BE AN OWNER
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As America continues to undergo the painful process of getting back to normal after the war, it is to be hoped that greater opportunities and encouragement will be given to those who wish to open their own businesses or to buy their own homes. By thus extending a helping hand to prospective owners we can check the tendencies that have threatened to snuff out our important right to property. The Communists and Socialists want no part of this right since they think the political officers of the community should control all the means of production. Although Capitalism should favor individual enterprise, it, too, with its gradual limiting of ownership and control to a small number of free citizens, has run the risk of overlooking the greater mass of the people. But a reawakening should be expected and fostered. Hence, with a trust in the future resurgence of the "small owner" and with the hope of more privately owned establishments, when building and buying conditions will permit, it is well to recall some primary notions about the right to property.

EXTENT OF THE RIGHT

Man’s right to own is by no means unconditioned and unlimited. Rather, as is briefly noted by Rev. Ferdinand Cavallera, S.J.: "Property is the right to dispose freely of material goods within the limits of the law."\(^1\) To illustrate, if a governing body has determined certain areas of a town to be used only for private homes, no one can build a dairy or laundry in that section and then resort to his property rights in order to defend his action. Again, under ordinary circumstances, a citizen who attempted to make firewood out of an elm in a city park would soon find that his recourse to property rights as a justification would be use-

---

less. These procedures would destroy the balance between right and obligation or duty. What the right does mean is that no owner can, or should, be unduly curtailed in his use of private property, i.e., in his authority over "... any wealth or means of production as may, by the arrangements of society, be in the control of persons or corporations other than the political bodies of which these persons or corporations in another aspect are members." However, this offers only a general view. In actual practice, certain particular elements must be noted.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RIGHT

The tramp with the empty stomach, ragged clothes and moneyless pockets shows what a fair application of property rights, either on the tramp's or on society's part, would not produce. Before all else, by this right every man should have what is necessary for his present needs. Nor does it stop with the here and now. To have a warm fire tonight but an empty coal bin for the next few weeks; to have a sufficient meal this evening with the prospect of very little for the future; to be able to live only from day to day likewise reflects a misuse or negligence of this basic right. Therefore, in addition to daily requirements, provision for the time ahead and for periods of emergency should be made and expected. Yet, no one need do an intellectual or moral somersault to achieve the much talked of state of sufficiency. For example, the man who runs a grocery store or the owner of a haberdashery ought to be able to reach economic security without sacrificing his morality and good sense. When one has to resort to deception to make a living, he is actually shackled by the social setup and is guilty of distorting the proper order that should exist between economics and morality. Intelligently applied property rights would preclude, to a great extent, that perversion.

Such are some of the effects and implications of the right to property. Now we shall look more closely at the right itself. How can we account for this right? How can we defend this privilege? Passing over the reasons that rise from the necessity of self preservation and from the requirements of a healthy family life, we turn to the precise teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas for an adequate answer.

---

Be An Owner

BASIC IN NATURE

With his usual keenness, the Angelic Doctor goes to the heart of the problem. He centers his treatment of property around the Virtue of Justice and concludes with the Psalmist, who declared: “You have subjected all things under his feet,” that man has a natural right to possess exterior things.\(^3\) Not that any human being has power over the very nature of property—to assert that would be to usurp a power of God, to Whom all things are in subjection. But rather, as the Patron of the Schools points out, man has a natural dominion over external things. Each man can build a home, reap his crops, run his business and use the things of the world according to the manner in which they were made for him. Not because of any prowess as a home owner or shipbuilder or manufacturer does he acquire the right to utilize the goods of the earth; but simply because he is a rational creature with a free will does he have a certain control over the use of external things which have been created for his benefit.

