Armstrong, Paul F.

Working Paper

The Radicalism of D. J. MacDonald

Working Paper No. 2017-03
Revision 11 November, 2017

Suggested Citation:
Armstrong, Paul F. (2017). The Radicalism of D. J. MacDonald. MIRCS Institute, Working Paper No. 2017-03, Halifax, Canada.

This Version is available at:
http://www.mircs.ca/education/working_papers/

MIRCS Institute

P.O. Box 8041

Halifax, N.S. B3K 5L8

www.mircs.ca

The Radicalism of D. J. MacDonald

In Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces, the 'social question' showed up in outmigration and rural poverty. The problem of leaving home to make a living has been a historical reality for generations of Maritimers. As one historian of the region perceptively argued, "the consciousness of the Maritimes as a distinct place was largely developed in the first place through the common experiences of people who worked away from home then later returned" (Ernie Forbes, cited in Burrill, 1992: 4). By 1880, Burrill reports, "there were already more Nova Scotians in Boston than in Yarmouth, Sydney and Pictou combined" (1992: 4-5).[1] The experience of migration from every community of Nova Scotia has dominated the historical literature, and for good reason. "Going out west appears to be the order of the day in Cape Breton this spring", printed the *Aurora*, an Antigonish broadsheet in 1883, while the Shelburne *Budget* reported in 1899 that the "ever-increasing exodus" had drained the South Shore of the province of "many of its best men".

Attempts to describe and explain the economic forces behind this extensive migration have consumed historians and social scientists, and various regional studies have made claims about the impact of this migration on the various ethnic communities throughout the region. In a pioneering study on the Nova Scotian Scots, for instance, D. A. Campbell and R. A. MacLean argued that emigration was an alternative to the poor economy that was utilized by Scottish individuals "to a higher degree than any other ethnic group in the province" (Campbell and MacLean, 1974: 93).[2] One clergyman, ministering in a small eastern Nova Scotia community in the 1920s, admitted to issuing "far more birth certificates for emigrants than for newborn babies" (Nearing, 1975: 25). The Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimated that gross out-migration from the Maritimes to other Canadian provinces and 'the Boston States' during the fifty-year period between 1881 and 1931 was about 600,000 persons, with net

---

[1] Yarmouth and Pictou were among the largest communities outside of Halifax-Dartmouth at that time, and Sydney was soon destined to be.

[2] Conversely, argued Judith Fingard, the French Acadiens "were one of the few ethnic groups to be threatened but not weakened by out-migration" (1993: 103).

out-migration of 470,000.[3] As Patricia Thornton notes, this constituted "some 50 per cent of the population still present in 1931 at the end of the period" (1985: 5).

Thornton argues that outmigration did not become problematic for the Maritimes until after 1881,[4] peaking during the 1920s. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Daniel J. MacDonald ("D.J.") (1927), himself, wrote an early paper addressing the issue. Published by the N.S. Dept. of Natural Resources, and clearly aimed at a popular readership, MacDonald argued against the 'demand-pull' of migration, pointing out that the social and family costs of city life offset the benefits of higher incomes and suggesting that these costs needed to be weighed against the greater stability and community embedding of rural life in Nova Scotia. The focus of MacDonald's rebuttal of the desirability of migration stands in contrast with the cost-push argument of R. H. Coats. Writing that same year from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Coats argued that, in light of the dramatic population declines experienced, the "study of population tendencies in the Maritimes since Confederation may therefore be regarded as illustrating and reflecting the course of their economic development" (1927: 3; quoted in part in Thornton, 1985).

A vigorous academic debate about the reasons for this devastating social implosion was mounted through the 1970s and '80s. These debates got traction by taking issue with S.A. Saunder's classical analysis of the Maritime staple economy (1932, 1939), and focussed research on the implosion of the manufacturing sector. The most influential critiques built on various forms of dependency theory, criticizing the weakness of Maritime entrepreneurship, limited capital access, discriminatory tariff policy, high freight rates, agricultural under-performance, and external business acquisition.[5] However, as early as 1985, Michael Clow argued that "we have reached a situation where theoretical speculation has outrun substantive research" (p. 150).

In subsequent work during the 1990s, a couple of studies helped to undermine the thesis that Confederation itself led to the decline of the Maritime economy. Robert MacKinnon, in his analysis of the history of Nova Scotia agriculture, states flatly that "agriculture did not experience a 'prolonged crisis' in the second half of the nineteenth

---

[3] See Thornton, 1985: fn 8, fn 6, together with the references there.

[4] Her position stands in contrast with the argument of Brookes (1976), although not his data.

[5] See Acheson (1972, 1979), Clow (1984, 1985), Forbes (1977, 1979), Marchildon (1990, 1993), McCann (1979, 1981) and Troughton (1988).

century" (1996: 259). Kris Inwood makes a similar claim about Maritime industrialization: "Manufacturing in Nova Scotia follows a more interesting pattern; profitability was low in 1870 but it had largely recovered by 1890 after a decade of National Policy expansion … Nova Scotia did relatively well during the following forty years [from 1870 to 1910] in contrast to the disastrous experience of New Brunswick industry" (1991: 136). However, both studies point to volatility in the macro-economic indicators in the Maritimes during the 1870-1890 period, and go on to detail a rather sharp pattern of decline after 1890.

Recent work by Inwood and Keay (2005, 2008, 2012) and by Chernoff (2014) have begun the work of building an alternative explanation of Maritime industrial decline. Inwood and Keay have build a database of Canadian and American border-state financials for manufacturing enterprises using micro-data from industrial censuses of 1870 and 1871. This data enables an analysis of factor costs, value-added, profitability, and total factor productivity. After exclusions, the Canadian sample consists of 27,111 establishments, and the U.S. sample consists of 8,149 establishments. They conclude that, while Canadian industrialization did not follow the same path as did establishments in the United States, it was still highly competitive:

> We find that, in 1871, a wide range of Canadian manufacturers employed technology with significant scale economies, that Canadian establishments were technically efficient relative to geographically proximate US producers, and that any productivity differences associated with establishment size, seasonality, capital intensity, and power source were small … It is not what the Canadian establishments looked like – how large they were, where they were located, or their willingness to adopt capital-intensive, mechanized technologies that determined success. Rather, what mattered was the producers' willingness to foster more fundamental determinants of growth – technical efficiency, appropriate input and technology decisions, and the realization of scale economies (Inwood and Keay, 2012: 312)..

They also found that it was not a uniform Canadian performance, though. Using the same data, Alex Chernoff analyzed this further with his study of productivity differentials in Maritime manufacturing. He focusses attention on the high concentration of rural manufacturing in the Maritimes relative to the rest of Canada, and finds that while urban manufacturing was fully competitive in the Maritimes, "rural manufacturers in the Maritimes were *less* productive when compared to rural establishments in Ontario" (Chernoff, 2014: 78). Additionally,

Chernoff makes a suggestive observation of a difference in industrial organization in Ontario between 1871 and 1891:

> During this era, the industrial landscape in Ontario and Quebec featured dense clusters of manufacturing establishments that extended from the urban centres into the countryside. By contrast, in the Maritimes there was a lack of integration between the process of industrialization in Saint John and Halifax and the region's rural communities (Chernoff, 2014: 67).

He goes on to theorize that "regional agglomeration effects may have emerged as important determinants of growth during the late 19th century" (1014: 88), and makes some preliminary tests of this thesis.

This thesis is consistent with developments in growth theory that needed to wait for a much deeper empirical knowledge than was earlier possible. A distinction is now made between the macro-economic framework conditions which *sustain* growth from those meso-economic proximate factors which *ignite* growth.[6] This focus on meso-structural dynamics is concerned centrally with innovation and production linkages. José Antonio Ocampo, then U.N. Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, characterizes it thus:

> The dynamics of production structures may be visualized as the interaction between two basic, though multidimensional, forces, namely (1) innovations, broadly understood as new activities and new ways of doing previous activities, and the learning processes that characterize both the full realization of their potentialities and their diffusion through the economic system; and (2) the complementarities, linkages or networks among firms and production activities, and the institutions required for the full development of such complementarities, whose maturation is also subject to learning. Elastic factor supplies are, on the other hand, essential to guarantee that these dynamic processes can deploy their full potentialities. The combination of these three factors determines what we can characterize as the dynamic efficiency of a given production system (Ocampo, 2005: 13).

The macro-economic factors identified by the dependency theory of the 1970s and '80s highlighted important framework conditions which undermined industrial performance in the Maritimes, leading to a highly critical assessment of the Antigonish Movement. Current

---

[6] The distinction between sustaining and igniting growth is made by Dani Rodrik (2005).

theoretical work, though, suggests that an analysis of the Antigonish Movement should focus more on the extent to which they were able to foster innovation and build linkages.

The general approach of the Antigonish Movement is well-understood – its focus on adult education, the organization of producer and consumer cooperatives and credit unions, and the emphasis on self-help and grass-roots organizing. What is missing is an adequate understanding of how these ideas were connected to the larger frameworks of intellectual thought which have been elucidated in my previous papers. This paper is preliminary, then, to connecting the analysis of the Movement's role in fostering innovation and building linkages, but is a pre-requisite to that future task.

In this paper, therefore, I want to examine the intellectual building blocks on which D. J. MacDonald built his own vision of social renewal. This will be done through short studies in four areas: MacDonald's graduate education in Washington, the roots of that education in Anglo-French *économie sociale*, the resulting intellectual position that he held, and the work he accomplished.

Graduate Economics with Frank O'Hara

Following his Bachelor's degree in Sacred Theology from Urban College in Rome in 1902,[7] his ordination in 1904, and a few years of parish work at Bridgeport and Brook Village in Nova Scotia, D. J. MacDonald went on to do graduate work at the Catholic University of America (CUA) in Washington, no doubt at the request, and possibly with the financial support, of his Antigonish Bishop.

CUA had a strong reputation within Catholic higher education. Like Johns Hopkins, it had been established in 1889 as a graduate school only, for research and graduate instruction. It was only in 1904 that CUA introduced an undergraduate option in order to broaden its income base, rectify undergraduate deficiencies before entering graduate work, and provide a reliable source of students for its graduate departments. In 1911, CUA was deemed by the U.S.

---

[7] MacDonald's education in Rome was financed by his uncle, Colin MacDonald. Colin had, a generation earlier, gone to Boston to train as a medical doctor, and his brother, John B., the father of Daniel, had sold his sawmill to raise funds for his brother's education. Dr. Colin repaid that kindness by funding his nephew's seminary training in Rome (Interview with Flora Marie MacDonald, 05 Aug, 2017).

Commissioner of Education to be the only Catholic institution in the U.S. to satisfy the standard for adequate graduate preparation of its baccalaureates (Nuesse, 1988). It was with a view of getting the best graduate training possible that the Catholic University would have been selected by MacDonald.

MacDonald entered studies at CUA in September, 1910, and was there for two years, during which time, he acquired a Master's degree and a Doctorate. The annual report to his Diocesan bishop for 1910-1911 indicates that he took courses in Economics (then taught by Professor Frank O'Hara), Sociology (taught by Professor William Joseph Kerby), and Advanced English (taught by Professor Patrick Joseph Lennox) during his first year, and was "conscientious in his application to study, gentlemanly and priestly in his habits, kind and obliging in disposition, [and] fairly regular in his attendance at the community exercises" (MG1/2/538, St.F.X. Archives). In the second year, he did work in Philosophy (with Professors Edward Aloysius Pace and William Turner), Economics (with Professor Frank O'Hara), and English (with Professor Patrick Joseph Lennox). As MacDonald taught Economics and Sociology for almost his entire teaching career at St. F.X., the initial focus of attention here is on MacDonald's studies with Professor O'Hara.

