

AN OPEN LETTER

(IN TERRIS ET LABOREM)

TO

THE SUPREME PONTIFF

JOHN PAUL II

AND TO HIS VENERABLE BROTHERS

IN THE EPISCOPATE

TO THE PRIESTS

TO THE RELIGIOUS FAMILIES

TO THE SONS AND DAUGHTERS

OF MAN

AND TO ALL MEN AND WOMEN

OF GOOD WILL

ON LAND AND IN LABOUR

ON

THE HUNDREDTH AND SECOND ANNIVERSARY

OF

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

(IN TERRIS ET LABOREM)

Your Holiness, I: GREETINGS:

On land and in labour man must earn his sustenance by the sweat
en:3:29 of his brow *, for man is born of God and is the inheritor of
EN:1:10 God's gift, the earth* on which he is dependent and over which he
EN:1:28 has been given dominion*. As all are in agreement that "only man is
Efw4/10 capable of work"* and that only through his labour can man partake
of dominion over God's gift, the earth, in accordance with God's
P Bk intent and with natural law*, it follows that the field of man's
II/I work, his "workbench", in your own felicitous phrase, lies in the
great God-given garden of the globe itself:- in brief, the land of
the earth entire.

It is the blindness of some to the inalienable right of all free
man to free access to all the free land of the garden, that still
blinds humanity to the great light of God's truth "the land shall

ev 25/26 not be sold forever - for the land is mine" *.

However, it is not labour, the holy duty which God himself has
ordained for all men, that contains within itself "the unceasing
measure of human toil and suffering, and also of the harm and
injustice which penetrate deeply into social life within individual
E I-6: nations and on the international level*": no, a holy duty that is
/13 proclaimed by God, the creator, and the tool which man must use

for dominion over the earth cannot objectively contain harm,

injustice, toil, and suffering, for labour (or work) which is dutiful, divine, just, economic, and moral, cannot at the same time be its own opposite. Only if the duty of free labour (or work) is degraded by some other process can it become slavery - that is true toil and suffering, causing harm and injustice.

What is this process that degrades God's given duty to work into man's economic slavery?

Herein, in this question lies the beginning and the end of wisdom, the alpha¹ omega that will resolve the "many tensions, conflicts and crises which in relationship with the reality of work disturb the life of individual societies and also all humanity*".

Le I6:20/24

We are celebrating the hundredth and second anniversary of the Georgian Gospel "Progress and Poverty", on the eve of the greatest global material and spiritual crises the garden of eden has ever experienced. These crises will, as you rightly say, "require a re-ordering and adjustment to the structures of the modern economy and of the distribution of work*".

LEI-7:13/15

How is this to be achieved? Let us see.

It is not true, as your Holiness asserts, that God has ordained that "the heritage of nature is limited*²". For to limit the heritage of nature is to limit nature and to limit nature is

LEI-7:6/7

to limit God. Nor, therefore, does it follow that economic and technological changes "will probably involve a reduction or a less rapid increase in material well being for the more well developed countries*". Only if nature and God are limited must we thus rob from Peter to pay Paul.

EI-7:18/20

The nature of God, of the Kingdom of God on earth, and of man himself denies limits to goodness, prosperity, free will, or increase. "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it"* is the true and divine word of God.

en 1:28

Because man has a duty to be fruitful and multiply and to fill the world, subdue and dominate it, God has given him a tool for this work and this, his tool, is work:- labour is both at once the duty and the right of man, if he is to fulfill his created role as man. God, the architect, has planned and created the world for man and man is ordained by natural law to have dominion over the land;- this dominion as you so rightly say he exercises through work.

Truly his labour is his prayer.

As you say, "(work) as an activity for man to carry out in the world (shows) its very deepest essence. Man is the image of God partly through the mandate received from his creator to subdue, to dominate, the earth. In carrying out this mandate man, every human being, reflects the very action of the creator

of the universe" For every man work is therefore as you rightly

Furthermore, work (or labour) as your Holiness goes on to say,
"presupposes a specific dominion by man over "the earth" and in
its turn it develops and confirms this dominion*".

