

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON
NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH LITERATURE

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE TEXAS STATE COLLEGE
FOR WOMEN IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY

MABLE GENE CAMPBELL

DENTON, TEXAS

August, 1935

TEXAS STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

COLLEGE OF INDUSTRIAL ARTS

DENTON, TEXAS

August, 1935

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared
under my supervision by Mable Gene Campbell
entitled CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM AND ITS INFLUENCE
UPON NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH LITERATURE
be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts.

L. M. Ellison
In Charge of Thesis

L. M. Ellison
Director of Department

Accepted:

W. H. Clark
Chairman, Committee on Graduate Study

53975

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to show wherein Christian Socialism, the social-ethical theory based upon the Golden Rule, is reflected in the works of Thomas Carlyle, Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, John Ruskin, Arnold Toynbee, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, who evolved a plan for a social order, founded upon practical Christian principles, that would adjust the differences between social classes and would eradicate the economic and social injustices of the ancien regime.

To Dr. L. M. Ellison, head of the English department, for his invaluable suggestions and guidance and to the members of the library staff for their kindly assistance I wish to express my sincere appreciation.

CHAPTER I
CURRENTS OF SOCIAL UNREST IN EARLY
NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

	Page
I. The growth of democracy in the nineteenth century.....	1-10
1. The French Revolution the first articulate expression of the aspirations of democracy in Europe.....	1-2
2. The agitation for reform and the two-party system in England.....	2
3. The unsettling influence of the Reform Bill of 1832.....	2-3
4. The era of reform 1800 to 1848.....	3-4
5. The Chartist petition 1848.....	4-5
6. The "bloodless revolution" of 1848.....	5-6
7. "Chartism" a conscious class struggle.....	6-7
8. Marxian Socialism a disturbing influence in the later nineteenth century.....	7-8
9. Utopianism and its effect upon the social-economic life.....	8-10
II. English thought in the nineteenth century.....	10-15
10. The growth of rational thought.....	10-11
11. The religious disturbances of the period.....	11-14
12. The social-ethical theory of the period.....	14-15

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM: THE SOCIAL-ETHICAL THEORIES OF THOMAS CARLYLE, FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, AND CHARLES KINGSLEY

I.	General introduction to the period 1832 to 1848.....	16-19
1.	The strong materialistic implications of new tendencies in the scientific thought of the nineteenth century.....	16-17
2.	Innate idealism of the English people in revolt against a materialistic view of life in the world.....	17-19
II.	Carlyle an inspirational force upon the social-ethical philosophy of the nineteenth century.....	19-27
3.	Carlyle the prophet of his age.....	19-21
4.	Carlyle's <u>Everlasting Nay</u> to the democratic tendencies of the period.....	21-23
5.	Carlyle's <u>Everlasting Yea</u> , the doctrine of duty and work.....	23-24
6.	Carlyle's <u>real kings</u> and <u>real kingdoms</u> ...	24-26
7.	Carlyle and the Christian Social movement.....	26-27
III.	Christian Socialism and its effect upon the	

social-ethical theories of the latter half of the nineteenth century.....	27-65
8. The doctrine of Christian Socialism.....	27-29
9. Frederick Denison Maurice, the chief exponent of the Christian Social movement.....	29-32
10. Charles Kingsley and the Christian Social movement.....	32-33
11. The discovery of a policy.....	33-34
12. The literary activities of the movement...	34-38
13. The novels of Charles Kingsley.....	38
14. <u>Yeast</u> , <u>A Problem</u> : its purpose.....	38-39
15. Lancelot Smith's search for truth and faith.....	39-42
16. The influence of Barnakill, the prophet, upon Lancelot.....	43-46
17. A summation of the value of <u>Yeast</u> to Christian Socialism.....	46
18. Publication of <u>Alton Locke</u>	46-49
19. The author's purpose.....	47-49
20. The influence in the early life of Alton Locke.....	49-51
21. Alton Locke, the poet.....	51-55
22. Alton Locke's discovery of a hero.....	55
23. The associative activities of the	

Christian Socialists.....	56-57
24. The functions of the Council and the Central Board.....	57-59
25. The first Associations founded.....	59-60
26. Christian Socialism and the Trades Union strikes.....	60-61
27. The Central Cooperative Agency.....	61-62
28. The establishment of the Working Men's College.....	62-64
29. Achievements of the Christian Socialists.....	64-65

CHAPTER III
JOHN RUSKIN: CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM IN THE
TRANSITIONAL PHASE

	Page
I. General introduction.....	66-68
1. The status of Christian Socialism in the later nineteenth century.....	66-67
2. Ruskin's relation to the Christian Socialists from 1854 to 1860.....	67-68
II. Ruskin's social ethics.....	68-76
3. His gospel of art.....	68-70
4. His ethical spirit a reflection of Carlyle and Maurice.....	70-73
5. The topics of Ruskin's works indicative of the development of his ethical spirit.....	73-74
6. The Carlylean gospel of work as expanded by Ruskin.....	74-76
III. Ruskin as a political economist.....	76-83
7. His qualification for his singular task.....	76-77
8. Ruskin's criticism of orthodox political economy.....	77-78
9. The just relation of masters and men.....	78-80
10. Ruskin's definition of wealth and value..	80-81

