecclesiastical organization alone was perfect and powerful enough to control the situation."(65)

It is important to remember these two short phrases in the above quotation: "more from fact than from theory" and "De facto, the Church was mighty in both orders." Here we do not seek to develop possibilities which are suggested by these quotations, for this would be a paper in itself, but merely to compare the two attitudes on this particular subdivision of our topic.

That in theory Pope Leo agreed with St. Thomas is borne out in numerous places in his two most important encyclicals on this point, namely, IMMORTALE DEI and SAPIENTIAE CHRISTIANAE. In these two letters it is shown that Pope Leo XIII bases "his conception of the relationship of Church and State on the principles of St. Thomas Aquinas."(66)

On certain individual points St. Thomas and Pope Leo will

differ in fact though they agree in theory. This may be due to the conditions of their times. During the time of St. Thomas the Church was strong in both the temporal and spiritual orders. During the time of Pope Leo the Church was stripped of her temporal power and weakened in her spiritual influence.

Another point to remember is that St. Thomas was never pope and so he could only teach his doctrine to others who listened according to the attitude of their time. Leo was pope and was in a position to put into effect what he spoke or wrote. Leo had the power to do in fact what Thomas could only do in theory.

That the purpose of the State is less perfect than that of the Church both St. Thomas(67) and Pope Leo(68) agree. Saint Thomas recognizes fully that the civil sphere is apart from the ecclesiastical, and, like Pope Leo, that "each in its kind is supreme".(69)

We shall close this section of the paper by quoting a few passages from St. Thomas and Pope Leo so as to bring out more clearly their harmony of teaching on this point.

ST. THOMAS: "But as long as a man's mortal life endures there is some good extraneous to him, namely, final beatitude which is looked for after death, in the enjoyment of God...Consequently the Christian man, for whom that beatitude has been purchased by the blood of Christ, and who in order to attain it, has received the earnest of the Holy Ghost, needs an additional spiritual care to direct him to the harbour of eternal salvation, and this care is provided for the faithful by the ministers of the Church of Christ."(70)

POPE LEO XIII: "Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own character or by reason of the end

to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgement of the Church. Whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to the civil authority."(71)

ST. THOMAS: "...in order that spiritual things might be distinguished from earthly things the ministry of this kingdom has been entrusted not to earthly kings, but to priests, and in the highest degree to the chief priest, the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff, to whom all the kings of Christian peoples are to be subject as to Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. For those to whom pertains the care of the intermediate ends should be subject to him to whom pertains the care of the ultimate end, and be directed by his rule."(72)

POPE LEO XIII: "Now we are convinced that the principal source of these evils is the contempt and rejection of the holy and august authority of the Church, which presides in the name of God over the human race, and which is the support and maintenance of all legitimate authority. The forces of public order are perfectly well aware of this fact. They consequently conclude that nothing could aid more in upturning the foundations of society than to wage an incessant war on the Church of God; to render her odious and hateful by scandalous calumnies, representing her as the enemy of true civilization. They labour to weaken her strength and authority by continual attacks; and to destroy the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff, who is here below the protector and interpreter of the eternal and immutable principles of right and justice."(73)

ST. THOMAS: "...the king ought to be subject to the dominion and government administered by the office of priesthood, ...he ought to preside over all human offices, and regulate them by rule of his government which is ordained to another as to its end, is bound to see that his work is suitable to that end...he should command those things which lead to the happiness of Heaven, and as far as possible, forbid the contrary. What conducts to true beatitude and what hinders it are learned from the law of God, the teaching of which

belongs to the office of the priest..."(74)

POPE LEO XIII: "This, then, is the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the constitution and government of the State. By the words and decrees just cited, if judged dispassionately, no one of the several forms of government is in itself condemned, in so far as none of them contains anything contrary to Catholic doctrine, and all of them are capable, if wisely and justly managed, of insuring the welfare of the State. Neither is it blameworthy in itself, in any manner for the people to have a share, greater or less, in the government; for certain times, and under certain laws, such participation may not only be of benefit to the citizens, but may even be of obligation."(75)

POPE LEO XIII: "In matters, however, of mixed jurisdiction, it is in the highest degree consonant to nature, as also to the designs of God, that, so far from one of the powers separating itself from the other, or still less coming into conflict with it, complete harmony, such as it suited to the end for which each power exists, should be preserved between them."(76)

The State, then, must always strive after the general welfare, the common good of those who belong to it, and who in some things are subject to civil authority, but in others independent of the State. Especially is this true of the eternal destiny of the citizen. Since the means and aid for the attainment of this end has been entrusted to another perfect society the State itself cannot guide the citizens to this further and higher destiny, but it also must be guided lest it place obstacles which hinder or even prevent arriving at that supernatural end.