As one commentator saw him, O'Hara was a "social Progressive investigator" (Yellowitz, 1968: 348). Born March 24, 1876 in Lanesboro, Minnesota,[8] his outlook was shaped by the Progressive Movement of the American Midwest. He was raised and did his undergraduate degree in Minnesota, and followed it with a Master's degree at the University of Notre Dame. His doctoral studies were conducted at the University of Berlin where he studied with members of the German historical school of economics, recording his great debt to Professors Adolf Wagner, Gustav von Schmoller, and Max Sering (O'Hara, 1916: v).[9]

---

[8] Biographical details are taken from Cook (1934-35), Curtis (1911), and CER Editor (1938), not all details of which are consistent with one another.

[9] While Professors Wagner and Schmoller are well-known, and were referred to in a previous paper, it may be helpful to offer a word about Professor Max Sering. Sering (1857-1939) completed his doctorate under Schmoller at Strassburg (Nelson, 2015: 1) and, after a period at the University of Bonn, was appointed Professor of Economics at the Agricultural Institute in Berlin, and Privat-dozent at the University, being raised to Extraordinary Professor at the University in 1893 (Personal Notes, 1894: 159). He conducted a fact-finding mission to Canada and the United States concerning grain production in 1883, and published several studies on the economics of the German agricultural sector. He was a principal architect of the *Verein's* rural survey in the early 1890s (Tribe, 1989a: 98), and "had a relatively close relationship at the beginning of the 1890s" with Max Weber (Riesebrodt, 1989: 148;

O'Hara's 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia article on "Political Economy" provides a good overview of the views he held during the period when D. J. MacDonald was his student. The article exhibits a good grasp of the history of economics with a discussion of patristic and late medieval economic philosophy, the debates between mercantilists and physiocrats, 'classical' Anglo-French political economy, and German historical economics. He outlines the contribution of Mengerian economics, mentioning the parallel work in England by W. S. Jevons and in the U.S by J. B. Clark, but conceptualizes that contribution, in what was then the standard understanding, as supplementing the inductive approach with the deductive approach, rather than addressing the more fundamental distinction between theory and observation which was advanced by Menger. The article is notable in its failure to address either the concept of scarcity or marginal choice in any significant way, defining the province of economics as "the social science which treats of man's activities in providing the material means to satisfy his wants" (p. 213), a definition rather similar to Alfred Marshall's. In fact, O'Hara references Marshall's *Principles* (1898), along with a number of other commonly used Anglo-French and American introductory texts, the most important of which were: (i) Henry Rogers Seager's *Introduction to Economics* (1908), (Professor of Political Economy at Columbia, 1902-1930, two years of study overseas at Halle, Berlin, and Vienna under Johannes Conrad, Gustav von Schmoller, Adolf Wagner, Eugen Böhm-Bawerk, and Carl Menger); (ii) Richard Ely's *Outlines of Economics* (1908), (Professor of Political Economy at Wisconsin (Madison) 1892-1925, three years of study overseas in Halle and Heidelberg under Johannes Conrad and Karl Knies; teacher of John R. Common and Wesley Mitchell); and (iii) Edwin R. A. Seligman's *Principles of Economics* (1905), (Professor of Political Economy at Columbia 1885-1931; three years of study in Berlin, Heidelberg, Geneva, and Paris with Karl Knies, Adolf Wagner, and Gustav von Schmoller (with Eugen Böhm-Bawerk, a fellow-student); a prominent advocate of a progressive income tax). O'Hara's core references, therefore, cite authors which had very similar backgrounds to his own. D. J. MacDonald used the Seager text and the Ely text in his course in 'Introduction to Economics'. In the case of the Ely text, it was used in 22 years of the 29 years that MacDonald was listed as teaching the course.[10] Asso and Fiorito, in their "Introduction" to the republication

---

cf. Roth, 2002: 68). Weber and Sering, in fact, moved in much the same circles: Sering had, for instance, been offered the faculty position at Freiburg prior to Weber (Tribe, 1995: 82).

[10] MacDonald was a faculty member in economics for 30 years, but there is no calendar for one of those years. It is not likely that he taught all of, or perhaps any of, the years that he was President, but there is not, at present, any information to

of Edwin Seligman's autobiography, nicely summarize the viewpoint of this 'Progressive' American economics, the kind of outlook which O'Hara seems to have shared:

> Seligman was one of the first American economists of his age who followed historicism without dogmatically rejecting the innovations introduced with marginalism and the inclination toward formal logic in economics. Having spent in Germany the decisive years of his formation as an economist, he grew up with the conviction that the academic fighting over methodological divergences was a rather unproductive enterprise and did not need to take the front stage of scientific research. Thus he remained throughout his life a fervent advocate of the cooperative coexistence – or the "peaceful rapprochement" as Brad Bateman (2004) called it – between different methodological approaches. Following Seligman, Richard Ely, John Bates Clark, and others, this apparently odd alliance between historicists and marginalists against the supporters of the old classical doctrines was soon to become a distinctive feature of the Progressive era and is now considered to have determined the blossoming of that peculiar pluralism which has so profitably characterized American economic thought in the subsequent decades. The use of different or complementary methods came to be normally accepted and respected within American economics, as long as economists were all seriously engaged in investigating the real changes in economic conditions and as long as they strengthened their participation in policy reforms and designs for their amelioration (Asso and Fiorito, 2006: 151).

There is another component, however, to O'Hara's analysis of political economy. After a brief discussion of Marxist socialism, O'Hara identifies 'Christian Democracy' as "the movement which has been gaining ground for the last half-century among Christian churches, both Catholic and non-Catholic to emphasize the importance of religious and moral elements in a healthy economic life" (1913: 215-216). He then goes on to talk about the practical efforts toward co-operative association, distinguishing between, what we would now identify as, civil society-led and state-led wings:

> The more "liberal" wing, led by such economists as Le Play, Périn, and Victor Brants, would reduce state action to a minimum, while others, looking to Bishop Ketteler, Cardinal Manning, and Count de Mun, would invoke a considerable measure of so-called State socialism (O'Hara, 1913: 216).

---

determine this, and he continued to be listed in the University Calendar as having Professorial responsibilities.

In his 1916 textbook, to a greater extent in his 1939 textbook, and in several publications on credit unions, O'Hara amplified his discussion of the co-operative movement.

Anglo-French *économie sociale*

The international standing of the German university in the nineteenth century as a model for advanced research and teaching, and its distinct historicization of political economy were not the only differences with the Anglo-French tradition. I want to highlight two other principal differences – in their methodological approach, and their conception of choice.

John Neville Keynes (father of John Maynard, lecturer in Moral Sciences at Cambridge) provided the standard for Anglo-French economics methodology in the late nineteenth-century with his *Scope and Method of Political Economy* (1891). It was his analysis which led to the common understanding of the *Methodenstreit* between Menger and Schmoller as being a conflict over the roles of deduction versus induction. Indeed, as I indicated, Frank O'Hara assumed this same position, although watered down by failing to connect the "'bitter struggle" to the methodological arguments of Menger:[11]

> In opposition to this narrow and non-ethical view of the Classical School, there arose in Germany in the middle of the nineteenth century, the Historical School, holding that political economy is an inductive and an ethical science … After a bitter struggle of half a century the opposition between the schools has almost disappeared. And it is now generally recognized that the economist must use both the deductive and the inductive methods, using now one predominantly and now the other, according to the nature of the problem upon which he happens to be engaged (O'Hara, 1913: 214).

But as I tried to show in a previous paper, the heart of the methodological debate was not about the roles of induction versus deduction, but about the role of theory versus observation. It was this understanding of the debate which allowed Weber to push back against the Mengerian abstractions with his conception of 'ideal-types', extending and deepening the historicization of the social sciences

---

[11] O'Hara cites the Keynes text in his bibliography to his 1913 article.

within a now more rigorous theoretical methodology. Keith Tribe makes the point:

> The contrast which is at work here is not one which turns on an opposition of historical to analytical method, nor one which turns on the deductive-inductive opposition emphasized by Keynes. Weber has no time for a mathematical apprehension of economic phenomena as practiced by Jevons and as developed by Marshall because he believed that this left to one side a considerable proportion of the subject matter proper to economics. If we are to identify a relevant contrast separating the economics of Weber from that of Marshall or J. B. Clark then the distinction would perhaps turn on his opposition to the development of a mathematically-based science of economic behaviour and his belief in the material variety of economic life (Tribe, 1989b: 6-7).

The differences in the Anglo-French and German theorization of the economics of choice is similar. The Anglo-French tradition had been built upon a simple psychology of observation, thought-experiments, and sense-impressions without the same awareness of historicality and language that developed in the German tradition. As sophisticated as some of the strands in the Anglo-French tradition were, even those elements in Scholastic theology that were most erudite and philosophically sensitive remained "ahistorical and metaphysically oriented" (Leinsle, [1995] 2010: 354). As we saw in our discussion of the conceptualizations of Carl Menger and Max Weber, the German economics of choice had philosophical roots in a discussion of 'human need', intimately entwined with ontological issues of value and human nature which such a discussion presupposed. In the Anglo-French tradition, the same conversation about the economics of choice was about interests, plain and simple, without reflection on how those interests were formed or whether they served human need. The elision of need with demand in the Anglo-French tradition led inevitably to a focus on the calculus of choice, and the eventual mathematization of economics. Keith Tribe again elucidates these differences:

> The theoretical tradition of *Nationalökonomie* in which Weber stood, unlike the Anglo-French tradition of political economy, turned on the concept of 'human need', its variations and the modes in which it could be satisfied. Thus Menger's *Grundsätze* of 1871 begins from the nature of utilities which, when embodied in a manner related to the satisfaction of need are called 'economic goods' (1968: 2). In establishing this point Menger appends a lengthy footnote which begins with a definition drawn from Aristotle and, via physiocratic literature, works its way towards

> earlier nineteenth century writers such as Soden, Hufeland, and Jacob. Likewise in his later discussion of value, this is constantly related to the question of the satisfaction of needs. If we compare this approach with the contemporary work of Jevons we can immediately note some differences: here the calculus of pleasure and pain is employed so that the value of a good in exchange might be related to the optimization of utility with respect to quantity of a good. This theory of economics is, as Jevons states, 'purely mathematical in character' (1879: 3). The new economics of later nineteenth-century Britain carries over from Smith and Ricardo a concern with value, but formulated in a mathematical fashion first by Jevons, and then by Marshall (Tribe, 1989b: 4-5).

The emerging Anglo-French focus on optimization was simply not important in any fundamental sense in the German tradition. It was not a matter of overlooking the question, or of lacking the necessary skills, but of believing that such a focus was philosophically inept and theoretically defective. "The basic problem" for German economics "was not the allocation of scarce resources; it was the wider question of the conditions under which economic order and general welfare were secured" (Tribe, 1988a: 6).

Of course, there was, and continues to be, both a left-wing and a right-wing in the Anglo-French tradition of economics. Indeed, the underlying commitment to 'progress' in that tradition absolutely requires a distinction between those partisans committed to radical advance and those reactionaries who defend entrenched interests. We will refer to the Anglo-French tradition, of both the left and right, as *économie sociale*, for they both shared a commitment to the rights of the poor and dispossessed. The thesis being advanced here is that the kind of social science which was taught at the Catholic University of America when D. J. MacDonald was a student was a form of *économie sociale*, informed by and adapting German historical economics, but doing so within an Anglo-French tradition. In the remainder of this section, I want to sketch the history of Anglo-French Catholic *économie sociale*.