11.	Production and consumption as the basis of political economy.....	81-83
IV.	Ruskin as a social reformer.....	83-92
12.	Government and its functions.....	83-85
13.	The true social order.....	85-87
14.	The organization of agriculture.....	87-89
15.	The place of education in the true social order.....	89-92
V.	The practical experiments of Ruskin.....	92-97
16.	Ruskin's early practical social experiments.....	92-93
17.	Basic principles of the Guild of St. George.....	93-95
18.	Financial difficulties of the Guild of St. George and its ultimate success...	95-96
19.	The Ruskin Art Museum at Sheffield.....	96
20.	The hand-weaving industries of Langdale and Laxey.....	97
VI.	Ruskin a modern prophet.....	97-98
21.	A summation of his influence.....	97-98
22.	His influence upon settlement work.....	98

CHAPTER IV

ARNOLD TOYNBEE AND MRS. HUMPHRY WARD:

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM IN A LATER PHASE

I.	Aspects of later Christian Socialism.....	99-100
II.	Arnold Toynbee, social reformer.....	100-105
	1. Arnold Toynbee, a public spirited man....	100-101
	2. Toynbee's opposition to Continental Socialism and Collectivism.....	101-102
	3. The place of the Church and the State in a democracy.....	102-103
	4. The need for a vitalized Christianity....	103-104
	5. Practical Christianity a solution of the social problem.....	104-105
III.	Social Settlement work in London.....	106-121
	6. Mary Arnold (1851-1867).....	106
	7. Mary Arnold at Oxford from 1867 to 1881..	106-107
	8. Marriage to T. Humphry Ward and early public interests.....	107-108
	9. Religious skepticism.....	108-109
	10. London and early literary effort.....	109-110
	11. <u>Robert Elsmere</u> , a religious problem.....	110-113
	12. University Hall, 1890.....	113-114
	13. Aims and achievements of University Hall.....	114-115

14.	The Passmore Edwards Settlement.....	115-116
15.	The Children's Evening Play Centres.....	116-117
16.	The Crippled Children's School.....	117-119
17.	The Vacation Schools.....	119-120
18.	Act of Parliament recognizing Mrs. Ward's social work.....	120-121
IV.	The social-political novels of Mrs. Humphry Ward.....	121-152
19.	The novel the medium of expression in the nineteenth century.....	121-123
20.	Mrs. Ward's qualifications as a novelist.....	123-124
21.	<u>Marcella</u> , 1892.....	124-125
22.	Marcella Boyce at Mellor.....	125-126
23.	Marcella and Jim Hurd, the poacher.....	126-127
24.	Marcella and Wharton, the radical.....	127-129
25.	Social-political ideas as revealed in <u>Marcella</u>	129-130
26.	<u>Sir George Tressady</u> , 1897.....	130-131
27.	Sir George Tressady and the reactionary policy.....	131-133
28.	Aldous Raeburn and the conservative liberal policy.....	133-135
29.	Marcella and Sir George Tressady.....	135-138
30.	Significance of the novel.....	138-139

31.	<u>Lady Rose's Daughter</u> , 1903.....	139-141
32.	Jacob Delafield.....	141-142
33.	Significance of the novel.....	142
34.	<u>The Coryston Family</u> , 1913.....	142-143
35.	Mrs. Ward's opinion as to the rights of property.....	143-145
36.	Lady Coryston and reactionary fanaticism.....	145
37.	Lord Coryston, radical fanatic.....	145-147
38.	Edward Newbury exponent of High Church tyranny.....	147-148
39.	Lady Coryston, a Tory tyrant.....	148-149
40.	<u>The Coryston Family</u> an index to Mrs. Ward's social political theory.....	149-150
41.	Mrs. Ward's contribution to society.....	150-152
V.	Summary and Conclusion.....	153-158

CHAPTER I

CURRENTS OF SOCIAL UNREST IN EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

The French Revolution was the first articulate expression of the aspirations of democracy in Europe, for it gave to those forces created by the Industrial Revolution and chafing under the restrictions of the ancien regime the necessary encouragement to break down the sharp barriers between social castes of the aristocratic landowners and the industrial class. Though discredited by excesses and obscured by the military despotism of the Napoleonic era, these aspirations were nevertheless to be the determining forces of the history of the western world during the Nineteenth Century. The middle class, determined to assert its power in the State, instituted strong agitation for reform of the franchise and the system of representation. The working-men, excluded by the property restrictions from the privilege of the franchise, and prevented by the Combination Laws of 1799 and 1800 from organizing to protect themselves against the aristocracy, whom they considered their arch enemies, joined the middle class in its struggle for political freedom. They were led to believe that by shifting the power of government to the middle class, democracy would be established and their

own welfare secured. But, in reality, the proposed reform was beneficial only to the industrialists.

The agitation for reform became so strong that it impelled the division of power into the two-party system, the Tories, representing the aristocratic conservative interests, and the Whigs or liberals, who favored reform. The Tories denounced the proposed measure as being "destructive of all property, all right, and of all privilege"¹. The Whig constituency - reenforced by the allegiance of the social reformer, Robert Owen, the radical editor, Richard Cobbett, the radical organizer, Francis Place, and the Tories alienated from their party by the Catholic Emancipation Act - formed a Whig Cabinet in 1831, and forced the enactment of the Reform Bill in 1832.

