

Prophecy and the Poor:

Fr Vincent McNabb and Distributism

Angela Cunningham

Fr Vincent McNabb (1868-1943) was one of the most widely-known Dominicans of the English Province from the years prior to the First World War up to his death in the Second. Apart from his work internally within the Order he was well-known to Londoners for his appearances for the Catholic Evidence Guild at Speakers' Corner in Hyde Park and for his involvement in social action, which sometimes made the tabloid headlines. He was involved in the ecumenical movement, in speaking and writing prolifically on all kinds of topics on all sorts of platforms and in all kinds of publications, sometimes far beyond Catholic or even Christian circles. He was a spiritual director and retreat giver of distinction, and he gave lectures on Aquinas under the auspices of the University of London Extension Lectures scheme – an unforgettable teacher according to many students. Clearly an apostolate of remarkable range.¹

He was a man who aroused strong feelings, and some within the Order were critical of him. One of the grounds for criticism concerned his involvement with Distributism, the social and philosophical movement most commonly associated with Belloc and Chesterton, and it is this area of his life which provides the focus of this article.

McNabb was unique in the influence he wielded in this most lay of movements, although in a private letter of 1932 Fr Vincent denied being a Distributist. His rejection of the label can perhaps provide a point of departure for trying to understand the place of Distributism in McNabb's thinking.

Fr Vincent was quite clear that he was, first, a Dominican priest and, secondly, a theologian. From an early age he had held firmly that priests should not be involved in politics – in 1914 he wrote in *The Tablet* that 'Tragic events during my school life in the North of Ireland have given me a deep-seated distaste for the priest-politician'. Whenever moral or ethical matters were involved, however, the priest was inevitably involved too, since he was the expert on ethical and moral questions. Since such aspects were involved at all levels of the social question, Fr Vincent was deeply involved in social matters. In an election in the 1920s, however, he

purposely did not vote because he wanted to keep 'his mind set on the ethical rather than on the political aspects of politics'. In the *Church and the Land*² we find that he considered that since *Rerum Novarum* had advocated the increase of small ownership Catholics *per se* were committed to bringing about the Distributive State. So it seems that his rejection of the Distributist label had more to do with his view of politics and the priesthood than with any rejection of Distributism.

McNabb's tackling of the social question did not only stem from his views of the responsibilities of the theologian/priest – his approach too was moulded by these views. His treatment of moral and ethical questions was primarily a scholastic procedure, a referring of particular situations back to first principles, to what in his terms was primary, and to his chief authorities, which were ever the Bible, Aquinas and the papal encyclicals, in particular *Rerum Novarum*. An example of this method can be found in a *New Witness* article in 1913 on the dubious activities of monopolies in the USA. The article, entitled 'A Dialogue on Confiscation', does for the monopolies by measuring their activities against the ten commandments, and finding them wanting.

THE FAMILY

All McNabb's Distributist concerns can be grouped under two headings, first industrialism and its consequences, and secondly, the land. In my view, however, it would be misleading to say, simply, that he developed his views on the necessity of a return to the land *because* of his analysis of the evils of industrialism (industrialism here = industrialization + capitalism), like so many other critics of industrialization, e.g. Eric Gill, the later Middleton Murry. Rather, I believe, his arguments in regard to both proceeded in a way jointly from his theology, and in particular his theology of the family, which was his central concern. That is, his advocacy of a return to the land was independent of his rejection of industrialism but dependent on his views of the family. I stress this because I believe it in part accounts for what has been termed the extreme nature of his views about what kind of a life should be lived on the land.