Moreover it is profoundly true as your Holiness clearly sees
and says, that the earth (or land) is not only "that fragment
of the visible universe that man inhabits*" but also "by
extension", however it can be understood as the whole of the
visible world as it comes within the range of man's influence

and of his striving to satisfy his needs*" or as the great
prophet of the science of political economy states "land in
economy is in short all natural materials, forces, and
opportunities... a fertile field, a rich vein of ore, a
falling stream which supplies power... the term land necessarily
includes not merely the surface of the earth as distinguished
from the water and the air but the whole material universe

outside man himself*" in brief it is all of God's ordained and
divine creation.

This land is the "earth" over which man has been given dominion
by God. And by the sweat of his brow, this dominion over the
land is to be exercised. Of necessity therefore it follows that
if every man is ordained freely to labour, every man is freely
ordained to have full and free access to the whole land as the
work place for his divinely ordained "workbench".

Thus, this land "the earth", is the gift of God to all men.

Now, since both the church, through your witness, "is convinced that work is a fundamental dimension of man's existence on earth*" and science through the natural law of Georgics convinces the intellect of the fundamental truth of human work on the earth therefore truly "what is a conviction of the

II 4-13-10/11 intellect is also a conviction of faith*" and therefore the words that ordain man to work "placed ~~at~~ the beginning of the

E II 4:15-15/
17 bible, never cease to be relevant*" and if they are relevant because they never cease to be relevant (for what convinces both intellect and faith must transcend time and be forever relevant) then it follows that work as a fundamental dimension of man's existence is still now relevant and will remain of eternal relevance both now and in the future while man exists on earth.

So that no matter what its fields or endeavour, nor the transmutations it may undergo in technological, automated, or micro-chipped means, "none of these phenomena of

"acceleration" exceeds the essential content of what was said

LE II 4:15-30/
33 in that most ancient of biblical texts*" . Furthermore it is true that "this process is, at the same time universal: it embraces all human beings every generation, every phase of economic and cultural development, and at the same time it is a process that takes place within each human being, in each

E II 4:16-10/15conscious human subject*" so that if any man exists he has both the God given duty and the human right to work.

"He that shall not work neither shall he eat" is both a divine ordinance and a material fact.

In order for divine justice to operate in the field of work it is necessary only for all men to have access to all the fields of the world in order to work, so that "each and every individual, to the proper extent and in an incalculable number of ways" may take "part in the giant process whereby man "subdues the earth" through his work*".

But in what capacity is man to earn his dominion over the earth? In justice, must every man not earn his right to dominion over the earth by respecting the equal right of all other men to the same opportunity to dominion over the earth?

And if every man has the duty and the right to work in order to survive, is it not equally just that no man has a right to dominion over the earth unless he carry out his duty and his right to work? If we can discern unequal rights to work or inequalities of opportunity to work or unequal duties in work or if we see those who dominate the earth but do not work, do we not thereby discern wherein lies the "increasing measure of human toil and suffering and also the harm and injustice which penetrate deeply into social life?*"

For is it not true, as was declared by the first national assembly of France, that "ignorance, neglect, or contempt of human rights are the sole causes of public misfortunes and corruptions of government*"? And is not the ignorance, neglect and contempt of present day governments to the human

E II 4-17/20

E II:6-9/13

face of the earth, which is God's gift to all men?

Is it not the inception and conclusion of all matters as the prophet of the gospel of the good labourer on the good earth has stated "that we should do unto others as we would have them do to us - that we should respect the rights of others as scrupulously as we would have our own rights respected:*" For this "is not a mere counsel of perfection to individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform social institutions and national policy if we would secure the blessings of abundance and peace*".

or FT?
b Cit

or FT?
b Cit

II The Priority of Land

We now ask, is the earth the workbench of the ~~Lawd~~ or is it the work place? If we are to secure the blessings of abundance and peace we must respect the rights and duties of all men to labour and to deny to no man the opportunity and the choice to work.

But since the only field on which man can work is the earth, it follows that he who dominates the land without working denies his fellow man the right to work and in the end the right to exist. So that if man under natural law can only dominate the earth through work he who dominates the land without work is by logical reduction either himself the creator of the land, or else an unlawful usurper of God's gift.

Now since God created the earth, no man can dominate the earth

through mere assertion of the right of ownership of the land.

For to assert ownership of land is to deny God's law that all of creation is divine and a gift from providence. So that the only just means of the domination of the earth is through work. For by man's work and by the effort of his labour he will dominate the earth. By asserting owners dominion over the earth without work one man may steal both the earth and the fruits of another man's work. This usurpation of the land by some who assert an unjust dominion through land ownership is the only stumbling block to the achievement of social justice through universal human rights to work.