Though limited in actual scope, the Reform Bill of 1832 was extensive in its influence, for from its acquisition emanated those forces of unrest which characterized the reform era. It organized discontent along definite party lines, and established the precedent of reform through peaceful agitation in accord with British conservatism rather than by revolution. It encouraged the proletariat to change from its placid

¹ Schapiro, Modern and Contemporary European History, p. 60.

acceptance of its lot - poor housing, bad working conditions, low wages, child labor, industrial accident, and industrial disease - into a seething mass of discontent, and laid the foundation for their long struggle for social equality, political freedom, and economic opportunity.

Though the reforms of the first forty years of the nineteenth century reflect largely the struggle for political privilege, and were designed primarily for the protection of property and the advancement of wealth, the social conscience had been awakened to the injustices of the industrial system, which imposed such an unequal distribution of capital and the fruits of labor as to divide society into two classes, the possessed and the dispossessed. The welfare of the individual, to the public-spirited, had become synonymous with the welfare of the nation. Whether this interest, evinced by the Earl of Shaftesbury and other aristocrats, was purely an altruistic interest or a policy of selfishness adopted to combat the arrogant middle class, it is not our purpose to prove. But that there was a conscious effort to ameliorate the conditions of the poor is attested by the legislative reforms of the period: the repeal of the Combination Laws, 1824; the Factory Act of 1833, which limited the labor of children between

the ages of nine and thirteen to forty-eight hours a week, and of those between thirteen and eighteen to sixty-eight hours, provided for a system of factory inspection, and prohibited the employment of children under nine in textile factories; the act of 1842, which forbade the employment in mines of boys under ten and women and girls; the Ten Hour Act of 1847, which restricted the labor of women and girls in factories not to exceed ten hours a day; the revision of the Poor Law in 1834, limiting outdoor relief to the aged and infirm; and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, which removed² the protective duty on breadstuff.

We are not to assume, however, that this forfeiture of privileges by the middle-class oligarchies was with their acquiescence, but quite the contrary. They bitterly opposed reform agitation. Their opposition increased the antagonism of the reform element, the Chartists, whose revolutionary tendencies reflected much of the fervor and heat of the rebellions on the continent. This concentrated movement for reform in England from 1837 to 1848 was known as Chartism, which on the one hand was a struggle for political freedom, and on the other hand a radical social and economic struggle.

² Schapiro, Modern and Contemporary History of Europe, pp. 62-70.

The Tory policy of repression, pursued assiduously, had concentrated and solidified their opposition. In 1838 a petition, drawn up by a group of men convened at the London Workingmen's Association, set forth the demands of the laborers. It contained "six points": (1) universal manhood suffrage, (2) abolition of property qualifications for members of Parliament, (3) annual Parliaments, (4) equal representation, (5) payment of members of Parliament, and (6) vote by secret ballot. The "People's Charter", as it was called, was rejected in 1839, and through the succeeding decade the agitation for it took on revolutionary tendencies. Reenforced by the National Charter Association at Manchester and the failure of the potato crop in Ireland and the wheat crop in England in the early forties, the Chartists members increased in number. Demonstrations in open defiance of law and order were speedily repressed.

It must be borne in mind that over a period of ten years, a reform measure may lose its original body of advocates and supporters. This was true of "Chartism". Prosperity in the late forties, occasioned by the repeal of the Corn Laws, 1846, the improvement of factory conditions through the Ten Hour Act of 1847, and the providential good crops in Ireland and England, caused a wane in the interest of the more conservative supporters

of the Charter, and left it largely in the hands of reckless partisans. On April 10, 1848, a public demonstration was planned. One hundred thousand men, with Feargus O'Connor, a fiery Irish barrister, as their leader, were to meet on Kennington Common to present their petition subscribed to by six million names. The Government, alarmed by the threat of rebellion, stationed in London seventeen thousand constables under the command of Wellington. Instead of the expected 100,000 men, barely a tenth of that number arrived, and less than a third of the boasted 6,000,000 names were subscribed. The fiasco, as graphically described by Kingsley - "broke up pitiably piecemeal, drenched and cowed, body and soul, by pouring rain on its way home - for the very heavens mercifully helped to quench our folly - while the monster petition crawled ludicrously away in a hack cab, to be dragged to the floor of the House of Commons amid roars of laughter."³

Though "Chartism" failed in its immediate demands, its effect upon subsequent reform is unmistakable; for by the franchise acts of 1867, 1884, and 1918, by the removal of property qualifications of members of the House of Commons in 1858, and by the industrial acts

³ Kingsley, Charles. Alton Locke, p. 310.

which restricted the exploitation of labor by the ruthless capitalists, its general demands were gained. More important than its defeat was its success in amalgamating the proletariat into a conscious class, struggling to effect these reforms. "Chartism" was unique in that it focused for the first time the political aspirations of the masses, and promulgated radical social-economic theories.