McNabb believed in a return to things primary, to the essentials of production and consumption of real things, rather than the secondaries of exchange and price and their concomitants, tokens rather than real things. Whereas the individual, and the individual soul, was the primary unit of the Church, he held that the family, not the individual, was the primary unit of society, with the Holy Family at Nazareth as *the* model to emulate. Interestingly, especially for someone from an Irish, usually much ramified situation,

what usually comes over as 'the family' is a nuclear family rather than an extended one. Politics and economics, normatively speaking, were subservient to ethics – and only a sound ethics could lead to sound economics. Without such sound (Thomist) ethics absurd situations had developed, such as 'the fallacy that the Fair Price and the Fair Wage are a relation to the work done and the thing made, and not to the Worker and the Maker'.³ As early as 1912 he was writing in the *New Witness* (in relation to the bitter miners' strike where the owners were cutting rates because of falling profits) that a living *family* wage was what the miners should have and that furthermore such a living family wage should be the first charge on any industry – not interest on capital.⁴ As usual *Rerum Novarum*, Aquinas and the scriptures provided his weapons.

Industrialism was rejected primarily because McNabb considered that as a system it was hostile to the good, if not the existence, of the family. To explain why he thought this was so, I can do no better than quote from McNabb:

Modern Industrialism

An occasion of sin was defined by the moralists
As a set of circumstances where the average man will sin,
But where the heroic man will not sin.
Occasions of sin must be judged not by what
a minority will do, but what an average person will do.
The thing we call Industrialism is an occasion of sin.
If the modern industrial arrangement of the world
Is such that to avoid sin needs heroic virtue,
Then the modern industrial arrangement of the world
Is an occasion of sin.
This arrangement has impoverished its followers.
When married folk have not the house room
necessary for the average family,
Then the average married folk
Will practise birth-prevention.
It is impossible for the modern industrial system
To give an economic wage,
Which will pay an economic rent.⁵

EUGENICS

That quotation refers mainly to birth control chosen by parents, but the wider field of eugenics was one where McNabb and the other early Distributists were very actively involved. The concern with the threat from eugenics was very important, and the whole history of this is relatively little-known. Particularly in the years just before and after the First World War the situation was

such that it is quite difficult for us today to grasp. Going back to the Boer War, when a very high proportion of recruits were found to be unfit for military service, disquiet about the future quality of the race began to be widely voiced among the English upper and middle classes, who seemed to be breeding less while the lower, 'unfit' classes were producing more. It was in this atmosphere of fear of being engulfed by Frankenstein's monster, the proletariat, that eugenic legislation got under way: it was assumed to be more progressive and scientific to stop the unfit from breeding rather than enable them to become more fit through a lessening of their poverty. Legislation such as the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913 was being put forward, and passed, and considered beneficial and progressive (by e.g. the Fabians), which allowed adults to be locked up for life, for children to be forcibly taken from their parents, and for sterilization to be urged if not forced upon those not considered worthy carriers of the race – all on the say of one or two 'experts'. G K Chesterton's novels, such as *The Ball and the Cross* quite often involve such happenings. One of the nastiest features of all this sort of legislation was that it was enforced only against the poor – and it was this which particularly incensed the *Eye-Witness* and later the *New Witness* and *G K's Weekly*.

McNabb, with many others associated with these journals, put much energy into combatting the 'Neo-Malthusianism' of 'science and sanitation', and Fr Vincent wrote many articles, and spoke at meetings up and down the country. His articles here fell into two main groups – diatribes against what he termed 'moral defectives', experts like Sir George Newman, the Chief MOH at the Ministry, and other Medical Officers of Health, who were advocating eugenic control of the poor, articles very much on the offensive. Secondly there were what could be termed his 'Biddy in the basement' articles, tales of ordinary people he'd met, usually poor, who were just the kind the Eugenists wished to expunge, but who were *good*. A good example of this kind of article is a story of a stereotyped drunken, violent Mick he'd come across in Leicester Gaol, who was pretty dim, just the C class the eugenists would deem unfit to breed and yet, claims McNabb, he was simple and holy.⁶ Without yet having sufficient evidence to be sure, I suspect that it was in some measure due to the fight that was put up by the weekly campaigns by the *Eye-Witness* and *New Witness* writers that not more legislation was passed, and not too much use was made of the acts that were passed. If this is so, it could well be one of the major achievements of Distributism, and what one may term pre-Distributism.