Social Catholicism was a response to what Paul Misner refers to as 'economic modernization': "the process commenced with the well-named industrial revolution in Great Britain. It reached Catholic countries first in Belgium and France in the 1820s and 1830s" (Misner, 1991b: 3). It gained traction not so much as an intellectual critique of commercial sociability, or as a reaction to the horror of *la Terreur*, but in response to the manifest poverty generated by industrialization:

> Previously, poverty was diffuse: with industrialization, it became heavily concentrated in some categories of the population and in some places. It was massive, obvious, and visible and its very existence seemed tightly linked to the huge and parallel development of wealth. A new word was needed for this new world: "paupérisme" started to be widely used in the French language from the 1820s on. With pauperism, what would be called later the "social question" was posed (Faccarello, 2014: 81).

The Catholic critique of this period was launched by Vicomte Alban de Villeneuve-Bargemont (1784-1850) in his three-volume work, *Économie politique chrétienne ou Recherche sur la nature et les causes du paupérisme en France et en Europe* (1834). Building on the earlier work of the Swiss Protestant, J. C. L. Sismondi, Villeneuve-Bargement's book "created sensation because of its powerful denunciation of the evil of pauperism and its supposed causes: the policies suggested by political economy" (Faccarello, 2014: 86).[12] He argued that "charitable institutions, agricultural labours, and particularly the assistance provided by a deeply moved religious charity were quite more efficient than our dissertations of political economy" (1934: 7; quoted in Almodovar and Teixeira, 2012: 209). He went on, though, to call for institutional reform:

> The kind of reform that Villeneuve-Bargemont had in mind meant that those values were necessarily to be embedded into a new legal and institutional framework … His proposal was not just a question of improving charity within the existing system, for he also emphasised the importance of agricultural development, and asked for a general reorganisation of industry in order to prevent the excessive concentration of wealth (Almodovar and Teixeira, 2012: 211).

In spite of these criticisms and proposals, Villeneuve-Bargemont stands at the head of a more traditional strand of economic reform. His family's property had been confiscated during the French Revolution, and he remained a "legitimist", loyal to the monarchy of the Bourbon Restoration (1814-1830). He was a member of the Academie des Sciences Morales and a Deputy in the National Assembly. In the latter role, he was "one of the foremost authors of the law of 1841 limiting child labour" (Goyau, 1913: 431). Villeneuve-Bargement had, therefore, a deep concern with economic reform, but it was one consistent with state regulation and the order of natural law.

---

[12] Among others, "Villeneuve-Bargemont exercised a considerable influence on Tocqueville's opinions about economic and social issues" (Drolet, 2003: 95).

Charles de Coux (1787-1864) stands at the head of a more radical strand of economic reform, advocating independent action from below. Coux was part of a cluster of activists who formed around the charismatic Félicité Robert de Lamennais in the later 1820s and early 1830s. Lamennais (1782-1854) was a complex figure, whose evolving thought moved from one strong religious position to another. Initially, an outspoken advocate of ultramontanism, he had, by the end of his life become an outspoken advocate of radical socialism. Armenteros argues that the common thread in Lamennais' life was his effort "to realize completely what defenders of the faith had advocated since the middle of the eighteenth century, when they combated *philosophie* by brandishing the facts against the imagination" (Armenteros, 2014: 154). Inspired by this intellectual ferment, several members of the circle – Jean-Baptiste-Henri Lacordaire, Charles de Montalembert, Harel du Tancrel, Olympe-Philippe Gerbet, and Charles de Coux – started a daily newspaper, *l'Avenir*, in 1830, with the motto 'God and Liberty'. Although this publication was shortly condemned by papal encyclical, the group "progressively formed a powerful network of influence … [and] exerted a lasting influence on the French intellectual life" (Faccarello, 2014: 87).[13]

It was Coux who had the knowledge and interest in political economy. His family had fled the French Revolution when he was three years old, and he had been raised in Great Britain by his mother, an Englishwoman, and subsequently "worked for some years as an interpreter at the Legislature of Louisiana in the United States" (Faccarello, 2017: 7), later spending time in Brazil. He returned to France in 1823, at 36 years of age, and contacted Lamennais in 1830 expressing a desire to publish some articles about political economy. Of those in the Avenir Movement, Coux had the most interaction with Lamennais, and "alone of this group definitely shared the general tendencies of Lamenais' thought" (Stearns, 1960: 843). Coux shared an interest with Lamennais in social reform as an independent and autonomous goal, not as simply a means to either a restoration, or a renewal, of the church.

Coux was appointed to a Chair in Political Economy at the Université Catholique de Louvain in 1834. The university, once the centre of Jansenism in the Low Countries, had been established in

---

[13] It is of some note that Gerbet and Coux lectured at a series of conferences in 1832 – the Conférences de philosophie catholique' – on the invitation of Antoine-Frédéric Ozanam. These conferences were a precursor to what later became the 'Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul'. Coux lectured there on political economy, and this "brought Coux's ideas to the attention of a broader audience than the circle close to *l'Avenir*" (Faccarello, 2017: 8).

1425, but had been forced to close by the French in 1797 during the Revolutionary Wars, only being able to open again in 1834. This became a base for Coux to lecture and publish for the next 11 years:

> Coux's lectures on political economy – broadly understood as 'social and political economy' – involved two courses: one on social economics ('économie sociale'), and the other on 'political economy in its strict sense', sometimes also called 'économie réglementaire' (regulatory economics). But some of his lectures reached a wider public, thanks to the above-mentioned *L'Université catholique* (Faccarello, 2017: 9).[14]

Coux's work focussed on a critique of the political economist's commitment to spontaneous order. He argued that the bargaining position between workers and owners was fundamentally unequal, that the neglect of distribution unjustly favoured the owner, and that wealth was artificially restricted to material goods. Finally, Coux argued that political economy, rather than constituting a science of natural laws was simply arbitrarily mapping a particular form of economic activity, one that was then prevalent:

> According to Zoroaster, ancient magi believed that the spirit of the seas would severely punish the least stain on his waters; they consequently detested navigation and, in the interest of their eternal happiness, they relinquished the incalculable advantages they could have drawn from it. With such a doctrine, trade could not flourish; a moral obstacle opposed its development and … Say and Sismondi, had they lived among the fire worshippers, would have been as useful to them as a dance teacher for paralysed people (Coux, quoted in Faccarello, 2017: 1).

It seems clear that Coux had intended to publish a major treatise on Christian political economy, but it did not come about. Charles Périn took over the Chair in Political Economy from Coux in 1845, and Coux commented to a friend that "the person who replaced me in Louvain knows all my ideas. He must publish a treatise on political economy. They could be stated in a much better way than I could do it myself" (Thibeaud, quoted in Faccarello, 2017: 12).

Charles Périn (1815-1905), a student of Coux, did publish extensively, as did Victor Brants (1856-1917), a student of Périn, who

---

[14] In addition to publishing in *L'Avenir*, *L'Université catholique*, *Revue de Bruxelles*, and *Le Correspondant*, Coux published at least five long English-language articles in *The Dublin Review*, a journal founded in 1836 by several well-known Irish Catholics – Daniel O'Connell, Cardinal Wiseman, and Michael Joseph Quin.

succeeded him to the Chair in 1881 and died "in the saddle". However, Catholic social thought in the second half of the century migrated from Coux's theoretical confrontation to more practical concerns with social organization and reform. Périn advocated for the principles of renouncement – "curbing the excesses of the individual search for wealth" – and charity – "lessen[ing] the excessive existing inequalities" (Almodovar and Teixeira, 2008: 71), but this was no longer the same theoretical undertaking that had been mounted by Coux:

> Social Catholicism mainly focused on important but practical goals – hence the quasi-disappearance of the phrase "Christian political economy". Authors aimed, for example, at changing the legislation in favour of the working classes (limitation of child labour and the working day, improvement of working conditions, decent housing, education, insurance, charity and the role of religion, etc.), and among other actions at the promotion of new forms of cooperation between workers, and between capitalists and their employees (invention of new forms of guilds or corporations) … The dream of a Christian political economy was over (Faccarello, 2017: 38).

While this practical engagement developed, significant differences emerged between those advocating for civil society-led solutions and those advocating for state-led solutions. In an 1883 book, Brants surveyed the existing schools of political economy, dividing them into the *science libérale* and the *science morale* (Almodovar and Teixeira, 2008: 72). The schools of *morale science* were, in turn, divided into four lines, each built around their principal champions – Ketteler, Périn, Le Play, and Roscher. Charles Antoine, a Jesuit Professor of Moral Theology and Social Economy (Nitsch, 1990: 58-61), in his 1896 book, *Cours d'Économie Sociale*, reduced the four lines to two: those of the 'Angers' school - Claudio Jannet, Charles Périn, Frederic Le Play – advocating for civil-society led solutions, and those of the 'Liège' School – La Tour du Pin, Ketteler, Pesch, Vogelsang – advocating for state-led solutions (Solari, 2007).[15] "This taxonomy was to become a standard for most of the subsequent works" (Almodovar and Teixeira, 2010: 130).

Louvain, therefore, became an institutional centre in the late 1800s for an '*économie sociale* from-below'. The difference between the 'Angers' and 'Liège' schools has considerable resonance with the earlier struggles between the Conciliars and Papists, the Jansenists and

---

[15] The names given to the schools – 'Angers' and 'Liège' – refer to their clerical 'sponsors' at this time: Monsignor Charles Freppel in Angers and Bishop Doutreloux in Liège.

the Jesuits, and the Gallicans and Ultramontanes. Although Jansenism was ruthlessly eradicated at the University of Louvain in the first half of the eighteenth century, its resuscitation under different auspices in the late nineteenth century speaks to the enduring patterns of culture – beyond all doctrine - at Louvain.

Graduate Sociology with William J. Kerby

Frank O'Hara's economics was one of "peaceful rapprochement" between, what he understood as, the induction of historical economics and the deduction of marginal economics, albeit leavened by the policy concerns of *économie sociale*. The Anglo-French tradition of Catholic social science, however, was injected even more strongly into the curriculum of the Catholic University in Washington through the charismatic teaching of William J. Kerby.

Matthew Hoehn remarks that "in 1895 [Kerby] joined the faculty of Catholic University where Dr. Thomas Bouquilllon took an interest in him and urged him to enter the field of sociology" (Hoehn, 1948: 385). True as far it goes, but the role of Bouquillon was considerably larger than what is allowed in this simple statement.

Thomas Joseph Bouquillon (1840-1902), a Belgian theologian, had been recruited by Rector John Keane in 1889 from the Benedictine monastery at Maredsous (Kerby, 1913: 715) as the first occupant of the Francis A. Drexel Chair of Moral Theology at CUA.[16] Described in 1902 as "the most erudite man in the Catholic World today" (Nuesse, 1986a: 602), Bouquillon had special expertise "in the theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly those of Spain and the Low Countries" (p. 602) - where, as we saw in an earlier paper, Jansenism took root and grew – and was "sociologically knowledgeable" (Nuesse, 2000: 80), indeed, Nuesse argued, the "'precursor' of the social sciences" at CUA (Nuesse, 1986a: 619).

---

[16] The next important occupant of the Chair after Bouquillon was the notable Dr. John Ryan, himself a student of, and much influenced by, Bouquillon: "The most fortunate experience in my student life at the University was association with the Very Rev. Dr. Thomas Thomas Bouquillon ... His lectures and seminars were especially helpful to me because they gave comprehensive attention to social problems. Whenever he had to apply a moral rule or principle to economic or social conditions, he set forth in specific terms the pertinent economic or social transaction or institution. In other words, he took adequate account and gave an adequate description of the economics of the sociology as well as the ethics of the problem" (Ryan, 1941: 63).