Foremost among these is socialism, which, in one form or another, profoundly influenced the last half of the Nineteenth Century. Socialism, unlike precedent reforms, seeks not to rehabilitate old institutions in new "clothes" in the manner of restrictive legislation, but to build a-new. Its aim is not reform, but revolution. The whole system of existing society was founded upon the wrong principle of exploitation of labor; as producer, by capital; as consumer, by the middle class; as tenants, by landlords. The whole capitalistic system is corrupt and wasteful. Its entire course, in the light of history, has been class struggle determined by economic conditions. First, under the feudalistic agricultural system, it was a struggle between landowner and tenant. Second, under the capitalistic system, it was a struggle between capital and labor. The socialist solution of the economic chaos most influential in the

Nineteenth Century was that advanced by Karl Marx (1818-1883) a well-to-do Jew, born at Trier, Rhenish Prussia. In his Communist Manifesto (1848), Marx advanced his theory of a Cooperative Commonwealth. He advocated Government ownership of all public utilities, the restriction of private personal property to clothes, houses, and household goods, and the distribution of wealth according to labor through Government regulation of salaries. He recognized labor as the source of all value; that is, the exchange value of a commodity was regulated by the amount of labor and pains necessary to produce it. Marxian socialism recommended a democratic government in which the majority, the laborers, had controlling power; it rejected "ideas and emotions centering within race, religion, culture, and fatherland as ideological veils obscuring the real motive forces, which are material."⁴

Socialism, as defined by Marx, was not so influential in England during the middle decades of the Nineteenth Century as was Utopianism, an essentially humanitarian movement led by Robert Owen (1771-1858). He was a philanthropist and a social reformer. He believed that harmony between classes could be established

⁴ Schapiro, Modern and Contemporary European History, p. 579.

through environment. He was deeply sympathetic toward the laborers, and spent his life and fortune in an earnest endeavor to ameliorate their condition. In New Lanark, Scotland, a manufacturing town of two or three hundred inhabitants, he began the practical experiment of his Utopian schemes. He organized the laborers of the village for the purpose of cooperative action for the good of the whole. He increased the wages of his employees, improved factory conditions, organized schools, and built wholesome houses for men. With the success of the Lanark project, his desire to expand it increased; and he founded similar village commonwealths at Orbiston, England, and New Harmony, in America. Objection to Owen's religious heresies and his thoroughly communistic principles led to difficulties in the management of these projects and ultimately defeated them. Owen became interested in promulgating his doctrines, and to this end he lectured and wrote during the remainder of his life. His influences as a reformer were extensive and permanent. His economic doctrine was imperfect and vague. The "Owenites" favored "state socialism", the centralization of powers in the State. They were opposed to Marxian socialism, and denounced Marx's theory of labor as the only source of value. The state socialists advocated

state regulation of labor and capital. Social insurance, railway rates, and minimum wage rates are examples of "state socialism". It is distinctly conservative, and its possibilities for benevolence and charity enlisted the liberals of the Church and the State. State and private philanthropy began to take an interest in the laborer and to do their part to make them better men. They did much toward releasing laborers as teaching them to release themselves from the thralldom of machinery and the individualistic materialism of the period. Scientific progress of the early nineteenth century was rapid and far-reaching. It increased production and wealth, but the mal-distribution of the fruits of production resulted in widespread poverty, unemployment, and discontent. The series of experiments carried on by the unions, by Owen and others forced on the masters of industry the knowledge that in spite of the great part played by machinery, improved conditions and shorter hours of labor actually tended to increase production. This knowledge resulted in the restricted conditions of women and child labor, shorter hours, factory improvements, and better wages.

Of equal importance with the practical application of science as an unsettling influence was the development of rational thought. Prior to the development of the theory of evolution by Lyell, Darwin, and

Herbert Spencer, the phenomena of nature were ascribed to "chance". Educated men recognized no causation or law of nature. Their idea of the universe was "catastrophic"; that is, that the physical aspects of the earth are the results of accident or chance, not subject to natural laws and orderliness such as Lyell set forth in his Principles of Geology (1830-1833). The most important theory advanced in the period of scientific conquest was Darwin's theory of evolution, the theory that all animal and plant life is the result of a gradual development through different forms. By the publication of his famous book, The Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection (1859), Darwin aroused a storm of discussion that lasted a generation. The theologians asserted that the theory was a direct attack on the Biblical idea of the creation of man by God. They denounced the theory as in opposition to religion and the belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. It forced the members of the different branches of the Christian Church to readjust their religious philosophy.

The half century from 1830 to 1880 witnessed the greatest upheaval in English theological thought of any period since the Reformation. The application of scientific methods to theological research, and the

Oxford Movement, were the main forces in the struggle. The first was forced upon the Church from without, but the latter was a reaction from Methodism and came from within the Church. The Oxford Movement (1833-1845) was begun by a group of Oxford divines, Pusey, Keble, and Newman, whose aim was to rescue the Church of England from the cold intellectual formalism that removed it from vital religion. The Wesleyanism of the eighteenth century had accomplished, in a small measure, the same mission; but Wesleyanism was distinctly a middle class revival and did little toward interesting the intellectual and hereditary aristocracies. Their purpose had been to revive personal religion and "to spread Script⁵ tual holiness over the land". The Oxford movement reached its height at the time of the passage of Irish Church Temporalities Bill in 1835, which alarmed the clergy at the danger of the possible spread of Roman Catholicism. They set themselves to arouse the Church from its lethargic state, and they published a series of articles called Tracts for the Times, which soon roused all England. The tractarians, as they were called, stated their purpose to be to teach a "higher notion of the Church than was conceived by the

⁵ Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. XV, p. 357.