But regretably, your Holiness stands mute in the fact of this obvious, this evil, this flagrant, injustice:- private ownership of the land.

It is not that "in some instances technology can cease to be man's ally and become almost his enemy"*. But that some landlords usurp and monopolize the ownership of the land, the gift of all men, that first causes injustice, toil, harm and the social tensions we see all about us.

As your Holiness rightly proclaims "agriculture constitutes through human work a primary field of economic activity and an indispensable factor of production"*. Indeed only two factors of production exist - land and labour - the creator's garden and the created being, man. For in as much as there is

E II 5:18 -
6/28

E VI 6:1931/
32

my basic conflict between man and his environment the land:-

so too, there is no prime conflict between man and his duty and his right to work.

Further there is no fatal conflict between man and his tools, his capital, his technology, his means of production. All these are natural outgrowths of the divine ordinance that man is to achieve dominion over the earth through his work.

The conflict arises only when something or someone PREVENTS any man from achieving dominion over the earth through his own ~~work~~ work. Conflict only arises when someone prevents any man working. Conflict, depression, crisis, war all stem from unemployment.

"This explains why the analysis of human work in the light of the words concerning man's "dominion" over the earth goes to the very heart of the ethical and social question"*. What causes unemployment?

What is "the cause of industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth*?" Now, if we think of the land as the prime or given factor of production we can trace the error incipient in your Holiness's confusion between work place and workbench implicit in your Holiness's assertion that there is a division inherent between employer and employed between capitalist and labourer. It is on this ontological confusion that your Holiness falls into error. It is not that "the

E II 7:25-29

P Subtitle

LE people into classes according to the type of work done*" nor
that "by broadening certain aspects that already belonged to the
old Testament Christianity brought about a fundamental change of
LE ideas in this field*". It is by natural law rather that man
produces wealth through the division of labour. As the prophet
of San Francisco "St. George" has said "the ~~two~~ primary factors
of production are land and labour without which nothing whatever
can be produced. To these essential factors is added when
production passes beyond primitive forms a third factor **capital** -
which consists of the product of land and labour (wealth) used
for the purpose of facilitating the production of more wealth...
there can be no labour until there is a man; there can be no
capital until man has worked and saved; but land was there before
or FT? man came*". So if man is the worker, capital is his workbench
hap. XVII and land, and only land, his work place. Wherein lies the threat
of unemployment if the worker has a workbench if not in the
universal denial to him of a work place? If the worker
contributes his exertion and the capitalist his workbench
what does the landlord contribute?

"The landowner furnishes - what? The superficies of the earth?
The latent powers of the soil? The ores beneath it? The rain?
The sunshine? Gravitation? The chemical affinities? What does
the landowner furnish that involves any contribution from him
to the execution required in production? The answer must be -
nothing!"* And in justice and equity if nothing is contributed
or FT? to production nothing is due in ~~dis~~tribution. Yet the landowner,
hap. XVII Cit usurper of God's kingdom of the earth demands as "all his" what

usurpation by man of God's domain and "in doing this we must always keep in mind the biblical calling to subdue the earth in which is expressed the will of the creator that work should enable man to achieve that dominion in the visible world that is proper to him*". Your Holiness asserts that as a result of historical events a great conflict arose "between Capital" and "labour", that is to say between the small but highly influential group of entrepreneurs, owners or holders of the means of production, and the broader multitude of people who lacked these means and who shared in the process of production solely by their labour. The conflict originated in the fact that the workers put their powers at the disposal of the entrepreneurs and these following the principle of maximum profit tried to establish the lowest possible wages for the work done by the employees*". Let us test this statement by appeal to intellect and to faith. Intellect tells us that no workbench can produce without a worker but that a worker can produce without a workbench and that furthermore without a work place to stand on neither worker nor workbench can produce at all. Therefore it is not true that labour put itself voluntarily at the disposal of capital. It is true that landless workers driven into the city by the exploiting and enclosing land owners of the rural areas were and still are exploited through their lack of a work-place by those who owned the work-places and subsequently the workbenches and thereby forced the landless proletariat into factories as wage slaves and landless workers.