According to Thomas Shahan, his colleague and later Rector of the university, it was Bouquillon "who really laid its academic foundation" (Curran, 1995: 157).

Bouquillon, a Neo-Thomist,[17] was "a firm supporter and follower of Pope Leo's program of renewal with its emphasis on Neo-Scholasticism as the only true and adequate method for Catholic theology and philosophy" (Curran, 1995: 163). Bouquillon had, though, what would then have been considered, an expansive conception of the scope of moral theology:

> Even before coming to the university, he had written to impress upon the rector, whom he had not yet met, that moral theology was not to be regarded as "simply casuistic," but ought to be "highly scientific" in view of its task to interpret in a "living" rather than a merely "formal" manner the great principles to be applied "to all the manifestations not only of individual life, but also of social, economic, political life." To accomplish this task the moral theologian would have to be constantly *en rapport* with the applicable practical sciences (Nuesse, 1986a: 609, quoting Bouquillon).[18]

This position was not just principled, but well-informed. In 1891, the Rector John Keane was already considering the creation of a 'School of the Social Sciences',[19] something actually established in 1895. At the request of the Rector, Bouquillon prepared advice on the status of Catholic social movements in Europe, referred to as the "Bouquillon Memorandum". In the Memorandum, he referred to, among others,

---

[17] William Callyhan Robinson (1834-1911), who was appointed to the CUA faculty in 1895 and became the Dean of the Law School, considered the primary conception of the founders to be "that of a school in which the scholastic philosophy is taught as the basis of all scientific knowledge and with it those other sciences which derive from it their principles or reach their conclusions through its methods" (Robinson, quoted in Nuesse, 1986b: 33).

[18] Compare his survey article, "Moral Theology at the End of the Nineteenth Century", where Bouquillon comments that "when we consider the time and talent devoted to the study of the moral sciences in our day, the efforts made to improve methods and to awaken the public to a sense of their importance, we must regretfully admit that Moral Theology has failed to keep pace with the times" (1899: 244).

[19] The initial name proposed was 'School of Sociology and Comparative Jurisprudence', but William Graham Sumner was consulted, and it was reported to President Keane that "he says that Sociology is a word having no meaning and not a suitable one to use; that there is no name now in use which would cover the field we desire to describe; that no name is likely to be invented expressing the whole body of the social sciences, and that a suitable appellation for such a school would be 'School of the Social Sciences'" (Letter from Robinson to Keane, quoted in Nuesse, 1986b: 35).

the work of Bishop Ketteler, Comte de Mun, M. Le Play, Claudio Jannet, Brants, Périn, Father Taparelli and Liberatore, and Tocqueville – all figures that are familiar from our own discussion here. Significantly, Bouquillon summarizes his survey by discussing the division between what I have referred to as '*économie sociale* from-below' and 'state-led *économie sociale*':

> It suffices to travel to the congresses or to read the reviews to note that Catholics have until now been divided into two camps. One fears the intervention of the state; it relies especially on private initiative; it opposes obligatory insurance, etc. This faction is now led by M. Perin, M. Claudio Jannet, Bishop Freppel, M. Woeste (in Belgium) – its organs are the Réforme sociale, the Revue catholiques des institutions et du droit; its ideas prevailed last year at the Congress of Angers. The other finds that the intervention of the state is necessary to eliminate abuses from the point of view of wages, hours of work, etc. This faction is led by Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Langènieuse (Rheims), M. de Mun, etc.; in Germany the great majority is favorable to this view; it prevailed last year at the congress of Liège. The recent encyclical of the Pope [*Rerum Novarum*] is favorable to the partisans of state intervention (Bouquillon, quoted in Nuesse, 1991: 9-10).

While Bouquillon provided advice such as this, and otherwise communicated in publications and correspondence, he had a deeper and more direct influence through his own efforts at institutionalization. As early as 1891, Bouquillon had aspirations to develop an "Academy of Moral Sciences". The previous year, he had inaugurated a seminar that he led modelled on the German university seminar, as "a course organized for training in research, with stated meetings at which the students present for criticism and discussion the results of their studies" (Bouquillon, quoting Clement Lawrence Smith; quoted in Nuesse, 1986a: 613). In the first year of its offering, the seminar topic was 'suicide', and Bouquillon proudly reported that it was "the first seminar in moral theology in any Catholic university anywhere" (Bouquillon, quoted in Nuesse, 1986a: 613). In terms of content, suicide "had been considered in its philosophic, theological, juridical, and social aspects" and "that with the use of statistics, account had been taken of such factors as race, religion, social and political circumstances, the economic situation, and general morality" (Nuesse, 1986a: 614).[20]

---

[20] Emile Durkheim published his study, *Le Suicide*, in 1897. Bouquillon's seminar on suicide was, therefore, conducted some five years before Durkheim's study. It is possible that Bouquillon knew Durkheim as he was very knowledgeable about European social thought and continued to attend conferences in Western Europe.

It seems fair, therefore, to regard Bouquillon as a progenitor of the social sciences at CUA. Apart from defining a general model for the "moral sciences" and developing an institution path, Bouquillon's other contribution was training William Kerby and John Ryan – "the two pioneers of American Catholic social thought who were to rise to national influence as members of the university faculty" (Nuesse, 1986a: 605-606). Ryan was appointed to the Chair of Moral Theology in 1915, and was, therefore, not on the faculty when D. J. MacDonald was a graduate student there. MacDonald took sociology from Professor Kerby, though, during the 1910-1911 academic year. While Kerby gained national prominence during his life, he was also prominent within the University itself, such that, by 1903, it could be said that "his influence in every department of University activity has been far-reaching and constructive" (Senate Minutes, quoted in Nuesse, 1986b: 39).

Kerby had already been teaching sociology at CUA for 13 years when MacDonald became a graduate student. Kerby was recruited by President Keane to the new Chair in Sociology in 1895, and funded for his doctoral study in Europe. President Keane suggested he consider the University of Louvain which had opened its School of Political and Social Sciences a couple of years previously, but there was no doctoral program yet anywhere in Europe. At Louvain, "only in the Faculty of Arts would the Thomistic theologians have a stance favorable to the kind of program that Thomas Bouquillon, Bishop Keane and William Kerby had in mind" (Blasi, 2005: 115). It was home to the Neo-Scholastic, Désiré Mercier (later Cardinal Mercier) whose article "distinguishing between positive science and the positivism that the followers of Comte were propagating" (Nuesse, 2001: 650) was reprinted in 1895 in *The Catholic University Bulletin*. However, Bouquillon advised Kerby to go to Leipzig[21] or Berlin.

After spending the summer of 1895 in Bonn, Kerby went to Berlin for the next three semesters, studying with Georg Simmel, Gustav von Schmoller, and Adolf Wagner, among others (Mulvaney, 1955). Kerby took five courses in 'Nationaloekonomie' (three of them with Schmoller), a course in German social history, and four courses in the philosophy of law and practical philosophy "in which many of the

---

His interest may just have arisen, though, out of a shared intellectual context. As Ian Hacking has demonstrated in *The Taming of Chance*, the concern with administrative statistics of this sort, equally in France, had a lengthy history well before Durkheim's publication.

[21] "Empirical Volkerpsychologie was to be found in Leipzig with Wilhelm Max Wundt, but William I. Thomas had yet to make it common sociological currency in the English-speaking world" (Blasi, 2005: 115-116).

topics that were being included in the emerging European sociology were being treated" (Nuesse, 2001: 652). Above all, though, "all these topics might well have been given a focus by the lectures of Georg Simmel" (p. 652) in the course which Kerby took with him in sociology. In the fall of 1896, Kerby transferred to the University of Louvain and wrote a dissertation on socialism in its School of Political and Social Sciences – *Le socialisme aux États-Unis* (Kerby, 1897) – returning to Washington to start teaching in the fall of 1897. After examining Kerby's detailed lecture notes, Nuesse concludes that "Kerby's Berlin stay was clearly the more significant of the two years that he spent in Europe" (2000: 81).

Blasi records that the first part of Simmel's course covered the history of sociological thought, touching on various mid- and late-nineteenth century social thinkers, and the second part covered material that was later published in Simmel's *Soziologie* ([1908] 2009).[22] Kerby's sociology was rooted in Simmel's 'form sociology', although he used the term 'patterns of behavior', rather than form. The Simmelian form is an ideal-type construction, but Simmel was more interested in the dynamics of social interaction than the civilizational dynamics which attracted Weber. What Kerby does is to insert this understanding of social cognition into a Thomist moral framework:

> Morality for Kerby was not a matter of religious commands,. In his day, Catholic moral thought had moved away from a normative approach. The pedagogical method in moral theology moved away from running through the Ten Commandments and instead used the Thomistic catalog of virtues and vices. The focus was on the quality of dispositions to act, not on rules … By focusing on interior intent and predispositions, the revived Thomistic approach would have the moral actor consider the quality of a proposed action, the quality of the means of accomplishing it, and the circumstances under which the action would be performed … The changed system of Catholic moral theology involved an analysis of the empirical situation, not a mechanical reading of a normative code. Empirical goods included one's own welfare, but also the welfare of individual others and of the society as a whole ("common good") (Blasi, 2005: 117-118).

The link between material goods and the satisfaction of human need, therefore, is not direct, as it was for Carl Menger in his 'first edition' position, but is mediated by human intention, which itself is dependent

---

[22] It should be noted that Anthony Blasi was one of the editors/translators of the Brill translation of Simmel's text: *Sociology: Inquiries into the Construction of Social Forms*. I am drawing from Blasi's account in the remainder of this paragraph.

on the ultimate values held and the social forms which are available. As a result, socialization – into skills, the preferences of others, and sensitivity to the common good – becomes a critical vector for building virtue. Socialization, though, is aimed at building the moral character of people, and needs to be further fulfilled through the processes of individualization and idealization.[23] Individualization revolves around the recognition of the individual as an end in himself, such that "social protection is assured to each part of society, each person, because personality is conceived as an end" (Kerby, 1948: 92). The reconciliation of socialization and individualization is achieved through idealization. "Idealization is the setting up and winning of respect for ideals by which both socialization and individualization are judged (p. 105). Kerby, therefore, was developing a sociology which moved some distance to satisfying Bouquillon's conception of the moral sciences, where the particular sciences are enveloped within the larger frame of moral theology.[24]

The inspiration for Kerby's dissertation may have also had its source in Simmel's course. Kerby's notes from his time in Berlin include material about the involvement of the German churches, both Protestant and Catholic, in social reform (Blasi, 2005: 116). However, Simmel also "treated at some length the origins of conservatism and radicalism and the bases of social continuity" (Nuesse, 2000: 82). By the beginning of 1896, there is a shift in Kerby's dissertation plans, with a decision to focus on socialism since he discovered for it in Europe "an enthusiasm before which argument is powerless" (Kerby to Keane, quoted in Nuesse, 2001: 652). In his dissertation at Louvain, Kerby indicated that he believed America, with its Christian and Democratic traditions, could avoid socialism, but was in danger of going too far and closing off legitimate avenues of reform. He argued that socialism "incited idealism without providing the adherent with a reasonable program based on an understanding of history and the limitations of human nature … and threatened to suppress the individual personality" (Lavey, 1986: 101). His alternative was institutional social reform supported by a coalition of civil society elements (notably the churches and universities), with a positive but limited role for government (pp. 102-106).