Evangelical theology or the popular and political
 notion of it"⁶. They aspired to lead a "neglectful
 generation to the acceptance of the doctrines of the
 Anglican Church, its rituals, discipline, orders,
 and sacred ordinances"⁷. Hurrell Froude, Newman, Pusey,
 Wilberforce, and others contributed to the series of
Tracts, which began with the Irish Bishoprics and went
 on to advocate Apostolic Succession, Efficacy of the
 Sacraments, Priestly Absolution, and the Authority of
 Church. In Tract XC, Newman attempted to show that
 the Thirty-Nine Articles were not inconsistent with
 Roman Catholicism. This statement aroused the inherent
 English hatred of popery; and with Newman's withdrawal
 to Rome in 1845, gave rise to widespread theological
 controversy. Chief among the divisions of the Anglican
 Church occasioned by the Tractarians were the High
 Church party, which embodied the doctrine of Pusey,
 and the Broad Church faction, which represented the
 liberals. The latter was led by such men as Thomas
 Arnold, Dean Whately, Mark Pattison, and Benjamin
 Jowett. These men accepted the principal tenets of
 the Church, and were willing to treat religious questions

⁶ Cambridge History of English Literature, Vol. XII,
 p. 283.

⁷ Ibid., p. 283.

in the light of new scientific thought. They did not originate a new doctrine but established their faith on the union of the rationalism of the Noetics and the idealism of the German transcendentalists. The Broad Churchmen were, to a certain extent, influenced by the effect which they saw that the High Church practices produced on character. They, however, were principally mystics who looked for communion with the divine through the inner revelation of God.

In the Christian Socialists the vital elements of the High Church and Broad Church movements were united. Frederick Denison Maurice embodies this union. The High Church recognized the Church as the social ideal and sought to bring the whole of life into the Church in order to make the world a true representation of the divine will. Maurice saw that the social ideal which he wished to establish was made possible through a universal brotherhood of mankind wherein each individual would consider his neighbor's welfare before his own. Maurice was guided by his love of humanity. He attempted to bring the world into the Church, under the fatherhood of God, and in sonship with Jesus Christ as a remedy for all the evils and misery he saw about him. The union of both parties, the High Church and the Broad Church, was in their demand for character.

Here again Maurice was the union of the two; for to him the final justification of all theory and practice was to be found in its effect upon human character. Maurice and his little band of followers known as the Christian Socialists did more than any other group toward keeping the forward movement in the political and social life in union with God, and directing the currents of unrest toward a universal brotherhood. Though the High Church and Broad Church movements influenced them, their chief inspiration came from Thomas Carlyle, who in the midst of Godless materialism, struck the first bold notes for idealism. The succeeding chapter will be an attempt to show wherein the whole Christian Social movement, led by Maurice and Kingsley, was basically the social-ethical philosophy of Thomas Carlyle.

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM: THE SOCIAL-ETHICAL THEORIES OF THOMAS CARLYLE, FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, AND CHARLES KINGSLEY

The student of social theory during the Victorian era in England soon finds himself in a vast ferment of ideas that sought articulate expression in the theories of utilitarianism, liberalism, orthodox political economy, positivism, and socialism. Of the many changes of the period those that were most revolutionary came in the fields of science, invention, and machinery. Science amplified and reordered knowledge and the method of acquiring it; invention found new controls and services for the forces of science; machinery multiplied resources. Science did not concern itself with sentiments, emotions, and sympathies, but with the materialistic improvement of man and his environment. It directed man's mind away from the supernatural to the actual world about him; and although the church continued to do its share in education and humanitarian work, it had lost its hold upon the laborers, who had embraced secularism and dissent. The church and the aristocracy were the main defense against the demands of the proletariat, and were the bulwarks of tradition. In their

opposition to liberalism they had driven the working class to an acceptance of the industrial philosophy of Utilitarianism, which, through practical application of economic and ethical law, promised the organization of society so as to secure "the greatest happiness of the greatest number". The economist held that Utilitarianism, the doctrine of laissez-faire, uncontrolled competition, was the law of progress and the right interpretation of the world. The proletariat embraced the doctrine with enthusiasm because they fancied they saw in Utilitarianism a deliverance from poverty and oppression, and a means for securing material well-being. In reality they had only changed masters, substituting for the traditional aristocracy industrial oligarchies actuated primarily by the greed of Midas, selfishness, prejudice, and class interests that for a long while retarded and obstructed humanitarian compassion for the ever-increasing suffering of the working classes.