E II 9:9-13

E III 11:39-
1-10

that man is to subdue the earth we know that these words refer to all the resources contained in the visible world and placed at man's disposal. However these resources can only serve man through work*. That is to say that all the riches of the earth are freely open to man and to every man provided that he work. So we see the priority of the land and the primacy of man's labour established in relationship to each other and that

"therefore what is a conviction of the intellect is also a conviction of faith*". I know through intellect and believe through faith in the priority of land subsisting and

underlying the primacy of labour as man's only title to the fruits of the garden of this earth. Therefore, your Holiness

is wrong to assert that "to enable through his work to make these resources bear fruit man takes over ownership of small

parts of the various riches of nature*". In this lies your fundamental error, Holy Father, for it neither convinces us from intellect nor inspires us through faith. It is not true

that man can take over the world by ownership; but that

"he takes all these things over by making them his workbench, he takes them over through work and for work*". Your Holiness

is correct when you say "in every phase of the development of his work man comes up against the leading role of the gift

made by nature, that is to say in the final analysis by the

creator*". So that everything is as you say the result of

work, everything that is but the very gift of nature itself:

the land, and its natural resources - because the land is not

the result of work but the gift of God. The land is the field

of man's dominion and no man may dare

LE III
12/21-24

LE II 4:13-
10/11

LE III 12:
42-1/4

LE III 12:
42-5/8

*LE III 12:
42-28/30

to lay claim to exclusive ownership of God's gift, the land. This is as true and as just as to say that no church may lay claim to exclusive monopoly of the word of God which is like the land, free and equal to all men. Therefore while all men may use the gifts of nature in their work no man may dare assert an exclusive or inclusive right of ownership in any gift of nature, resource, land nor portion of the visible natural world which is a gift of God given to us - "totus tuos" given by our one own God to all of us, his children, all his sons and daughters, world without end, from here to eternity, from first to last, on earth as it is in heaven.

III PROPERTY AND THEFT:

"As we view the whole human family throughout the world, we cannot fail to be struck by a disconcerting fact of immense proportions: the fact that while conspicuous natural resources remain unused there are huge numbers of people who are unemployed or under-employed and countless multitudes suffering from hunger*".

What appears as a disconcerting fact to your Holiness proves to us the correctness of the gospel of Henry George that no peace, no prosperity, no justice, nor love could exist on earth while some men sinfully asserted in the face of God's divine prohibition, their own unlawful "right" to own any portion or any part of the earth and to thereby deprive their brothers of existence except on such terms as make unemployment, hunger and despair, a necessary condition of

Who prohibits the use of those "conspicuous resources which remain unused?"*

Who, indeed, but those who assert the "legal right" of human property in land?

As your Holiness knows, man fought for four thousand years from Prince Moses to President Lincoln in order to deny the right of human property in labour.

After turmoil and civil war, exodus and social commotion, the slaves were freed and the sound of the shofar was heard in the Synagogue "proclaiming liberty unto all the land and all the inhabitants thereof*".

Now is the time fast approaching when the remaining twin evil:- the assertion of a right of human property in land must itself soon be forsaken.

As the supreme Pontiff, your Holiness truly discerns that "working at any workbench, whether a relatively primitive or an ultra-modern one, a man can easily see that through his work he enters into two inheritances:- the inheritance of what is given to the whole of humanity in the resources of nature, and the inheritance of what others have already developed on the basis of those resources"*. But it is through his own labour that man enters into this inheritance, not through primogeniture. purchase. ownership nor power. but through

Lev 25:26

God's gift of life and through man's own exertion of effort, through holy labour does each man enter into God's kingdom.

The keys of the kingdom are held not by priest, pontiff nor landlord not by capitalist, union leader nor commissar, not by secretary general, president nor premier. Not by state nor church, not multi-national corporation, state employer, employee, ~~bureaucrat~~, planner, soldier, nor policeman but by God himself, creator of the universe, who by the individual gift of life bestows the keys to the kingdom of heaven through the duty and the right to work for every man, to every man, in justice and in right, in duty and in peace "with malice toward none and charity for all"*, on earth as it is in heaven.