In the years of his teaching before the First World War, Kerby revisited and expanded on many of these themes with an extensive

---

[23] The first three chapters of the four chapter posthumous publication of Kerby's sociology textbook, *Introduction to Social Living* (1948), are titled 'Socialization', 'Individualization', and 'Idealization'.

[24] Cf. Carey (1993: 256): "[Kerby] wanted to integrate as much as possible the sciences – sociology in his case – with theology and a Christian way of life."

publication record, but he also worked with them in the courses he offered, primarily to graduate student learners. In the 1896-97 academic year, Kerby offered a course in the 'History and Literature of Sociology', which was "designed to study sociological theory 'historically rather than critically' as subsequent announcements put it" and a course in the 'Elements of Sociology', which had "rather a methodological and philosophical cast" (Nuesse, 2001: 656). In the years remaining before the First World War, though, Kerby created a series of specialized courses building on his Berlin studies:

> During 1898-99 Kerby added to his previous offerings a course on socialism and a seminar on sociological literature. During 1900-1901 he began to offer work "on the Labor Question and the Social Reform Program of the Catholic Church," thus indicating the active interest in labor problems that he maintained for some years. During 1901-1902 he offered a course on the sociological aspects of the medieval guilds and during the following year a course on the sociological aspects of the labor movement … Other courses that Kerby introduced before 1915 treated "social processes in American life with particular reference to the functions of conservatism and radicalism" (1907-1908), the sociological background of poverty and aims and methods in charity (1908-1909), and principles and methods in social reform and social legislation (1910-11) (Nuesse, 2001: 656-657).

And it was in this last year that D. J. MacDonald from Antigonish did his graduate work with Kerby.

The Intellectual Perspective of D. J. MacDonald

MacDonald was no different than many of us in being subject to – perhaps even seeking out – multiple strands of influence in a complex path of intellectual and moral development. To make sense of MacDonald's intellectual outlook, we need to begin by locating his doctoral dissertation, which, unexpectedly, was in English.

In his graduate studies, D. J. MacDonald majored in English with a minor in Economics. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, English had a primacy in the educational curriculum derived from the Arnoldian model of 'liberal education'. The study of literature and poetry was the glue that held the rest of the subjects together. The subject matter of MacDonald's dissertation in English, then, might better be

considered as a 'capstone' project for his studies in the social sciences, than it was an indication of competing interests.

Indeed, the title of MacDonald's dissertation – *The Radicalism of Shelley and its Sources* – betrays the influence of Professor Kerby's sociology. Kerby was drawn to the question of social change and published a number of articles about the relation between radicalism and conservatism, perhaps inspired initially by the lectures of Simmel on this question, as was indicated above. Apart from his studies of socialism and social change which started with his 1897 dissertation and continued through another ten journal articles, Kerby wrote directly on radicalism and conservatism in three articles: 'Radical and Conservative Fault-Finding' (1911), 'The Conservative Mind' (1920a), and 'Processes in Radicalism' (1920b), the last of which was read to the American Sociological Society, of which he was a member of the Executive at that time. So, it is not unexpected to see a topic in which Kerby is deeply interested, then show up as the topic of MacDonald's dissertation.

Apart from the influence of Kerby, though, it must also have been the case that MacDonald felt some interest in, and perhaps attraction to, Romanticism. In an earlier paper, I discussed Jansenism as an expression of the impulse for a 'better appreciation' of immutable reality. Romanticism also, at least in its philosophical and literary inquiry, focussed on the creative impulse and had some resonance with earlier Jansenism.[25] Thomas O'Meara, a Dominican priest and now Emeritus Professor of Theology at the University of Notre Dame, in his influential book, *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism*, writes:

---

[25] It should be understood that Jansenism was never altogether extinguished. Rev. Peter A. Nearing, an Antigonish priest and member of the St. F.X. Extension staff in the 1930s, in a 1965 interview about Bishop John R. MacDonald (who succeeded Archbishop James Morrison to the Antigonish Diocese in 1950), commented that "we talk a lot about Jansenism and the results of Jansenism" (Antigonish Diocesan Archive, Peter Nearing Papers, Fonds 9, Series 2, Sub-Series 1). This, comment, it should be remembered, was made over 250 years after *Unigenitus*, the 1713 encyclical which condemned Jansenism. Nearing summarized his own assessment of the Antigonish Movement in a 1937 article, arguing that "the necessity of intelligent [social] reconstruction is evident" (p. 76) and that "the modern vehicle which carries the common man to the point where he may embark upon the great journey of exploration into those foreign lands of spiritual and material greatness is adult education and consumer's co-operation" (p.79). It is worth noting that Nearing's article was published in the journal, *Rural Sociology*, which had strong editorial links to the University of Wisconsin and the U.S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics (see Gilbert, 2015). It may not also be an accident that Edwin O'Hara of CUA was a contributing editor.

> There are, in the cultural history of the nineteenth century, two great segments; the middle of the century, particularly the years leading to 1848, separates them. The following pages chart the first segment; in many ways the rest of the century – modernism, late Romanticism, neo-scholasticism, socialism – are a reaction to the creativity of the first decades … The upheavals in church and theology before and after Vatican II have their sources in this earlier renewal, a stream which rose in 1790 and ebbed after 1840 … only to rise again in our century (O'Meara, 1982: 12, 15)

In any event, in his dissertation, MacDonald conducts an inquiry into Shelley's intellectual influences, and uses that to contextualize Shelley's poetic output. He concludes that Shelley expressed a noble impulse for reform, but was hampered by a limited sociology:

> "It cannot be said that Shelley had a clear consciousness of the social forces at work in society or of the good being done by the institutions of his time … Shelley would do away with government and authority. Surely some would say, that is enough to discredit him as a thinker forever. On the contrary, it shows how far in advance of his time he was; it shows he had a good grasp of the sociological principle that the less compulsion and the more cooperation under direction there is in any state the better it is … Shelley may not have the 'sense of established facts,' and may be unable to offer suggestions which will work out well in practice, but he does infuse a higher and a nobler conception of life into the consciousness of a people" (MacDonald, 1912: 141, 152).

This claim that MacDonald's dissertation was built around themes of social reform – is given support with the pattern of teaching appointments which MacDonald assumed at St. F.X. after his return. In the first year of his appointment to the faculty at St. Francis Xavier University, 1912/13, MacDonald's position was 'Lecturer in English Literature and History', assisting A. G. MacEchen, 'Professor English Literature, Political Economy & Law'. In the second and third years, MacDonald took over from Professor MacEchen with the position 'Lecturer in English Language, Sociology & Economics'. In the fourth year, 1915/16, MacDonald's position was 'Lecturer in Sociology & Economics', but this was reversed in the fifth years to give precedence to Economics, with the position titled, 'Lecturer in Economics & Sociology', and MacDonald was raised to 'Professor in Economics & Sociology' in the following year, 1917/18. For the next three of the immediate postwar years, 1918/19 – 1920/21, MacDonald benefited from the appointment of Henry Somerville as Lecturer in Sociology, allowing MacDonald to consolidate his position as

'Professor of Economics'.[26] For the following three years, 1921/22-1923/24, MacDonald continued in the position as 'Professor of Economics', although now teaching in sociology as well, perhaps hoping to regain another lecturer in sociology. In 1924-25, MacDonald's position is renamed 'Professor of Economics & Sociology', a title he retains until his retirement from the university in 1944. How do we make sense of this rotation around economics and sociology?

The Simmelian sociology in which Kerby was trained, and later reproduced in his teaching, provided latitude for an alternative to the evolutionary models being developed in America. In the German tradition, sociology grew out of economics itself in a schema with a much broader economic horizon. In the Anglo-French tradition, on the other hand, sociology was conceptualized along Comtean lines as an inversion of the Christian ontology of the sacred and secular, such that society was reified and sociology was enthroned as the queen of the social sciences. In his 1922 'Amalgamation Report', MacDonald shows himself to be thoroughly familiar with, and hostile to, the social determinism of the early American literature in sociology.[27] MacDonald later defined sociology as "the science which attempts to describe the origin, growth, structure and functioning of group life by the operation of geographical, biological, psychological, and cultural forces, operating in interpenetration through a process of evolution" (MacDonald, 1931). I suggest that the determinism of Anglo-French sociology pushed MacDonald toward economics, defined in the then conventional manner as the ordinary business of life, but with the German focus on ethics:[28]

---

[26] Somerville, an Englishman, had founded the *Catholic Socialist Society* in Britain in 1907. He came to Canada in late 1915 where he made a name for himself in Catholic circles with a column on social reform in *The Catholic Register*. Quick to recruit talent, St. F.X. gave him a three-year appointment as Lecturer in Sociology, beginning in the fall semester of 1918; unfortunately, Somerville had to return to England late in the second year of his appointment because of family obligations. He returned to Canada in 1933 upon the offer of a position as editor of *The Catholic Register*, a position he held for the next 20 years until his death. Jeanne Beck has suggested that "Henry Somerville was for many years, particularly during the 1930s, the most influential layman in the English-speaking Catholic Church in Canada" (Beck, 1977: 434; Cf. Beck, 1975 and 1993, and Sinasac, 2003).

[27] Among American sociologists which would still be recognized, he quotes from Robert E. Park, Franklin Giddings, Charles Ellwood, William I. Thomas, Charles Sumner, Edward A. Ross, and Robert McIvor. By the time of Parsons' 1937 reconstruction of sociology around Marshall, Pareto, Durkheim, and Weber, Simmel had been eliminated and Weber assimilated. The positivism of American evolutionary sociology won out over the ethical historicism of German social economics.

> They say that Economics investigates the laws governing the production and distribution of wealth and that it takes no account of the ethical value of these laws. This opinion is fast losing ground however, and the best economists of today recognize the intimate connection between the subject matter of Economics and the subject matter of Ethics and Religion … Chemistry and other physical sciences are neither Christian nor anti-Christian, but this is not true of Economics. Chemistry deals with the actions of matter – dead matter – of molecules and of atoms; but Economics with the *actions of men*, and with these the Church is greatly concerned (MacDonald, 1915; emphasis added).

This kind of focus on economics rather than sociology was, in fact, rather common, particularly among Catholics within social science. At the Catholic University of America, for instance, William Kerby was the sole appointment in sociology until 1915. At that point, Dr. John O'Grady, who had just taken his doctorate in economics, was hired, initially "engaged to help with the social work activities of the Department", but appointed as Professor of Sociology in 1928 (Mulvaney, 1955: 268). So, the priority given to economics by D. J. MacDonald is understandable, and his expertise in sociology was still recognized by his colleagues. In a letter from Moses Coady to Dr. MacPherson while doing studies in education at CUA during the 1914/15 academic year (dated 30 October, 1914), Coady writes about wanting to take some courses in sociology: "I should, I suppose take some sociology for this and may do so later. Does Dr. D. J. teach any sociology at St. F.X? If I could get an elementary course at home it would be just as good." (G5/9/2007, St. F.X. Archives).

The link between MacDonald's economics and his sociology is shown quite clearly in his discussion of economic scarcity:

> Again, Economics deals with the wants of men, and with the good upon which the satisfaction of these wants depends. There are more wants than goods to satisfy them. Where there is scarcity, there will be two men wanting the same thing, and consequently an antagonism of interests … [But] Economics is concerned not only with the conflict between man and man for the possession of economic goods but also with a conflict of interests within the individual himself … If one desire is satisfied some other desire must remain unsatisfied … This conflict may be lessened by either modifying our desires or by increasing the volume of want satisfying

---

[28] One of the textbooks that MacDonald used was William Smart's *An Introduction to the Theory of Value on the Lines of Menger, Wieser, and Bohm-Bäwerk* (1891, 1910).