By way of conclusion, we repeat, what must now be apparent, that without doubt the solution to many of our present day problems does not lie in throwing off or disregarding the power of

the Catholic Church. Until the rulers, and more, the people themselves, who often influence rulers unwisely, become aware of this fact, the world will remain in an unnatural state of strife, turmoil, or concord, but will never gain true and lasting peace.

FOOTNOTES

1. All references to the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII (and Pius XI) will be taken from and referred to according to the divisional markings found in the following work: Husslein, J., Social Wellsprings, Vol. 1 (and vol. 2) (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943).
2. Gonella-Bouscaren, A World To Reconstruct (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1944), p. v.
3. Turner, W., History of Philosophy (New York: Ginn & Co., 1929), p. 643.
4. Official text, Acta Leonis, Vol. 1, pp. 255-284; Acta Sanctae Sedis, Vol. 12, pp. 97-115; English translation, Husslein, op. cit., pp. 246-264.
5. In speaking of the inclusion of the encyclical in his work Husslein writes the following:  
"...This document does not deal formally with the theme of our book, but is the basis for all contained in it. The entire structure of Pope Leo's social doctrine is erected foursquare on the solid foundation of Christian Theology and Philosophy. It is the latter which the Pope desires to stress here as one of the most important subjects that can engage the Catholic mind in any age. The social import of this encyclical lies in the fact that we shall look in vain for success in the stupendous task of correcting social ills, unless we first attack the cause of them. This is the godless materialistic Socialist-Historic Materialism or Economic Determinism the most recently spawned vagaries of philosophical atheism promoted in the schools..." pp. x-xi.
6. De Reg., Lib. I, cc. 14 and 15; Com. Polit., Lib. I, lect. 1.
7. Libertas Humana, 7; Rerum Novarum, 6; Diuturnum, 7 and 8.
8. Summa Theol., 1a 2ae, q. xcv, a. 2; Rerum Novarum, 3.
9. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. x, a. 8; Immortale Dei, 18.
10. IV Lib. Sent., dist. XIII, q. ii, a. 3; Immortale Dei, 10 and 15; Libertas Humana, 18, 21, and 30.
11. Redden and Ryan, Freedom Through Education (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1944), pp. 5-9.
12. "However we must never forget that he (St. Thomas) was writing on this point for a world which was substantially a politico-religious unit; and with this unique state of affairs vanished, his doctrine would not meet modern mentality and sentiment. But the Church of St. Thomas real-

izes as well as her most intelligent enemies could inform her, that the twentieth century is not the thirteenth; that the principles of the Angelic Doctor are more valuable than his applications of them; and that, while his service to truth is great, his is not necessarily the last word on a subject. Aquinas himself believed that law should relax or contract, to further enlightenment and to new necessities; all the more would he admit advancement and development in doctrine. It is sufficient that he advocates spiritual freedom and even strenuous means of attaining and maintaining it, to envice the democratic essence of his thought." Murphy, St. Thomas and Democracy (Washington, D.C.; Catholic University Press, 1921), pp. 143-4.

13. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. x, a. 8, ad. 4; Libertas Humana, 19.
14. Libertas Humana, 19 and 20.
15. On this point the following is taken from a statement made by the American Bishops on Nov. 24, 1944:  
    "...This war came largely from bad education. It was not brought on by primitive or unlettered peoples. The contemporary philosophy which asserts the right of aggression is the creation of scholars. Discarding moral principles and crowding God out of human life, scholars produced the monstrous philosophies which, embodied in political and social systems, enslave human reason and destroy the consciousness of innate human rights and duties." Catholic Chronicle, Toledo Diocesan Weekly, November 24, 1944.
16. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. x, a. 11; De Reg., Lib. I, cc. IX.
17. Immortale Dei, 18; Libertas Humana, 2 and 3; vide: n. 18.
18. "St. Thomas, apparently, intends this principle (of toleration) to apply to a civil society in which the cultural and spiritual influences of the domestic and ecclesiastical institutions are freely operative. It seems certain that he would concede a wider state of action today, when religion has broken down in so many lives, and parental influence has so far declined." Murphy, op. cit., p. 144.
19. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. x, a. 12; Rerum Novarum, 11.
20. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. xiv, a. 2; Rerum Novarum, 12.
21. Com. Polit., Lib. VII, c. 1; "...Finis autem optimae reipublicae est optimus finis hominis, quia republice non est aliud quam ordo civitatis..."

22. Rerum Novarum, 26: "...For it is the province of the commonwealth to consult the common good."
23. Summa Theol., 1a 2ae, q. ii, aa. 1-8.
24. Immortale Dei, 1 and 5.
25. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 9; Rerum Novarum, 21.
26. For tabulation of these desires, vide: Murphy, op. cit., p. 148.
27. As to how fundamental nature is to the Thomistic Political Philosophy, the following quotations will aid in bringing out:

"...The bedrock of Thomistic political philosophy is nature..." Farrell, W., O.P., "Natural Foundations of the Political Philosophy of St. Thomas," Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, Vol. 7, p. 75.