AL II ND IA

PP Bk VII
Chap. 1 pg.
334

"What constitutes the rightful basis of property?"* Your Holiness admits that this social, this moral, this material problem is a fundamental "thus the issue of ownership of property enters from the beginning into the whole of this historical process. The encyclical Rerum Novarum which has the social question as its theme stresses this issue also, recalling and confirming the church's teaching on ownership, on the right to private property, even when it is a question of the means of production. The encyclical Mater et Magistra did the same*". Your predecessors in the supreme Magisterium Leo XIII and the good John XXIII (of blessed memory) are in error and your Holiness is also unhappily in error in the

LE III
14/50

right (of private property) as absolute and untouchable.

On the contrary, it has always understood this right within the broader context of the right common to all to use the goods of the whole of creation: the right to private property is subordinated to the right to common use, to the fact that goods are meant for everyone"*. . .

In what lies your Holiness's error?

It resides in the confusion between the undoubted right of all to common access to the resources of the whole of creation and to the undoubted right of each to private property in the "goods" produced by the exertion of his individual human labour on those resources,

Thus when your Holiness carelessly refers to "goods" as meaning "resources" you create a conditional, limited, and subordinate "right" to private property. Now a "right" which is conditional, limited, or subordinate is not a right but a revokable licence and thus if your Holiness is correct to abrogate, supercede, revoke, or confiscate private property is perfectly just and correct if one accepts that "private property is sub-ordinate to the right to common use"*. . .

In what way then are the communists, the socialists, the collectivists of any party or any group wrong when they assert the utilitarian or totalitarian right of "the greatest good

EBM against the state"*, and the sovereignty of the collective over the individual if the supreme pontiff, yourself also asserts "from this point of view, therefore, in consideration of human labour and of common access to the goods meant for man, one cannot exclude the socialization, in suitable conditions, of certain means of production"?

E

How does this unholy writ differ in one jot and tittle from socialism, communism, fascism, multinationalism, or crude materialism?

No, your Holiness, in confusing "goods meant for man" with "human labour" and "common access" you fall into the error of excluding the minor premise.

That private property is an inalienable, inviolable, irrevokable and natural right stems from the undoubted right of man to the fruits of his own labour. For, before his fall, Adam had no need of labour "and God said, behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed: to you it shall be for meat". And as our redeemer Christ Jesus prayed "Give us this day our daily bread". So that in the beginning not merely the earth but the entire fruits of it were a gift of God.

Gen 1:29

STM But after his fall, God ordained to Adam "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread"* and human labour to subdue the

Gen 3-28

his word were sufficient to give Adam dominion to subdue the world "and whatsoever Adam called every living creature that was the name thereof"*. For "in the beginning was the word

Gen. 2:19

and the word was with God and the word was God*". But since

St. John 1:1

(after the fall) human labour was the substitute God gave

Adam for the word of God which Adam had disobeyed, the gift

of God's bread before the fall became the fruit of man's

labour after the fall. In the ineffable mystery of the mass

and the miracle of transubstantiation God is eternally redeeming

man through his own flesh in order to return Adam to the holy

Gen 1:29

garden eastward in Eden where "to you it shall be for meat"*. But until the entire earth has thus been reconsecrated and

redeemed in toto, the right of private property in the fruits

of labour are inviolate, absolute, ordained, and inalienable. For in the sight of God "all men are created equal and that

they are endowed with certain inalienable rights and that among

Doi

these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"*

is the gospel of work.

For, "what is it that enables man justly to say of a thing

"it is mine"? From what springs the sentiment which acknowledges

his exclusive right as against all the world?" Is it not,

primarily, the right of a man to himself, to the use of his

own powers, to the employment of the fruits of his own

exertion?... as a man belongs to himself, so his labour when

put in concrete form belongs to him, and for this reason,

that which a man makes or produces is his own, as against

all the world - to enjoy or to destroy to use, to exchange

or to give. No-one else can rightfully claim it, and his exclusive right to it involves no wrong to anyone else.

Thus there is to everything produced by human exertion a clear and indisputable title to exclusive possession and enjoyment which is perfectly consistent with justice and it descends from the original producer, in whom it is vested by natural law". So that it is clear that private property resides only in the fruits of labour and production and cannot reside in the factors or means of production. The earth belongs to man precisely in the same way as his labour belongs to himself but man cannot buy nor sell the earth as he cannot buy nor sell himself. Man is inalienable both from himself and from the earth:- these two factors of production cannot be bought nor sold without alienating man from God and thus denying holy writ.