> goods. The Church has something to say about regulating desires. It grades them for us in some cases, tells us which are the important ones, and which not. In this way the Church affects the value of things for the value of things depends on the desire, the demand for them (MacDonald, 1915).

The crucial difference from what later became neoclassical economics revolves around the treatment of preferences. For MacDonald's social economics, preferences were not *given*, but were a variable that could and should be taught and socialized. That socialization of desire, however, most importantly of the young, is slow work. "Men are naturally conservative, they do not readily give up old habits and old ways of thinking" (MacDonald, 1915):

> In the family one gets one's first habits. There one gets one's language, one's religion, one's like and dislikes; there the child adopts unconsciously the ways of talking, of thinking, and acting of his parents. We are all chips off the old block, not so much because of physical inheritance, but because of the traits that we have developed in family relationships. Moreover, there is a natural tendency to look for the approbation of others, and on that account we act as others act in our environment (MacDonald, 1943).

The right ordering of desires must ultimately be aligned with "the eternal law or God's plan" (MacDonald, 1939: 12). Ultimate values were not arbitrary for MacDonald, therefore, but already given to ethics as natural law:

> According to individualism, the goal of man is freedom. But freedom is not the goal of man. In Christian ethics, freedom is the indispensable free condition for the moral act of man, but as such it is only the means for the attainment of man's ultimate aim, i.e., his perfection and final union with god. The goal of all men, is man's perfection, material and spiritual (MacDonald, 1939: 13).

The alignment of desires with the principles of Christianity leads to a demand for the "renovation of spiritual and material orders" (MacDonald, 1915). "This means,"' argued MacDonald, "the re-shaping of society for the better or in more detail a co-operative effort toward the development of a social order in which there is less friction and more harmony, a world where there is more human well-being for all" (Macdonald, 1931).

In his early essay, "Economics and the Church", while still fresh from his doctoral studies, MacDonald (1915) made it clear that, what later was referred to by Oswald von Nell-Breuning (1951) as the

'vocational order',[29] was the basis for an appropriate and viable strategy for the reconstruction of society. He began by referring to the late medieval guilds:

> To protect themselves against excessive legislation, and to defend their trade against aggression, the members of each trade leagued themselves into a guild. These trade guilds were prevalent in every town in the 15th century. They were not combinations of laborers to resist capitalists, but they comprised all the members of the trade both employers and employed. The members were knit together by bonds of religion, of mutual help and of trade interest. The rich burgher and the poor journeyman met on terms of equality … The union created by the guild minimized oppression and gave to the poorer craftsman a certain measure of content and a sense of security that the workman does not enjoy today … They saw to it that a workman got a decent living and neither he nor his family would suffer want. Besides being brotherhoods for the temporal welfare of their members, the guilds were also religious confraternities. They paid as much, if not more, care to the spiritual side of life (MacDonald, 1916).

MacDonald then tied this to the efforts at social reform that had been made in Europe in recent decades. He referred to Catholic work being done in Germany to promote social legislation, and identifies the "campaign of social reform" and the "methods of co-operation" that were inspired by Bishop Ketteler. He went on to report that "in France, Switzerland, and Belgium, every town has its Catholic association of workmen", and celebrated "the great work of Cardinal Manning in behalf of the working classes" of England, embodied there "in the Catholic social Guild". Finally, he commented on the American interest in the social question, the development of "social science schools in all our large Catholic universities" and "the works of Dr. Kerby and Dr. Ryan of The Catholic University", of which Ryan's book, *A Living Wage* (1906) was "the foundation rock on which all advocates of a living wage base their claims" (MacDonald, 1916).[30] MacDonald concluded by connecting the *économie sociale* of this reform with the guild model he had outlined:

---

[29] Von Nell-Breuning, it will be remembered, was a principal author in the drafting of the encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno.

[30] MacDonald had an ongoing relationship with both Kerby and Ryan: He used publications of Kerby's 'National Conference of Catholic Charities' for many years in his 'Introduction to Sociology' courses, and Ryan was invited to speak at an Antigonish conference in 1920, and various of his writings were reprinted and circulated in the Diocese.

> These efforts are having their effect and we now find a disposition among governments to go back to the old method, to go back and regulate as was done in the Middle Ages. People see that it is not right to leave the fixing of prices to unrestrained competition; they see that the strong oppress the weak, and hence the need of regulation and restraint. We are beginning to get minimum wage laws, Old Age Pensions, workmen's compensation acts, &c. We are beginning in a word to go back to the system of the Middle Ages (MacDonald, 1916).

The 'Banker' of the Antigonish Movement

The theoretical understanding which MacDonald absorbed at CUA was combined with MacDonald's cultural location in the 'Heatherton Inheritance'. As I have described it, the Heatherton community, clan-organized and Jansenist-influenced, was the 'seat' of the Scottish resistance to the ultramontanist campaign which had been waged by Bishop Cameron. The Antigonish Movement became a platform for that resistance to be advanced and placed within a world-historical mission.

MacDonald, as we saw earlier from Coady's remark about sociology, was known as "D.J.". This was no doubt an aid to distinguishing among the various MacDonald clansmen at St. F.X., but it was also a mark of affection, confidence, and respect. D. J. Macdonald was an 'insider' at Antigonish who worked closely with the key figures in the Antigonish Movement. In many ways, MacDonald was something of an 'éminence grise' who played his role behind the public scene. Although having a strong philosophical commitment to social reform, the chief role he was to play was administrative. MacDonald, it can be said, was the 'banker' for the Antigonish Movement.

Indeed, it was no accident that Daniel's younger brother, A.B. MacDonald became the public face as 'organizer' of the movement,[31] as distinct from Coady, the 'animateur' or Tompkins, the 'visionary'.

---

[31] A. B. Macdonald did an undergraduate arts degree at St. F.X., a degree in agriculture at the Nova Scotia College of Agriculture in Truro, and graduate work in agriculture, economics, and education at the Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph, at the University of Toronto, and at the Ontario School of Education (RG25.3/4/2731, "Biography of A. B. MacDonald", St. Francis Xavier University Archives).

Of these three leaders, A(ngus) B(ernard) MacDonald was the one who was most involved in the formation of credit unions, and later founded, first, the Nova Scotia Credit Union League, and then the Co-operative Union of Canada. It was the same capability for organization and administration which his older brother Daniel had.

I have described the intellectual formation of MacDonald in some detail in order to locate him as one of the major conduits for the theoretical influences on the Movement, working with the intellectual tools that were then available. He himself made no theoretical advance, and there is no evidence that he was aware of German theoretical work, beyond that of Simmel whom he would have known through Kerby; most of his activities were involved in teaching and administration, and he did not write much. And, yet, what writings do survive show a deft and confident handling of theoretical concepts that were far removed from the practical organizing problems of the Antigonish Movement, and an unyielding commitment to the transformation of society. It was no accident, therefore, that Tompkins referred to MacDonald as being the most radical of them all (Tompkins, 1924; cited in Cameron, 1996: 472). Tompkins said this, it seems evident, because he recognized the intellectual prowess of MacDonald's capacity to penetrate to fundamentals. In the spring of 1936, for instance, Tompkins wrote a letter to A. B. MacDonald discussing a book by Father John Ryan on social reconstruction, asking 'A.B.' to speak to his brother about the suitability of reproducing one of the chapters for dissemination in the diocese (RG30-2/21, R345d, St. F.X. Archives). Tompkins was enrolling D. J. MacDonald in 'vetting' the theoretical stance of the Movement. This mastery of fundamentals was given final expression in the Memorial in The Casket after MacDonald's death:

> Dr. D.J. had a keen sense of justice. He could not tolerate the enslavement of men by unjust employers or a system which permitted men to be enslaved. In company with other pioneers in the St. F.X. social movement, he saw the feasibility of a full, free life for every person within the framework of a Christian society. He saw Christianity as a practical way of life (*The Casket*, Sep 16, 1948).

MacDonald's first significant effort at uniting his theoretical understanding with his administrative capability occurred with his authorship of "A Report on the Proposed Federation of the Maritime Universities" presented to the Governors of St. F.X. in 1922. The Carnegie Foundation, concerned about the volume of requests for financial assistance from the various Maritime universities, had commissioned a member of their staff, Dr. William S. Learned, and the President of Bowdoin College in Maine, Dr. Kenneth C. M. Sills,

to investigate the situation of the Maritime colleges and to recommend "a constructive policy for the treatment particularly of the institutions that had applied for aid" (Learned and Sills, 1922: vii). In their report, published in the spring of 1922, they made a recommendation for a 'confederation' of the institutions of higher education, centred on Dalhousie University in Halifax. This proposal, however, did not adequately account for the religious foundation of the different colleges – Acadia (Baptist), Mount Allison (Methodist), St. Francis Xavier and Saint Mary's (Roman Catholic), and Dalhousie (by default, Presbyterian) – and the parallel geographical location of their constituencies. MacDonald's report was scathing in its rejection of the proposed 'confederation', arguing that the undergraduate liberal arts institution served a vital and essential function in the economic and social life of its region, that St. F.X. satisfied the minimum scale requirements for an efficient operation, and that the inevitably procrustean bed of studies at Dalhousie would lead to the secularization of values, the erosion of religious vocations, and the undermining of Catholic society in Eastern Nova Scotia. Tompkins, the most ardent supporter of 'confederation' among the diocesan priests, claimed that MacDonald did not believe a word of the report he had written (Tompkins, 1924; cited in Cameron, 1996: 472), but given the intellectual passion with which MacDonald advances his argument against 'confederation', this comment strains credulity to the point of breaking. Tompkins' observation is, rather, an indication of how clouded Tompkins' own judgement could become in the face of his own passions. From our present location in history, it seems almost self-evidently true that 'confederation' would not, in fact, have served the interests of St. F.X., the Catholic faith, or the people of Eastern Nova Scotia. History, it seems, would have sided with the judgements of Father MacDonald and Bishop Morrison on this matter, not with the opinions of Father Tompkins. In any event, the Report prepared by MacDonald was such as to convince the Board of Governors not to proceed with the talks on amalgamation, but to turn its attention to his own alternative, "the reform of Maritime rural life and economic relations" (Cameron, 1996: 241).

The Report opened an administrative path for MacDonald, and it was in just this way that he could serve the Antigonish Movement. Having the confidence of both Bishop Morrison and the Board of Governors, MacDonald was appointed as Vice-Rector in 1925, and then to the Office of Vice-President in 1930. The retirement of H. P. MacPherson in 1936, at the end of a thirty-six year Presidency (1900-1936), came as a shock to the university community, but it provided an opening for MacDonald, at the age of 55, to succeed him to the Presidency of St. F.X.