Also, St. Thomas' political philosophy "...might be said to have been drawn from his doctrine on the nature of man by way of collary." Idem., pp. 83-4.
28. Immortale Dei, 6.
29. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. xxix, a. 2, ad. 1; Rerum Novarum, 45; Sapientiae Christianae, 21.
30. In regards to the force of the Thomistic principles when applied to body politics larger than that St. Thomas had experience with, the following quotation is offered for consideration:

"...The following pages are an attempt to construct a Thomistic concept of international society - a conception derived from the fundamental principles of the moral, social, and political philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. It is true that a complete and fully developed outline of such a society is not to be found explicitly in the writings of St. Thomas...But these writings do contain sound philosophical principles which, when fully developed and elaborated, form a solid basis for the construction of a true international society..." Benkert, G., O.S.B., The Thomistic Concept of An International Society. (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1942), pp. ix-x.
31. De Reg., Lib. II, c. 1, 2, and 3.
32. Rerum Novarum, 33.
33. De Reg., Lib. II, c. 3; Rerum Novarum, 7 and 35.
34. Idem.



35. The Holy Father does not mention this point explicitly, however, one can conclude to this, especially, in the light of the international and national economic conditions during his time; there is indirect mention(Rerum Novarum, 35) of existing evils concerning which St. Thomas wrote and lamented. Also, vide: Rerum Novarum, 26.
36. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 13.
37. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 13; Rerum Novarum, 29, 33, and 35.
38. Rerum Novarum, 26.
39. De Reg., Lib. II, c. 3.
40. Rerum Novarum, 5 and 35.
41. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. lxxviii, a. 1.
42. Rerum Novarum, 35.
43. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, a. lxvi, a. 8, ad. 3.
44. Murphy, op. cit., pp. 161-2.
45. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. lxx, a. 1.
46. Rerum Novarum, 2.
47. Vide: n. 4.
48. De. Reg., Lib. I, cc. 9 and 13; Immortale Dei, 2.
49. Com. Polit., Lib. V, lect. 1; Rerum Novarum, 18, 19, and 20.
50. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14.
51. Com. Polit., Lib. V, lect. 7: "...For it is true, as Leo XIII has wisely pointed out, that without proper religious and moral instruction 'every form of intellectual cultural will be injurious, for young people not accustomed to respect God, will be unable to bear the restraint of a virtuous life, and having never learned to deny themselves anything, they will easily be incited to disturb the public order.'..." Pius XI, Rappresentanti in Terra, 23.
52. Murphy, op. cit., p. 145, fnt. 554.
53. Sapientiae Christianae, 22.
54. For full treatment of this point see the following sections of Pope Pius XI's encyclical Rappresentanti in Terra: all of

part 2, esp., 11, 17, 23, 34, 51-3; 81-2, 89.

55. Vide: n. 51.
56. De Reg., Lib. I, cc. 10, 11, and 15.
57. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. lviii; Immortale Dei, 2.
58. Summa Theol., 2a 2ae, q. lviii, a. 1.
59. Immortale Dei, 23; Rerum Novarum, 45.
60. Murphy, op. cit., p. 171.
61. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14; Contra Gentiles, Lib. III, c. 34; Immortale Dei, 20.
62. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14.
63. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14; Sapientiae Christianae, 16 and 17.
64. Murphy, op. cit., p. 172.
65. Idem., fnt. 675.
66. McSorley, J., An Outline History of the Church (St. Louis: Herder, 1944), p. 811.
67. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14.
68. Sapientiae Christianae, 15.
69. Immortale Dei, 6; also, vide: n. 67.
70. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14.
71. Immortale Dei, 6.
72. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 14.
73. Inscrutabili, 3.
74. De Reg., Lib. I, c. 15.
75. Immortale Dei, 18; also, vide: De Reg., Lib. I, cc. 1-6.
76. Immortale Dei, 17.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I. Primary Sources.

A. St. Thomas of Aquina.

Summa Theologica (Vives edition)  
Summa Contra Gentiles  
De Regimine Principum  
Commentaria in Politica  
Commentarium in IV Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri  
Lombardi

Phelan, G., Ph. D., trans., On The Government of Rulers  
(New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938).

B. Pope Leo XIII.

Inscrutabili, from: (Husslein, J., Social Wellsprings  
(Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943).

Arcanum  
Diuturnum  
Immortale Dei  
Libertas Humana  
Sapientiae Christianae  
Rerum Novarum

II. Secondary Sources.

Benkert, G., O.S.B., Ph. D., The Thomistic Conception of  
an International Society (Washington, D.C.: Catholic  
University Press, 1942).

Murphy, E., St. Thomas' Political Doctrine and Democracy  
(Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1921).

"Statement of American Bishops," Catholic Chronicle,  
Toledo Diocesan Weekly, Nov. 24, 1944.