No man has a right to sell himself or another into slavery, for liberty is inalienable;- likewise no man has a right to take or to give life, for life is inalienable, so too no man has a right to give or to take property in land for the land is the gift of God and inalienable from all men.

Therefore your Holiness falls into careless error, when you state that "in certain developing countries, millions of people are forced to cultivate the land belonging to others and are exploited by the big land owners, without any hope of ever being able to gain possession of even a small piece of land of their own". Why should any man "hope of ever being

able to gain possession of land : Land is
God, its only creator. It is profoundly true as you go on
to say that "land which could be cultivated is left
abandoned by the owners*".

Is this not the main Primum Mobile of your own "disconcerting
fact of immense proportions" the fact that, while conspicuous
natural resources remain unused there are huge numbers of
people who are unemployed or under-employed and countless
multitudes suffering from hunger*?" Truly as your Holiness
says "in many situations radical and urgent changes are
therefore needed in order to restore to agriculture and to
rural people their just value as the basis for a healthy
economy within the social community's development as a whole*".
But these "radical and urgent changes" are not "the defense
of legal titles to land", "the right to work, to free
association", "sharing in decisions" or "gaining possession
of small pieces of land by peasants"*.

The only real urgent and radical change required is to deny
the private ownership of land - for private property in land
is the sole injustice that prevents the just solution to the
dilemma of poverty amidst progress. For in as much as the
rights to private property in the fruits of labour derive from
the right of man to himself and is the only necessary and
sufficient title to property so "there is no other rightful
title in property because (1st) there is no other natural
right from which any other title can derive, and (2nd) because

LE IV 21-78
14/28

LE IV Ob Cit

the recognition of any other title is inconsistent with and destructive of this."* Your Holiness is in error and confusion when you assert "property is acquired first of all through work in order that it may serve work". For that is to say that man is made for the sabbath and not that the sabbath is made for man" Rather is it true that property is acquired in the fruits of work through work as a result of man's right to himself and therefore to the fruits of his labour not in order that his own property may serve work but that his own property may serve himself. To assert that property is acquired "to serve work" is to justify the total acquisition of title to land and to the labour of man in order "to serve work". As the prophet of San Francisco has said "what most prevents the realisation of the injustice of private property in land is the habit of including all the things that are made the subject of ownership in one category, as property or if any distinction be made, drawing the line according to the unphilosophical distinction of the lawyers, between personal property and real estate or things movable or immovable. The real and natural distinction is between things which are the produce of labour and things which are the gratuitous offerings of nature; or, to adopt the terms of political economy, between wealth and land. These two classes of things are in essence and relations widely different, and to class them together as property is to confuse all thought when we come to consider the justice or injustice, the right or the wrong of property"* . For as Henry George goes on to say "a house and

PP Ob Cit

LE Ob Cit

PP Ob Cit

the lot on which it stands are alike property, as being the subject of ownership, and are likewise classed by the lawyers as real estate alike, yet in nature and relations they differ widely. The one is produced by human labour, and belongs to the class in political economy styled wealth, the other is a part of nature and belongs to the class in political economy styled land"*. As you say, Holy Father, "in the first place work is "for man" and not man "for work"*. That is to say man is the subject of work and not to be merely subjected to work as an object.

Man is the subject of work and work is "for" him, because after Adam's fall only through work could man order, subdue and dominate nature and because only through work does man derive title to property in the produce of the earth. Thus the divine ordinance of the inalienable right of private property in the production of wealth directly opposes materialistic, utilitarian socialist or economistic thought;- labour, as you truly say, seen in materialistic terms as a commodity carries with it "the danger of treating work as a special kind of merchandise"* or as an impersonal force needed for production especially when the whole way of looking at the question of economics is marked by the premises of materialistic economism* but then why is it that "various ideological or power systems and new relationships which have arisen at various levels of society have allowed flagrant injustices to persist or have created new ones"? Is it not precisely because these ideological and power systems have alienated and confused the

PP Ob Cit

LE III
6: 22/25

LE

LE Ob. Cit

LE II 8/28

right of man to private exclusive property in the fruits of his own labour and have denied the right of humanity to the free and unfettered access to all the resources of nature as of right?