INDUSTRIALISM

The pressure of the Eugenists, then, fell mainly on the poor, and on the poor in their family situation. McNabb, as the defender of the poor and the family, was wholly committed to resisting the onslaught but, as far as contraception was concerned he saw the threat as coming, not from the Eugenists alone, but from the nature of industrialism, from the existence of industrial towns, where low wages, lack of good housing and high rates combined to influence the poor to contraception. In an article reprinted in *The Church and the Land* he admits that 'praise of larger families seems almost blasphemous when unaccompanied by denunciation of the state of things revealed by the official reports of our M.O.H.' Housing conditions in the slums constituted a proximate occasion of sin. Amelioration of urban conditions however was not the answer – 'Our duty towards London or Birmingham or Manchester is not to make them sanitary, but to make them impossible'.⁷

He had many ancillary reasons for rejecting industrialism, e.g. that it did not produce the goods it promised. Instead of producing more of the good things of life, the primary things that satisfied human needs, it only delivered more and more of the second or third rate, the secondary inessentials that pandered to our desires for the attractive inessentials – token wealth could be increased by industrialism (money, luxuries), but never, McNabb held, real wealth (food, housing, clothing, fuel). One interesting comment of his relates to modern transport. The argument claims, says Fr Vincent, that modern systems of transport save time, and when one compares the m.p.h. of trains against horses it seems clear this is so. But the reality is that time is lost, because people live further and further from their work, and spend many hours in commuting, with overall a considerable loss of time. I offer this as an example of McNabb's commonsense approach, and also because it has, I think, a very contemporary ring to it, chiming in with much ecological thinking today, including that of Ivan Illich.

Industrialism involved a retreat from reality, from the primary. People worked in increasingly servile conditions for tokens more than for things, unreal paper money rather than goods necessary for existence. McNabb held that the necessities of life, e.g. housing, were in scarcer supply for the poor of England than before the industrial revolution, indeed that England herself, by natural resources one of the richest countries in the world, after only two centuries of industrialism was in the hands of the official receiver.

But, to reiterate, for McNabb the central condemnation of industrialism was not a pragmatic one, that it did not work well, but a moral condemnation. In an undated scrap in his papers he

claimed the diagnosis of industrialism was that it was injustice – the programme, the remedy, must be the ten commandments – ‘I cannot see that anything save a spiritual force can cure the disease’. This brings us back to the earlier point that for McNabb economics, politics, the social question itself, all were in the end moral, ethical matters.

THE LAND

It is sometimes said that McNabb came from a farming family, which is not strictly true – certainly his grandparents and uncle were small farmers, and a childhood in non-metropolitan Ireland in the 1870s could not have been far removed from the soil. Nevertheless, the first time that it is on record that McNabb actually came into physical contact with turning the sod is 1914 at Hawkesyard, where he had been sent as Prior. He would then have been in his mid-forties. A full explanation of McNabb’s holding the positions on the land which he did might make much of this lack of direct knowledge (an argument which McNabb himself would undoubtedly reject as invalidly *ad hominem*).

As early as 1901, anyhow, an article written for the Irish paper *The Leader* under the pseudonym ‘Kintragh’ (his family townland) established his early and abiding interest in life on the land. It is entitled ‘Three Years in Belgium’, and this brings us to one of the earliest influences on McNabb’s thinking in this area. While pursuing his Dominican studies at Louvain after his ordination, McNabb had been much impressed by the intensive peasant farming practised in this ‘Nazareth among the nations’ – he gives us an instance of the no-waste approach he saw there in telling us that dry leaves were collected and used as stable litter by the small farmers.