By then, the Antigonish Movement was in full stride.[32] In its classic form, the 'mass meeting' was the initial building block of the Movement, followed by the formation of study-groups proceeding "on the general principle that study should issue as soon as possible in action calculated to bring about the economic betterment of the people" (RG31.3/25/973, St. Francis Xavier University Archives). The Extension Department of St. F.X., the animation and organizing unit of the Movement, was formed in 1928 with Moses Coady as its Director. In 1931-32, the Department organized 280 'mass meetings' with some 20,000 people attending. In the five years ending in 1935-36, the number of mass meeting annually had risen to 470 with some 43,000 people attending. Apart from the community organizers themselves, this activity was supported by an annual 'Rural and Industrial Conference', a yearly 'Short Course for Leaders', a bi-weekly Extension Bulletin, and a resource library of books, pamphlets and articles. The achievements were found in the formation of co-operative stores, producer co-operatives, and credit unions. In his 1939 paper presented to the Canadian Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas, MacDonald reported that the Antigonish Movement then had 11 full-time, 2 part-time, and 30 project workers. What is remarkable about this situation is that the number of Extension workers was then greater than the entire teaching faculty of the university. That situation speaks not just to the charisma and organizing capabilities of the Movement leadership, but to the anchoring hand of MacDonald's back-office capabilities as the 'banker' for the Movement.[33]

MacDonald's alignment with the aims of the Antigonish Movement is perhaps displayed best in his 1939 paper. The paper was titled,

---

[32] There is a large literature about the Antigonish Movement, including 13 doctoral dissertations (Alexander, 1985; Burbridge, 1943; Dennis, 2015; Dutcher, 2001; Hogan, 1986; Laidlaw, 1958; MacInnes, 1978; Mifflen, 1974; Murphy, 1949; Neal, 1995; Sacouman, 1976; Schirber, 1940; Sowder, 1967), a number of which have later been published as books. A handful of other scholarly monographs have been published as specialized studies (Coutinho, 1966; Dodara and Pluta, 2012; Ludlow, 2015; MacPherson, 1979; Mathews, 1999), and the influential collection of essays edited by Brym and Sacouman (1979) should be mentioned. Finally, there is a literature by Movement workers; see, for instance: Boyle, 1953; Coady, 1939, 1971; Delaney, 1985. Beyond this, there is a voluminous literature of popular books, articles, and secondary studies which are readily accessible.

[33] The role of banker is one at arm's length from day-to-day transactions, but is involved in the review, assessment, and possible underwriting of the strategic allocation of funds. The minutes for Sept. 11 and Sept. 18, 1939 of the Board of Governors' Committee on Extension Expenses, on which D. J. MacDonald sat, provide a good example of the extent to which the spending envelope of Extension was dependent on the strategic decisions relating to a larger financial architecture (Minutes, BOG Committee on Extension Expense, St. F.X. Archives).

"The Philosophy of the Antigonish Movement', and shows that MacDonald was every bit as committed to the world-historical mission of the Movement as Coady was. He uses this paper to outline the aim of adult education to raise up the poor and dispossessed and help them organize themselves cooperatively to build institutions of self-help and renewal. As he says, "Nowadays not so much attention is paid to bombing the Maginot line of the entrenched interests, but stress is laid rather on the value of study, and of the co-operative movement" (MacDonald, 1939: 7). After detailing the various forms of co-operation which have been developed under Movement auspices, MacDonald expands the discourse to claim that "the social justice and misery that prevail come from either the individualist or collectivist philosophies" (p. 11). Arguing that they are philosophically problematic, he indicates that "the Antigonish Movement is entirely antagonistic to these two philosophies" (p. 16), and proceeds to make the case for co-operation as the 'solution' for these social and economic ills. He quotes Cardinal Capecelatro who argues for an emerging apologia – a justification for social action – as the product of Catholicism and the science that Catholicism inspires:

> God Almighty has so constituted the Christian life, that in every age or rather in every series of ages, it appears with a new apologia, due to the new conditions of the race. Now, in our day, if I am not deceived, this new apologia will be the product of the Social Question, and progress in that question will most certainly be made in the name of Jesus Christ living in His Church. To the classic defences of the past – the martyrdom, to the more perfect sanctity of the Church, to the doctrine of the Fathers, to the monastic life, to the overthrow of barbarous Powers, to Christian Art and literature, to the harmony of science and faith, and the new forms of charity of the last two centuries will be added this fresh apologia, a solution of the Social Question by Catholicism and by the Science Catholicism inspires (Capecelatro (1909); quoted in MacDonald, 1939: 17).

MacDonald defines the world-historical mission of the Antigonish Movement with its philosophy of co-operation as the means to a resolution of the Social Question. The implication is that all the world was conspiring in this Movement as the fulfillment of the Church's social teaching. MacDonald closes his lecture with the words of uplift and encouragement by Cardinal Pacelli to Bishop Morrison:[34] "They (the teachers of St. Francis Xavier University),

---

[34] Letter to Morrison, March 8, 1938. Cardinal Pacelli was raised to the papacy as Pius XII on March 2, 1939.

strive to help them (the poor) better their lot in such a way that the full teaching of the encyclicals Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno may be put into practice" (MacDonald, 1939: 26-27).

~

In the earlier paper on 'The Heatherton Inheritance', I described the intellectual culture into which D. J. MacDonald was born: a Scottish Highland, Jansenist-influenced Catholicism, of rural farming and self-sufficient economies, organized in a clan-based system of affiliation and reciprocity. In this paper, I have sought to describe the more proximate intellectual influences on MacDonald. In doing so, I have concentrated on his graduate education at the Catholic University of America in Washington. I then tried to show how that intellectual platform provided the foundation for MacDonald's back-office leadership as the 'banker' of the Antigonish Movement.

Certainly the texts which MacDonald used most frequently in his courses at St. F.X. were consistent with his training. I focussed attention then on the writings of MacDonald himself, and tried to show that they were broadly consistent with a pattern evident in the early foundation of social science there by Thomas Bouquillon, and the later teachings of Frank O'Hara and William Kerby. I suggested that what was common was an approach in which the specialized social sciences were contained within a framework of moral theology.

In the case of MacDonald, his interests were more strongly focussed on the economic than the sociological, and his sociology seems to find a place as part of his own *économie sociale*. No doubt, this interest was more compatible with the pragmatic Scottish culture in which Macdonald was raised. However, his economics was conditioned by the Anglo-French tradition of social science, rather than the new theoretical models then being developed in German social science, and there is no hint of the methodological concerns that we find with Weber. In MacDonald's takeup of the Anglo-French models of social reform, MacDonald is attracted to a reconstruction of the vocational order with the model of the medieval guild. Rather than a state-led approach to regulation, however, he is committed to an '*économie sociale* from-below', the approach with which Kerby would have become familiar at Louvain. The Antigonish co-operative movement was simply the contemporary expression of the medieval guild built from the bottom up.

The failure to grasp the deeper theoretical issues of German *Sozialökonomik*, however, left MacDonald and the Antigonish Movement critically vulnerable. With the neoclassical synthesis of postwar economics, there was not an adequate philosophical or practical response to the market competition that the cooperative enterprise began to face. Dodara and Pluta (2012), in their recent analysis, flag the failure to integrate the various economic activities into a self-generating system. That failure, however, was, not just one of practice, but was, more critically, a theoretical failure. The Antigonish Movement was theoretically too weak to survive the postwar assault on its practices.

Given the theoretical developments that have happened since then, hindsight suggest that it would have been virtually impossible for those brave activists to have found the deeper solutions that were required. That task, in fact, awaits a new Antigonish Movement in the present day.

References

Acheson, Thomas William. (1972). "The National Policy and the Industrialization of the Maritimes, 1880-1910." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 1, No. 2, 3-28.

Acheson, Thomas William. (1979). "The Great Merchant and Economic Development in St. John, 1820-1850." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 8, No. 2, 3-27.

Almodovar, António and Pedro Teixeira. (2008). "The Ascent and Decline of Catholic Economic Thought, 1830-1950s." *History of Political Economy*: Vol. 40, Annual Supplement, 62-87.

Almodovar, António and Pedro Teixeira. (2010). "Is There a Catholic Economic Thought? Some Answers From the Past." In *Humanism and Religion in the History of Economic Thought*, D. F. Parish and S. Solari (eds.), pp. 125-147. Milan: FrancoAngeli.

Almodovar, António and Pedro Teixeira. (2012). "'Catholic in its Faith, Catholic in its Manner of Conceiving Science': French Catholic Political Economy in the 1830s." *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*: Vol. 19, No. 2, 197-225.

Armenteros, Carolina. (2014). "Hugues-Félicité Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854): Lost Sheep of the Religious Enlightenment." In *Enlightenment and Catholicism in Europe: A Transnational History*, Jeffrey d. Burson and Ulrich L. Lehner (eds.), pp. 145-164. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Asso, Pier Francesco and Luca Fiorito. (2006). "Editor's Introduction (to Edwin Robert Anderson Seligman, Autobiography (1929)." *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology*: Vol. 24-C, 149-162.

Beck, Jeanne R. (1975). "Henry Somerville and Social Reform: His Contribution to Canadian Catholic Social Thought." *CCHA Study Sessions*: Vol. 42, 91-108.

Beck, Jeanne R. (1977). *Henry Somerville and the Development of Catholic Social Thought in Canada: Somerville's Role in the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1915-1943*. Doctoral Dissertation. Hamilton: McMaster University.

Beck, Jeanne R. (1993). "Contrasting Approaches to Catholic Social Action During the Depression: Henry Somerville the Educator and Catherine de Hueck the Activist." In *Catholics at the Gathering Place: Historical Essays on the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1841-1991*, Mark McGowan and Brian Clarke (eds.), pp. 213-232. Toronto: Canadian Catholic Historical Association.

Blasi, Anthony J. (2005). "The Sociology of William J. Kerby of Catholic University." In *Diverse Histories of American Sociology*, A. J. Blasi (ed.), pp. 111-123. Leiden: Brill.

Bouquillon, Thomas. (1899). "Moral Theology at the End of the Nineteenth Century." *The Catholic University Bulletin*: Vol. 5, 244-268.

Brookes, Alan A. (1976). "Out-Migration from the Maritime Provinces, 1860-1900." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 5, No. 2, 26-55.

Burrill, Gary. (1992). *Away: Maritimers in Massachussetts, Ontario, and Alberta*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Cameron, James D. (1996). *For the People: A History of St. Francis Xavier University*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Campbell, Douglas A. and R. A. MacLean. (1974). *Beyond the Atlantic Roar: A Study of the Nova Scotia Scots*. Ottawa: McClelland & Stewart.

Carey, Patrick W. (1993). "Kerby, William J." In *The Roman Catholics*., pp. 256-257. Westport: Greenwood Press.

CER Editor. (1938). "Dr. Frank O'Hara, Educator, is Dead." *Catholic Educational Review*: Vol. 36, No. 7, 429-430.

Chernoff, Alex. (2014). "1871 Productivity Differentials and the Decline of the Maritime Manufacturing Sector." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 43, No. 1, 65-88.

Clow, Michael. (1984). Politics and Uneven Development: The Maritime Challenge to the Study of Canadian Political Economy. *Studies in Political Economy*, *A Socialist Review*: Vol. 14, No. 1, 117-140.

Clow, Michael. (1985). "Situating a Classic: Saunders Revisited." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 15, No. 1, 145-152.

Coats, R. H. (1927). *The Maritime Provinces Since Confederation: A Statistical Study of their Social and Economic Condition during the Past Sixty Years*. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Cook, Robert C. (ed.). (1934-35). "O'Hara, Frank." In *Who's Who in American Education: A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Living Educators of the United States*, Sixth Edition, p. 557. New York: The Robert C. Cook Company.

Curran, Charles E. (1995). "Thomas Joseph Bouquillon: Americanist, Neo-Scholastic, or Manualist?" *Catholic Theological Society of America (CTSA) Proceedings*: Vol. 50, 156-173.

Curtis, Georgina Bell (ed.). (1911). "O'Hara, Dr. Frank." In *The American Catholic Who's Who*, p. 489. St. Louis: B. Herder.