THE RIGHT INDIRECTLY NECESSARY

Yet when it is said that man has a natural dominion over earthly goods it must be noted that natural rights are not all of equal importance. Defining a natural right as that which is “... derived from the nature of the individual and existing for his welfare,”\(^4\) we distinguish three main types. The right to life is the most basic and most important in every circumstance. In fact it is “... the end to which even civil society is a means.”\(^5\) Next come the rights of the second class, or rights that are required for the reasonable well-being of most members of a community. As an example, the institution of marriage can be cited. Some may choose not to marry, but for the majority of individuals the married state is a necessity since it is the direct natural means to reasonable life. Finally, in the third class of rights we find the right to property. While the rights to life and to marriage are direct, that is, directly necessary for man, the right to own is only indirectly needed for man’s well-being on earth. To put it in another way, one may not own any of the means of production and yet he may maintain a decent existence. Actually,

\(^3\) St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Ila Ilae, Q. 66, art. 1 & 2.
such is the case with most inhabitants of the big cities. The or-
dinary worker in a metropolis can satisfy his needs without
owning a house or growing his vegetables or running a business.
Therefore, one can get along without being an owner.

On the other hand, as an individual member of society, each
citizen has certain needs that can be most capably satisfied by
the provisions of the social system. To care for these needs, it
is necessary that private ownership be accepted as a "social in-
ititution." The noted social writer quoted above explains the
necessity in these words: "It is necessary for the same reason
and in the same way as a civil police force. As the State is ob-
ligated to maintain a police force, so it is obliged to maintain a
system of private landownership." At the same time, this ob-
ligation does not mean that the State can determine who the
owners are to be. Though the right is indirect, it is nonetheless
valid and certain. Consequently, every man, not just a deter-
mined few, has the natural right to own. In rare instances and
for strong reasons the State may prevent certain individuals
from exercising their right. But generally the governing body
must recognize and respect this privilege of its citizens.

As a final note, it should be borne in mind that by being
granted the right, man is not necessarily obliged to exercise it.
It is the prerogative of the non-owner to prefer freely to do
nothing about his lack of possessions. On the same score, having
made his choice in this fashion, he cannot claim that an injustice
is being done him because he happens to have less than his neigh-
bor. Similarly, one who owns nothing cannot demand the goods
of another unless the non-owner is faced with starvation. Then
the Law of Justice allows the poverty-stricken one to insist
upon what is essential for life since the right to life comes first.
Outside of this exception, though, "... it belongs to what is
called Commutative Justice faithfully to respect the possessions
of others, not encroaching on the rights of another and thus ex-
ceeding the rights of ownership."  

CONCLUSIONS

The above are certain philosophical aspects of the right to
own. From the acceptance of such conclusions, it becomes clear
that man is much more than the beasts he directs and the ma-
chines he uses; and it also becomes evident that he must be ac­
corded the power to use his faculties of self-direction in the pos­
session and cultivation of property. As Pope Leo strikingly
wrote: “Every man has by nature the right to possess property
as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between
man and the animal creation, for the brute has no power of self­
direction, but is governed by two main instincts. . . . But with
man it is wholly different . . . it is the mind, or reason, which is
the predominant element in us who are human creatures.”8 Thus
the Marxian adherents and the Socialist advocates are ultimately
working contrary to the nature of man when they plead for com­
mon control of property. “Five-year plans” and State monopoly
will not change the human nature of the bourgeois or of the pro­
letariat, and that nature can insist upon its right to possession.

POSSIBLE OBJECTION

While defending our position in this matter, it is likely that
we will be confronted with the objection that the Natural Law
provides for all men and that, therefore, it dictates common
ownership. This is presuming too much. What should be said is
that the Natural Law simply makes no division of property; in
this way community of goods can be attributed to it. To the
Positive Law belongs the task of assigning, for example, the
boundaries of certain territories, or of determining the control
of particular materials, and such assignations are not contrary
to nature. Rather, Positive Law, supposing and being built upon
the Natural Law, thereby acts in conformity with it. With this
in mind, we can better appreciate the advice given by Pope Pius
XI when he said: “Provided that the Natural and Divine Law
be observed, the public authority, in view of the common good,
may specify more accurately what is licit and illicit for property
owners in the use of their possessions.”9

BE AN OWNER

Yes, to encourage small owners is a wise move. By doing
so, we add to our own security and to the harmony of society.
More important, we thereby protect our freedom, inasmuch as

8 Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum* (International Catholic Truth Society
the benefits of diffused property are "... a buttress to freedom, because they make men independent of the domination of other wills. This is as striking spiritually as socially and economically, for the fear of the 'sack,' or extreme poverty, is a deterrent to the good use of reason and frequently to good morals."¹⁰