Study any ideology or power structures that allow flagrant injustices to persist or have created new ones and you will find, Your Holiness, that the expropriation of private property in the fruits of capital and labour and the alienation of capital and labour from the free access to nature is a prime fact of such exploitation. Only by these two means can injustice in the sphere of political economy arise. For in as much as the prophet has said "three things unite to production labour, capital and land, three parties divide the produce the labourer, the capitalist and the land owner. If with the increase of production the labourer gets no more and the capitalist gets no more it is a necessary inference that the land owner reaps the whole gain"*. So do we see how this injustice does march on.

"It is clear that recognition of the proper position of labour and the worker in the production process demands various adaptations in the sphere of the right to ownership of the means of production*". What are these natural "adaptations which are becoming necessary in the spheres of the rights of ownership to the factors of production"? If not they be the final fulfillment of the right of inalienable private property

and the concurrent denial

of the right of private property in the factors of production be they either land or labour?

Therein lies the only necessary, sufficient and radically moral, just and satisfactory adaptations required to ensure the just return of wages for the sufficient exertion of labour; the just return of interest for the sufficient input of capital; and the just socialisation of rent for the sufficient use of the land in the factors of production of the created wealth of nations.

Only by means of the exertions of human labour applied to nature's land with the aid of wealth's capital can the wealth of nations be created.

It is in the just and due proportion and relations of the three factors of production that property in the fruits of labour will be secure, and the equality of social justice be achieved in free and ~~equal~~ access to the resources of nature so that man may work out his destiny on earth at his workbench in his work place, free and equal in the light of the Christian cross and in the hope of eternal redemption.

IV INDIVIDUAL INSPIRATION

Within the broad context of human life, human rights proceed from human duties and the rights of man are dependent on the duties of man

From the individual inspiration of the indwelling soul the problem of individual life is centred on the Pelagian categorical imperative "if I ought I can".

Following this call of the spirit the radical founder of the national movement for a united Italy appealed to your predecessor in the supreme magisterum, Pius IX, to lead the Italian people as the vicar of God to a free, theocratic, republican, catholic, and united Italy. He proclaimed from the rostra of the tribunes of the Roman republic "no war of classes, no hostility to existing wealth, no want and unnecessary or unjust spoliation of the rights of private property, but a constant disposition to ameliorate the material conditions of those classes least favoured by fortune", and for these patriot pains, the Pontiff called down upon the republicans of Rome the shells of the Bonapartist French army Cannon in the sack of the holy city in 1849. Yet Giuseppe Mazzini, Italian prophet of God and of the people, was right in 1849 and today the Italian republic stands, united, free, a member of his dream of the United States of Europe, and yet the papacy itself is now bereft of temporal power, Italian lands and rents and acknowledges tacitly the final division

Thus in 1849 Mazzini was right and Pius IX was wrong. A generation later in 1891 the radical American founder of the world-wide movement for the abolition of private ownership in the means of production land, appealed to your predecessor in the supreme magisterum, Leo XIII, to acknowledge the inequity of private property in land. He proclaimed this crusade in a vividly and movingly and lovingly printed open letter to the Pope of which we too today celebrate the 90th anniversary.

"How sad it is to see a church in all its branches offering men stones instead of bread and thistles instead of figs, from Protestant preachers to Pope avowed teachers of Christianity are with few exceptions preaching armgiving or socialism and ignoring the simple remedy of justice"* for "as has been pointed out many times, the essence of Henry George's economics is ethical - the natural order - justice. It carries with it a profound belief in the all maker; it pulses with the conviction of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man"* and in all this ferment the Catholic church stood mute, replying not ~~th~~ the earnest entreaty that "our postulates are all stated or implied in your encyclical, they are the primary perceptions of human reason, the fundamental teachings of the Christian faith, (in which) we earnestly seek the judgement of religion*". But answer from Rome came there none.

Yet, your Holiness, in 1891 Henry George was right and Leo XIII

Life of
Henry George
Bk. 13

Ibid

bid

if the Catholic church be a true mother and teacher it will not now deny the sons of man yet a third time, but accept and acknowledge the truth proclaimed in 1849 by Giuseppe Mazzini repeated in 1891 by Henry George and now witnessed yet again through the power of the holy spirit and through the words of the Gospel

from your own humble servant,

H.I.M.

DIO VOLENTE

- FINIS -

London - UK

October 1981

(Ninetieth anniversary of Henry George's

"Open letter to the Pope")

24th October 1981