Dodara, Santo, and Leonard Pluta. (2012). *The Big Picture: The Antigonish Movement of Eastern Nova Scotia*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Drolet, Michael. (2003). "Legitimism and Political Economy: The Influence of Villeneuve-Bargemont." In *Tocqueville*, *Democracy and Social Reform*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Faccarello, Gilbert. (2014). "From the Foundation of Liberal Political Economy to Its Critique: Theology and Economics in France in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." In *The Oxford Handbook of Christianity and Economics*, Paul Oslington (ed.), pp. 73-93. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faccarello, Gilbert. (2017). "A Dance Teacher for Paralyzed People? Charles de Coux and the Dream of a Christian Political Economy." *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*: Online First, 1-48.

Fingard, Judith. (1993). "The 1880s: Paradoxes of Progress." In *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*, E. R. Forbes and D. A. Muise (eds.), pp. 82-116. Toronto and Fredericton: University of Toronto Press and Acadiensis Press.

Forbes, Ernest R. (1977). "Misguided Symmetry: The Destruction of Regional Transportation Policy for the Maritimes." In *Canada and the Burden of Unity*, David Bercuson (ed.), pp. 87-114. Toronto: MacMillan.

Forbes, Ernest R. (1979). *The Maritime Rights Movement, 1919-1927*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gilbert, Jess. (2015). *Planning Democracy: Agrarian Intellectuals and the Intended New Deal*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Goyau, Georges. (1913). "Villeneuve-Bargement, Jean-Paul-Alban, Vicomte de." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume XV, Charles Herbermann et al. (eds.), p. 431. New York: The Encyclopedia Press.

Hoehn, Matthew. (1948). "Right Reverend William J. Kerby, 1870-1936." In *Catholic Authors*, *Contemporary Biographical Sketches*, *1930-1947*, Volume 1, M. Hoehn (ed.), pp. 384-385. Newark: St. Mary's Abbey.

Inwood, Kris E. (1991). "Maritime Industrialization from 1870 to 1910: A Review of the Evidence and Its Interpretation." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 21, No. 1, 132-155.

Inwood, Kris E. and Ian Keay. (2005). "Bigger Establishments in Thicker Markets: Can We Explain Early Productivity Differentials between Canada and the United States." *The Canadian Journal of Economics*: Vol. 38, No. 4, 1327-1363.

Inwood, Kris E. and Ian Keay. (2008). "The Devil is in the Details: Assessing Early Industrial Performance Across International Borders Using Late Nineteenth Century North American Manufacturers as a Case Study." *Cliometrica*: Vol. 2, No. 2, 85-117.

Inwood, Kris E. and Ian Keay. (2012); "Diverse Paths to Industrial Development: Evidence from Late-Nineteenth-Century Canada." *European Review of Economic History*: Vol. 16, No. 3, 311-333.

Kerby, William J. (1897). *Le socialisme aux États-Unis.* Bruxelles: J. Goemaere.

Kerby, William J. (1911). "Radical and Conservative Fault-Finding." *The Catholic World*: Vol. 93, No. 554, 213-224.

Kerby, William J. (1913). "Bouquillon, Thomas." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, Charles Herbermann et al. (eds.), pp. 715-716. New York: The Encyclopedia Press.

Kerby, William J. (1920a). "The Conservative Mind." *The Catholic World*: Vol. 110, No. 659, 577-590.

Kerby, William J. (1920b). "Processes in Radicalism." *Publications of the American Sociological Society*: Vol. 15, 163-173.

Kerby, William J. (1948). *Introduction to Social Living*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Lavey, Patrick Bernard. (1986). *William J. Kerby, John A. Ryan, and the Awakening of the Twentieth Century American Catholic Social Conscience, 1899-1919*. Doctoral Dissertation. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana -Champaign.

Learned, William S. and Kenneth C. M. Sills. (1922). Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada. Bulletin Number Sixteen. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Leinsle, Ulrich G. ([1995] 2010). *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, Michael J. Miller (trans.). Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1912). *The Radicalism of Shelley and Its Sources*. Doctoral Dissertation. Washington: Catholic University Press.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1915). "Economics and the Church, Part 1." *Xaverian Weekly*: Vol. 20, No. 2.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1916). "Economics and the Church, Part 2." *Xaverian Weekly*: Vol. 20, No. 3.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1922). *A Report on the Proposed Federation of the Maritime Universities*. Committee Appointed by His Lordship Bishop Morrison. Antigonish: St. Francis Xavier University.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1927). *Country Life versus City Life: A Few Timely Observations*. Halifax: Ministry of Natural Resources.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1931). "A General Idea of Sociology." *Xaverian Weekly*: Vol. 35, No.12.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1939). "The Philosophy of the Antigonish Movement." Paper Read before the Canadian Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas, Quebec. Antigonish: St. Francis Xavier Archives.

MacDonald, Daniel J. (1943). "Speech Given At Opening of Radio Station CJFX." Antigonish: St. Francis Xavier Archives.

MacKinnon, Robert. (1996). "Agriculture and Rural Change in Nova Scotia, 1851-1951." *Canadian Papers in Rural History*: Vol. 10, 231-273.

Marchildon, Gregory P. (1990). Promotion, Finance and Mergers in Canadian Manufacturing Industry, 1885-1918. Doctoral Dissertation. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Marchildon, Gregory P. (1993). "John F. Stairs, Max Aitken and the Scotia Group: Finance Capitalism and Industrial Decline in the Maritimes, 1890-1914." In *Farm, Factory and Fortune: New Studies in the Economic History of the Maritime Provinces*, Kris Inwood (ed.), pp. 197-218. Fredericton:. Acadiensis Press.

McCann, Lawrence D. (1979). "Staples and the New Industrialism in the Growth of Post-Confederation Halifax." *Acadiensis*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 47-79.

McCann, Lawrence D. (1981). "The Mercantile-Industrial Transition in the Metals Town of Pictou County, 1857-1931." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 10, No. 2, 29-64.

Misner, Paul (1991). *Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Mulvaney, B. G. (1955). "The Department of Sociology of the Catholic University of America, 1894-1955." *The American Catholic Sociological Review*: Vol. 16, No. 4, 266-274.

Nearing, Peter A. (1937). "Notes: The Xaverian Movement." *Rural Sociology*: Vol. 2, No. 1, 76-79.

Nearing, Peter A. (1975). He Loved the Church: The Biography of Bishop John R. MacDonald, Fifth Bishop of Antigonish. Antigonish: The Casket.

Nelson, Robert. (2015). "A German on the Prairies: Max Sering and Settler Colonialism in Canada." *Settler Colonial Studies*: Vol. 5, No. 1, 1-19.

Nitsch, Thomas O. (1990). "Social Economics: The First 200 Years." In *Social Economics: Retrospect and Prospect*, Mark A. Lutz (ed.), pp. 5-90. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Nuesse, C. Joseph. (1986a). "Thomas Joseph Bouquillon (1842-1902), Moral Theologian and Precursor of the Social Sciences in the Catholic University of America." *The Catholic Historical Review*: Vol. 72, No. 4, 601-619.

Nuesse, C. Joseph. (1986b). "The Introduction of the Social Sciences in the Catholic University of America, 1895-1909." *Social Thought*: Vol. 12, No. 2, 30-43.

Nuesse, C. Joseph. (1988). "Undergraduate Education at the Catholic University of America: The First Decades, 1889-1930." *U.S. Catholic Historian*: Vol. 7, No. 4, 429-451.

Nuesse, C. Joseph. (1991). "Before Rerum Novarum: A Moral Theologian's View of Catholic Social Movements in 1891." *Social Thought*: Vol. 17, No. 2, 5-17.

Nuesse, C. Joseph. (2000). "William Joseph Kerby (1870-1936): The Approach to His Field of the First American Catholic Sociologist." *American Catholic Studies*: Vol. 111, No. 1/4, 77-96.

Nuesse, C. Joseph. (2001). "The Introduction of Sociology at the Catholic University of America, 1895-1915." *The Catholic Historical Review*: Vol. 87, No. 4, 643-661.

Ocampo, José Antonio. (2005). "The Quest for Dynamic Efficiency: Structural Dynamics and Economic Growth in Developing Countries." In *Beyond Reforms: Structural Dynamics and Macroeconomic Vulnerability*, J. A. Ocampo (ed.), pp. 3-43. Palo Alto and Washington: Stanford University Press and the World Bank.

O'Hara, Frank. (1913). "Political Economy." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume XII, Charles Herbermann et al., pp. 213-216. New York: The Encyclopedia Press.

O'Hara, Frank. (1916). *Introduction to Economics*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

O'Hara, Frank, with Joseph M. O'Leary and Edwin B. Hewes. (1939). *Economics: Principles and Problems*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.

O'Meara, Thomas. (1982). *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Personal Notes. (1894). *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*: Vol. 4, No. 1, (January), 155-168.

Riesebrodt, Martin. (1989). "From Patriarchalism to Capitalism: The Theoretical Context of Max Weber's Agrarian Studies (1892-3)." In *Reading Weber*, Keith Tribe (ed.), pp. 131-157. London: Routledge.

Rodrik, Dani. (2005). "Growth Strategies." In *Handbook of Economic Growth*, Volume 1A, Phillipe Aghion and Steven N. Durlauf (eds.), pp. 967-1014. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Roth, Guenther. (2002). "Max Weber: Family History, Economic Policy, Exchange Reform." *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*: Vol. 15, No. 3, 63-78.

Ryan, John A. (1906). *A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects*. London: The MacMillan Company.

Ryan, John A. (1941). *Social Doctrine in Action: A Personal History*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Saunders, Stanley Alexander. (1932). The Economic Welfare of the Maritime Provinces. Economic Publications No. 1, Acadia University, Wolfville.

Saunders, Stanley Alexander. (1939). *Studies in the Economy of the Maritime Provinces*. Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited.

Simmel, Georg. ([1908] 2009). *Sociology: Inquiries into the Construction of Social Forms*, (Volumes 1 & 2), A. J. Blasi, A. K. Jacobs, and M. Kanjirathinkal (trans.). Leiden: Brill.

Sinasac, Joseph. (2003). *Fateful Passages: The Life of Henry Somerville, Catholic Journalist*. Ottawa: Novalis Press.

Solari, Stefano. (2007). "The Contribution of Neo-Thomistic Thought to Roman Catholic Social Economy." *American Review of Political Economy*: Vol. 5, No. 2, 39-58.

Stearns, Peter N. (1960). "The Nature of the Avenir Movement (1830-1831)." *The American Historical Review*: Vol. 65, No. 4, 837-847.

Thornton, Patricia A. (1985). "The Problem of Out-Migration from Atlantic Canada, 1871-1921: A New Look." *Acadiensis*: Vol. 15, No. 1, 3-34.

Tribe, Keith. (1988). *Governing Economy: The Reformation of German Economic Discourse, 1750-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tribe, Keith. (1989a). "Prussian Agriculture – German Politics: Max Weber, 1892-1897." In *Reading Max Weber*, Keith Tribe (ed.), pp. 85-130. London: Routledge.

Tribe, Keith. (1989b). "Introduction." In *Reading Max Weber*, Keith Tribe (ed.), pp. 1-14. London: Routledge.

Tribe, Keith. (1995). *Strategies of Economic Order: German Economic Discourse, 1750-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Troughton, Michael J. (1988). "From Nodes to Nodes: The Rise and Fall of Agricultural Activity in the Maritime Provinces." In Geographical Perspectives on the Maritime Provinces, Douglas Day (ed.), pp. 25*-46. Halifax: Saint Mary's University.

Von Nell-Breuning, Oswald. (1951). "Vocational Groups and Monopoly." *Review of Social Economy*: Vol. 9, No. 2, 89-110.

Yellowitz, Irwin. (1968). "The Origins of Unemployment Reform in the United States." *Labor History*: Vol. 9, No. 3, 338-360.