Important as were these various schools of thought in the improvement of humanity during the Victorian Era, especially that of Utilitarianism, the greatest impelling force lay in the idealism which fostered an active humanitarian spirit. The historical criticism which had questioned the Christian evidences of revelation,

and the advance of science which made absurd the idea of special providence, had not stifled but quickened man's eagerness to find a communication between God and the material universe. The scientific affirmation that "matter is all; God is a machine" was not sufficient to combat the innate idealism of the English mind. A new importance was placed upon the individual's place in the progress of the age, and conversion became less the evangelical idea of "plucking a brand from the fires of sin" and more the individual's determination of right activity in the world in which he lived. The evangelical doctrine was in harmony with the democratic movement in its assertion of the individual's importance, and in its disregard of institutions and forms. It was dynamically opposed to the Utilitarian materialism which recognized no revelation of God outside of things. It was less in sympathy with the eastern mystics who found revelation through contemplation and adoration which removed both themselves and God from an interest in the world's government, than with the English mystic, whose imagination found God very close to man. Literature, which had found the stimulus for imaginative framework for art in the Christian conception of the universe, found little stimulus from the rationalistic view of life. The great Victorians, Carlyle, Eliot,

Dickens, were children of the people, and had been trained in evangelical discipline to be mystics rather than rationalists. They believed in faith, preached duty, and sought revelation. Their literature responded to man's desire to imagine God. Even when the word God was rejected and usurped by such terms as "humanity", "destiny", or "civilization", there was still in Victorian literature an eagerness to imagine God. If there is any one message derivable from the literature of the Nineteenth Century, it is that "man does not live by bread alone", and no where in Victorian literature is this belief more forcibly given than in the works of Thomas Carlyle, Frederick Denison Maurice, and Charles Kingsley.

First among these authors was Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), who came among the deists, theists, economists, and rationalists of the Nineteenth Century as a prophet speaking to all sects, all creeds, and all parties unwelcome truths. "He came among them to tear the mask from their hypocritical cant."¹ He denounced with vituperation and scorn the Godless mechanism of his age:

¹ Warner Library of the World's Best Literature, Vol. VI, p. 3232.

Were we required to characterize this age of ours by any single epithet, we should be tempted to call it, not an Historical, Devotional, Philosophical, or Moral Age, but above all others, the Mechanical Age. - Our old modes of exertion are all discredited, and thrown aside. On every hand, the living artisan is driven from his workshop, to make room for a speedier, inanimate one.²

He recognized the material benefits to society, better food, clothing, and shelter, made possible by mechanical perfection, but he was aware, painfully aware, of the evils of its diffusion in other provinces, - politics, art, religion, and morals. He realized that the tendencies toward mechanical modes of action were coloring the modes of thought and feeling. He expressed his idea of the accepted modes of philosophy as follows:

The Philosopher of this age is not a Socrates, a Plato, a Hooker, or a Taylor, who inculcates on men the necessity and infinite worth of moral goodness, the great truth that our happiness depends on the mind which is within us, and not on the circumstances without us; but a Smith, a De Lolme, a Bentham, who chiefly inculcates the reverse of this, - that our happiness depends entirely on external circumstances; nay, that the strength and dignity of the mind within us is itself the creature and consequence of these.³

It was this latter philosophy of Benthamite Utilitarianism that Carlyle so bitterly decried. The "greatest

² "Signs of the Times", Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II, p. 141.

³ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 147.

happiness" principle was to him most calumnious. As he saw it, the worship of Mammon was rapidly changing it to an "unhappy principle". Mammon-worship was indeed a melancholy creed. Of wealth there was plenty, but of true happiness very little.

We have more riches than any Nation ever had before; we have less good of them than any Nation ever had before. Our successful industry is hitherto unsuccessful; a strange success, if we stop here! In the midst of plethoric plenty, the people perish; with gold walls and full barns, no man feels himself safe or satisfied.⁴

Thus Carlyle recognized the fatal effects of laissez-faire upon material well-being; but true prophet as he was, he discerned its "far fataler" effects upon the souls of men. It had obscured the ideal, the true and noble, with its shams and promises of vain, material happiness. In Chartism, Corn Laws, Trade-strikes, and Poor Laws, Carlyle saw the inevitable passing away of laissez-faire. He discerned in its failure the voice of God decrying supply and demand as the one Law of Nature; cash-payment the sole nexus of man to man. These he decried, but to democracy, the new and wider separation of man, he addressed his Everlasting Nay.

Democracy, to Carlyle, was the enthronement of

⁴ Past and Present, p. 6.

sham, the false definition of liberty, and the impediment to forces working for right and justice. It was an expediency, not a remedy, for the latter lay not in the power of "ballot-boxing" and "winnowing machines", but in the hearts of men, in their own conscious striving after truth, right, and justice.

If you do not know eternal Justice from momentary expediency, and understand in your heart of hearts how Justice, radiant, beneficent, as the all-victorious Light-element, is also in essence, if need be, an all-victorious Fire-element, and melts all manner of vested interests, ~~and~~ the hardest iron cannon, as if they were soft wax, and does ever in the long run rule and reign - you also would talk of impossibility.⁵

But to Carlyle the ultimate enthronement of justice, no less than its existence, was a fact. Behind dilettantism and Mammonism he discerned a radiance of heavenly justice not to be extinguished, though long delayed by party and private interests. He knew that right and justice would triumph, for they were in harmony with God, and however long their coming, by the inevitable Law of Nature, would come. That Carlyle foresaw the struggle is evident:

In God's-world, with its wild-whirling eddies and mad foam-oceans, where men and nations perish as if without law, and judgment for an unjust thing is sternly

⁵ Past and Present, p. 18.

delayed, dost thou think there is therefore no justice? It is what the fool has said in his heart. It is what the wise, in all times, were wise because they denied, and knew forever not to be. I tell thee again there is nothing else but justice.⁶

Prophetic indeed was Carlyle's vision of the long, dark interim of quackery, sham, and knavery, but hopeful was his everlasting faith that right would triumph - have its victory, and that in proportion to man's obedience to God's Law.