Nazareth, of course, was another of the long-standing focuses in McNabb’s thinking, one that remained central for him. Nazareth stood for the small scale – a small, peasant community, living according to the primary things of life, both divine and human. When accused of being a medievalist McNabb would riposte that, on the contrary, he didn’t advocate a return to the middle ages but to the First Ages: ‘We do not want to go back to Cressy and Agincourt but to Jesus of Nazareth’.⁸ I think this was an important truth, one that needs to be understood in any evaluation of McNabb, i.e. that he was *not* a romantic medievalist, but something other.

Land work, the growing of food, was *the* primary form of work. The land worker and the hand (craft) worker were both important, but the food grower was first in importance. We can see the Thomist influence in the manner in which McNabb creates these distinctions – man, man’s nature and man’s essential needs, are the starting point, everything is related back to first principles,

the divisions are clear.

Another element that needs to be considered in an understanding of McNabb's views on the land is his belief that rural life favoured a religious belief but industrial, urban life destroyed it. Worrying figures from the USA seemed to show that the percentage of Catholics, mainly urban, who kept their faith was much lower than that of Protestants, a larger proportion of whom were rurally based. McNabb associated this finding with the leakage figures in England's industrial towns compared with countryside communities of Catholics. His conclusion was that the expansion, if not the continuing existence of the Catholic Church depended upon an Exodus to the land, of groups of Catholic families living according to the Nazareth measure.

Apart from the large influence which his contact with Ditchling had on him (too large to be discussed here), the last factor which went to make up McNabb's land policy was the question of the unemployed. Between the two world wars there were never less than one million unemployed in England, sometimes well over twice that number. Naturally, then, anyone involved with the social question could not but be concerned with the resulting problems. Briefly, McNabb's solution was an end to what he termed the widowhood of the land – e.g. he claimed it significant that the number of people unemployed roughly coincided with the number estimated to have left the land.

Here I would like to take a look at McNabb's treatment of the term 'unemployment' as I think it provides a nice instance of his radicalism, and his ability to look at immediate problems in a longer perspective than is usual. In 'The Problem of the Unemployed'⁹ he began with tracking the word down in dictionaries and found that it only appears in the twentieth century – the implication being, of course, that it's a twentieth-century problem. Moreover McNabb held that the 'word quietly assumes the necessity of the very disease which the poor are trying to cure'¹⁰ i.e. *employment*, assuming an employer, a wage relationship, is *not* the cure but the disease (although he admitted it can be a palliative, rather like morphine). What is wrong, he stressed again and again, is not the unemployment of the poor, but their poverty – 'the unemployment of the rich is not generally looked upon as an evil'. Using the word misdirects attention, so that we see neither the real problem nor the real solution – 'men are unemployed because the land is unemployed'. Only the land can provide a real solution.

In a sense all these factors played a part in fashioning McNabb's land theory, i.e. his childhood, Belgium, the Nazareth theme, Ditchling, the Thomist approach which makes land work primary, the need to provide the circumstances in which Catholicism could

flourish, as well as the 'unemployment' situation. Nevertheless, they are in a sense subsidiary to, in a sense included within the family theme that I have argued was McNabb's first concern. That is, he believed, certainly by the First World War, that life on the land was the natural and the best life for the family.

However, the kind of life on the land necessary had, according to McNabb, to fulfil certain requirements in order to be primary.

As far as possible the family should own its homestead. Following Leo XIII and, of course, Distributist thinking, McNabb held that property (and here productive property is meant, not stocks or shares or cars) 'is the material condition of freedom'.¹¹

Secondly, the smallholding should be that – small. 'The Right of Property does not mean that some men shall have all property – but that all men shall have some property.'¹²

Thirdly, the smallholding should be as self-sufficient as possible. Instead of growing cash crops for sale at markets, the homestead should grow and make as much as possible, including clothes, of the family's needs, *pro focolo non pro foro*. Again authority was invoked, in this case Thomist reasoning that 'the more a thing is found to be self-sufficient the better it is – because what needs another is clearly wanting'.¹³

Linked with his subsistence, self-sufficiency angle was McNabb's distinction between agricultural mass production (growing as much as possible of one or two crops – products) and intensive production – growing as much as possible of as many as possible of the requirements of a family. A model of mass production, of the industrialization of the land, he found at Wisbech, where apples were grown for export from the area on a vast scale, but only margarine from Africa rather than local butter was to be found in the homes and shops. Another instance was the 500 cotton farmers of England, Arkansas, who rioted *for food* in the town. A model of intensive farming on the other hand was a family allotment, in which every square inch of land was used, with the needs of the individual family directly in mind. Another stipulation, again linked, was that as far as possible the area of production should be the same as the area of consumption, for real efficiency to obtain.

The last of McNabb's criteria for a successful Nazareth homestead was the one which perhaps caused more trouble and ridicule for him than anything else, both within Distributist ranks and beyond – the question of machinery. McNabb held that machinery should not be used at all, no tractors, no cars, no cultivators should be allowed. The machine, like the market, and like money, symbolized for him the serfdom of the countryside to the town, which *had* to be done away with and reversed if anything. McNabb be-

lieved that machines on the land actually produced less *per acre* than a man and tools, but we failed to see this because we were bamboozled with the *number* of acres it could deal with. But once used the machine influenced the farmer to grow less variety of crops (in order to use the machine, which was only capable of a very limited number of tasks), therefore to grow for the market, therefore to become less self-sufficient, and more dependent on the town, to sell the spare produce, to provide and service the machinery, and even, the final absurdity, to buy food from. Thus for McNabb the introduction of machinery on the farm spelled the doom of the other criteria.

On the other hand, if the homesteads did go in for intensive (and not mass) production and restricted themselves to tools and not machines, two (connected) consequences followed. There would be no desire, McNabb believed, for artificial birth control, since every hand could be used on the land, in more and more intensive cultivation – ‘The saturation-point of labour is at a higher altitude in land-work than in any other form of human toil’. Thus the McNabbean smallholding, unlike the industrialized towns, was *not* a proximate occasion of sin. Secondly there would be no need for the grown children to resort to the towns for employment, there would be room and need for them on the land, and thus ‘un-employment’ would cease to be a problem.

I have tried here to give a brief outline of McNabb’s position on questions that were central to him and to Distributism: the family; industrialism; the land, together with an account of why he adopted these particular positions, and a few examples of his way of tackling issues, such as the eugenist threat and unemployment. I would like now to offer some comments on his social thinking, followed by an assessment of his place in Distributism.

A frequent criticism of Distributist thinking on a return to the land is that there was not enough land in England for all the population to have a viable smallholding. This objection is easily parried by the reply that Distributists did not hold that everyone in a Distributist state should live on and from the land. Kenrick, a leading Midlands Distributist, thought that only one family in three would be actually on the land in the ‘most *complete* kind of Distributive State’.¹⁴ McNabb might well have hoped for a higher proportion but even he allowed (with Thomas) that e.g. some commerce was necessary. However, his belief that homestead life would mean that large families could be indefinitely kept on the land seems unconvincing, even granting his point that the land farmed in the way he wanted *was* capable of absorbing an increase – but I cannot see that large families of eleven, e.g. that Vincent so glorified

could long be multiplied on the land. The division of land, intensive cultivation and frugal comfort are far from indefinitely compatible.