If we walk according to the Law, the Law-Maker will befriend us; if not, not. - Nations cease to be befriended by the Law-Maker, when they walk not according to the Law.⁷

What, then, was to be done? The answer is Carlyle's Everlasting Yea. "Do the duty which lies nearest⁸ thee."

Duty, to Carlyle, was the sacred obligation of man to God, and it was his belief that self-renunciation was the first essential in fulfilling the obligation. Through love of God, not love of pleasure, man must first shake off his unbelief and then perform his duty; and duty was to Carlyle synonymous with work. He believed that man could perfect himself by working.

⁶ Past and Present, p. 11.

⁷ Ibid., p. 25.

⁸ Sartar Resartus, p. 39.

Work was the purifying fire that welded the infinite chaos of man into a harmonious whole. Doubt, despair, desire, remorse, indignation were dispelled by the blessed glow of labor. Labor was life to a man; it evoked his highest powers and awakened in him the greatest nobleness and knowledge:

Knowledge that will hold good in working, cleave thou to that; for Nature herself accredits that, says Yea to that. - Properly thou hast no knowledge but what thou hast got by working: the rest is yet all a hypothesis of knowledge; clouds, in endless logic - vortices, till we try it and fix it. "Doubt of whatever kind can be ended by Action alone."⁹

Profound as was his sympathy for the toilers, Carlyle feared the growth of democracy. He feared to trust the state to such as were blindly revolutionary. He distrusted human nature. He was pulled in two directions by his adherence to German romanticism and Scotch Calvinism. To the mystic reverence for the individual which characterized German romanticism was opposed his fear of the possible actions of man, a remnant of Calvinism. His desire was to find a force of authority strong enough to weld the chaotic elements of society. He turned to the hero - a man of sincerity and power, who in the light of past history had held

⁹ Past and Present, p. 191.

together the opposing forces of society. His theory of patriarchal government found expression in Heroes and Hero Worship (1841) and in Past and Present (1843). In the latter he exhorted men to action, each in his place, first to be heroic in himself and then to seek the heroic for the general. To the captains of industry, Carlyle made his plea, exhorting them to use their powers to drive out sham, dilettantism, and idleness, and to establish love between man and man. "Love of men cannot be bought by cash-payment; and without love¹⁰ men cannot endure to be together." His plea to the workers was that they organize not for competitive-cash-payment purposes, but for human interests and social growths. To him the organization of labor into orderly and firmly regimented groups was imperative:

All human interests, combined human endeavors, and social growths in this world, have, at a certain stage of their development, required organizing: and Work, the grandest of human interests, does not require it.¹¹

Organization, as Carlyle conceived it, was to be free from self-interests and class antagonism - a true brotherhood captained by real heroes and devoted to the chivalric adjustment of wages to work. To this

¹⁰ Past and Present, p. 262.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 265.

endeavor Carlyle called the aristocracy, the landowner, the workers, the master-workers, the talented, each in his field to know himself and his apparent place, and to act in noble conformity with his knowledge of these. Carlyle's theory of a regenerated society created a wide-spread social conscience which found expression in the individual response of his disciples, Maurice, Kingsley, Ruskin, and Mrs. Humphry Ward. His sincerity and his passionate insistence upon activity struck an answering note in the heroic young of England. This is his prophecy:

One thing I do know: Never on this earth were the relations of man to man long carried on by Cash-payment alone. If at any time, a philosophy of Laissez-faire, Competition, and Supply-and-Demand start up as the exponent of human relations, expect that it will soon end.¹²

So in the darkest years of English social life, 1832 to 1848, had Carlyle confessed his faith, and though his words were unfulfilled for many years and are still awaiting complete justification, the response, though long delayed, did come. The response was, in a large measure, the direct result of his own efforts. Before Carlyle, such opposition as existed to the dominant philosophy of Utilitarianism came mainly from

¹² Past and Present, p. 188.

rebel factions led by Paine, Godwin, Cobbett, and Owen, whose bitterness overshadowed their honesty and courage. Carlyle had stimulated social reform; and though for ten years the only manifestation of it was the Chartist uprising of 1848, which created many misgivings in the hearts of thoughtful Englishmen, there was nevertheless a movement for social righteousness. The most important of these movements was Christian Socialism, with which we are chiefly concerned. In many respects the leaders of this faction owed their inspiration to Carlyle's teaching that moral righteousness must precede political change.