This, however, is possibly a fairly low-level quibble which I imagine McNabb would have been able to settle. More seriously, I feel there is a gap in his thinking which is perhaps harder to fill satisfactorily. This revolves around his view of how he thought the Distributist state could be brought into being, and involves two criticisms, partly linked. The first concerns his notions of politics and the state. Always clear that he was not concerned with the political aspect of politics, it is unclear what his definition of politics actually was. He frequently engaged in what I would term political action, usually in defence of the poor and the family, claiming the right of workers to a living family wage before profits were to be considered, publicly supporting rent strikers, etc. He spoke and wrote tirelessly to persuade people to agreement with Distributism, but there is a lack of engagement with a programme, despite a clear statement that 'For us Catholics, the Distributive State (i.e. the State in which there are as many owners as possible) is not something which we discuss, but something we have to propagate and institute'.¹⁵ The propagation was certainly there, but one looks in vain for guidance as to the method of institution of the Distributive State. It is not that he was only interested in theory – far from it, he wanted articles on the care of goats and the making of straw sandals put in the *Cross and the Plough*. It is rather that the middle range is missing. His advice to individuals as to what they should do was, I understand, always that they should, forthwith, make a start on a smallholding. Under his influence many did so. This comes down to change of heart, conversion and example. He wrote to Fr H. E. G. Rope that they should use all their 'priestly influence to found families on the land'.¹⁶ As far as it goes this procedure is of course unexceptionable. What is curious is the unexamined view of the Nation State – the implications of his argument seem to be for a radical decentralization and breaking down of systems of production, but surprisingly there is little or no follow-through from this to an examination of the nature or necessary existence of government and the state. McNabb seems to take over from Thomas the category of the state, but whereas Thomas's views on the state are integrated into the rest of his thinking there is no sign of this with McNabb – it is almost a category without content. The nearest he came to it in any of his writings is an early article in the *New Witness* called 'Towards Decentralization'¹⁷ which suggests the decentralization of the executive – e.g. the Ministry of Agriculture – was recommended to move to Cirencester, where there was both countryside and an agricultural col-

lege, as well as an ancient atmosphere which would aid sanity. Although this has a very modern ring to it today it seems, without any other higher level thinking about the state, completely insufficient, just a tinkering with the system. Peter Maurin, of the American *Catholic Worker*, in many ways very similar to McNabb, followed his ideas through to a rejection of the Nation State. This is not to say that McNabb's only consistent option was a total rejection of the state but I am claiming that in this area, crucial to the institution of Distributism, McNabb failed for once to examine his assumptions, or to work things through to the end.

Another area for possible criticism concerns his position on the motivation for an implementation of change. McNabb was very sure that his demand for an exodus to the land could only be fulfilled in response to a religious impulse; only the divine could lead the town-dweller to leave 'pleasure-filled leisure for the work-laden life on the land'.¹⁸ His analysis of the social question, of industrialism etc. pertained to England as a whole, not just the Catholics in England, yet his solution (and here he differed from most Distributists) was only possible, only an option, to Catholic England which, he further believed, was in peril under the capitalist, industrial system. Although the conversion of England, that he said he loved as a wife, was a dream close to McNabb's heart, I think he considered it was not on the immediate agenda, and therefore he opted, I believe, for some form of a solution which involved Catholic families starting the return to the land in the hope of encouraging others as well as saving their own families. As a solution for individual families this conclusion may have been fair enough (although it is open to question whether his judgment was right in encouraging isolated attempts by people not *au fait* with farming or even gardening) but as a, or rather *the* method of realizing the Distributist state which would be characterized by the smallholding model it seems to me to be irremediably wanting.

DISTRIBUTISM

McNabb's Distributism was then a very Catholic notion – for him it could I think only make sense in a Catholic context, unlike the majority of Distributists who (however Catholic they were or became) offered Distributism, in a sense along Natural Law lines as being acceptable to all men of good will, not as wedded to a specific religious position. He was at once the most Catholic and the most moralist of the Distributists, and from this both his strengths (rationality, consistency, everything interlocking together) and his weaknesses stem (an inability to move from the moral sphere to the institution of a new order). Everything derived from, and was constantly referred back to, the ethical principles involved.

It has been said that his influence on the movement was incalculable.¹⁹ McNabb was very much the prophet of Distributism, both as a voice in the wilderness calling the people to repentance, and in the sense of prophesying the future, or at any rate being concerned with what then might have seemed nutty but now forms part of our conventional, if still alternative, wisdom. His ideas on self-sufficiency, the small is beautiful motif, his rejection of the idea of progress as linked with industrialism, these no longer seem cranky as they clearly did in the 1920s and 30s. His insistence that justice and peace must go together, too, now has a familiar ring, thanks to *Pacem in Terris* amongst other influences. This was far from true, I imagine, when he wrote, 'take care of justice; and peace will take care of itself'.²⁰

Was he then an extremist, as was often said against him? In some senses of the term, clearly yes, but we need to remember that 'extremist' is a relative term, relating to the average, which shifts. Thus Paul VI was an extremist for Lefebvre; one man's extremist is another's Mrs Average. Not a very useful concept. I would prefer to describe McNabb as a radical, one who constantly returned to the roots of things, to first principles, and to the authority of tradition, and whose views (except perhaps with regard to forms of government and the state) were not modified by his milieu, the preconceptions of the society in which he lived. To his great credit this is true even in regard to the *Eye-Witness*, *New Witness* and Distributist circles with which he had so much in common. Here I refer to anti-semitism, the wart on the face of Distributism and its predecessors, that so disfigures much Distributist writing. McNabb seems to have been entirely lacking in this: although he castigated individual Jews who were unscrupulous financiers, so he did the goyim. I've been unable to detect the faintest whiff of anti-semitism in all his writings I've read. Once again he seems to have been in advance of his time in terms of the Church, seeing the Jews as a crucial part of our Christian heritage.

McNabb is a figure who repays study, not just because of his importance during his lifetime, but also because many of his ideas still contain interest and challenge. If it is true that no generation ever finds the preceding one of interest, let us hope that by now we have passed on to the second generation after McNabb, and will examine his ideas afresh.²¹

- 1 For the fullest information about McNabb cf. Fr Ferdinand Valentine O P *Father Vincent McNabb*, Burns & Oates, 1955.
- 2 Burns & Oates, 1925, p 78.
- 3 Letter to George Maxwell, 2.9.1940, English Dominican Archives (copy).
- 4 *New Witness* 18.4.1912.

- 5 From a *Catholic Worker* pamphlet, *Fr Vincent McNabb*, by R. Walsh.
- 6 *Eye-Witness* 3.10. 1912.
- 7 McNabb notebooks, 'Industrialism', no date, English Dominican Archives.
- 8 Letter to Mr B. Keating, 25.6. 1932, English Dominican Archives.
- 9 *Church and the Land*, p 44 ff.
- 10 McNabb notebooks, 'Industrialism'.
- 11 *Nazareth or Social Chaos*, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1933, p 9.
- 12 Letter to Hilary Pepler, 18. 3. 1927, English Dominican Archives.
- 13 *Church and the Land*, p 36.
- 14 *Cross and the Plough*, Vol 15, No 2, 1948, p 13.
- 15 *Church and the Land*, p 78.
- 16 19. 2. 1927, English Dominican Archives.
- 17 9. 8. 1917.
- 18 *Church and the Land*, p 66.
- 19 Harold Robbins, *Cross and the Plough*, *ibid.* p 16.
- 20 McNabb notebooks, 'Peace', no date, English Dominican Archives.
- 21 A first version of this article was delivered at a Symposium on Fr Vincent McNabb held at Spode House in May 1979.

SUMMER SCHOOL

HERBERT McCABE O.P. will direct the
SIXTH ANNUAL INFORMAL SUMMER SCHOOL

4th – 11th August 1983
in County Kerry, Ireland.

ON

RECONCILIATION

Fairly primitive, self-catering, hostel accommodation (for a maximum of thirty) is available at the very hospitable local pub.

Besides this, there is a camp site and, nearby, a more luxurious but not expensive hotel.

Transport can be provided to and from Cork City, or Killarney for those who do not wish to bring their cars.

Booking Fee: £15.00 (with a reduction for children).

For further information (enclosing s.a.e.) write to:

MARTIN WARD, 9 ORCHARD CRESCENT,
COVENTRY CV3 6JJ