Christian Socialism was the attempt to establish society upon the basis of the Golden Rule, a brotherhood of men moulded by the tempering justice of Christianity. The Christian Socialists set forth cooperation, not competition, as the law of the universe, as the following trenchant words of Maurice proclaim:

Competition is put forth as the law of the universe. That is a lie. The time has come for us to declare that it is a lie. I see no way but associating for work instead of for strikes. I do not say or think we feel that the relation of the employer and the employed is not a true relation. I do not determine that wages may not be a righteous mode of expressing that relation. But at present it is clear that this relation is destroyed, that the payment of wages is nothing but a deception. We may restore the old state of things: we may bring in a new one. God will decide that. His voice has gone forth clearly bidding us come forward to fight against the present state of things; to call men to repentance first

of all: but then also, as it seems to me, to give them an opportunity of showing their repentance and bringing forth fruits worthy of it. - Given a moral state, and it seems to me the revelations are rather in favor of the conclusion that the old position of master and worker might be a healthy one. But it is no old condition we are contending with, but an accursed new one, the product of a hateful devilish theory which must be fought with to the death.¹³

The purpose of this Christian Social group was two-fold. They desired to establish political enfranchisement and industrial freedom, and individual reform and spiritual liberty. They purposed to make men really free, not only from the domination of others, but from their own ignorance, covetousness, and selfishness, to teach men to govern themselves in fellowship. The Christian Socialist theory was the union of the Owen philosophy that the alteration of the environment of the individual was all-sufficient, and the Evangelical philosophy that maintained that a moral and spiritual change of men's hearts was the sole change needed. The dual purpose of the movement was manifested in the choice of the terms Christian and Socialism, both of which were defined by the leaders of the Christian Social group in their broad, catholic sense. These men purposed in their hearts to socialize Christianity and to Christianize socialism; for they recognized the

¹³ Maurice, Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, Vol. II, p. 32.

futility of an attempt to perfect the individual without consideration of his environment, or to perfect the latter without thought of the individual. Frederick Denison Maurice, whose life and work will be considered in the succeeding paragraphs, held that reformation must proceed from both directions, the individual and the environment. He held that the two methods were opposite but not essentially opposed. To him socialism was rightfully the practical side of Christianity and an essential part of it. A "desire for Unity in the nation and in the Church" haunted Maurice all his life. That this statement is not an unfounded assertion can best be determined by an examination of the principal facts in his life.

Frederick Denison Maurice was born in 1805 of a Unitarian father, and of a mother who adhered to the doctrines of Calvin. His first religious difficulties arose from his attempt to reconcile these differences of faith. His education at Cambridge from 1823 to 1826 strengthened this desire. While at Cambridge, Maurice formed a close friendship with John Sterling and Julius Hare and occasionally met Carlyle. Upon leaving Cambridge, Maurice became editor of the Athenaeum in London; and while thus engaged joined the Church of England. He migrated to Oxford with a view

to taking orders. In 1836 he became a candidate for the chair of political economy at Oxford, but due to his heterodoxy revealed in his Letters to a Quaker, he was alienated from the leaders of the Oxford Movement, Keble, Pusey, and Newman, who withdrew their support. The Letters to a Quaker, later published under the title of The Kingdom of Christ, contained Maurice's fundamental convictions and revealed his opposition to the tenets of the leading church parties. He left Oxford in 1837, and in 1840 became professor of English literature and history at King's College, London. Later, in 1846, he was made professor of theology at King's College. In 1846 he was elected chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. It was here that he attracted to him a group of intelligent young men, among them J. M. Ludlow, Thomas Hughes, and Charles Kingsley, who embraced him as their prophet and became his ardent disciples. His claims to prophet's office were not unfounded; for in the midst of theological dogmatism and growing secularism, he came preaching the "everlasting love and fatherhood of God and the universal sonship of men". Maurice's attractions lay in his liberalism, which enlarged his sympathies to embrace all creeds and to recognize the elements of good in each; and his ability to see life as a whole in the light of Christ, to set aside secondary

differences and to discover the fundamental principles of oneness. This desire for unity characterized all his actions and permeated all his doctrines, social and Christian; for to him the separation of Christianity from society was impossible. He viewed all aspects of nature and society from the Christian point of view. Through him and his disciples the political and social progress of the latter half of the nineteenth century was identified with religion, and the current of Christianity was directed toward the consideration of social problems. Maurice was the first of the English clergy to voice a sympathy for the people's efforts at organization for political and social advancement in those years of greatest darkness (1840-1848). In a sermon on the Lord's Prayer, delivered in 1846, he said:

How can anyone ever make it a charge against any people that they hope for a brotherhood upon earth? Every hope points upward: if it cannot find an object, it is in search of one; you cannot crush it without robbing your fellowman of a witness for God, and an instrument for purification. Christianity as a mere system of doctrines or practices will never make men brothers. By Christianity we must understand the reconciliation of mankind to God in Christ. We must understand the power and privilege of saying, "Our Father, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven." This prayer does not treat the projects of men for universal societies, unbounded pantisocracies, as too large. It overreaches them all with these words, "as in Heaven".¹⁴

¹⁴ Ludlow, J. M. "The Christian Socialist Movement of the Middle of the Nineteenth Century", Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 77, 1896, pp. 110-11.

"The whole spirit of Christian Socialism", says Mr. Ludlow, "is in such passages though the term was not applied till two years later."¹⁵

The failure of the Chartists on April 10, 1848, gave the opportunity for Christian Socialism because it revealed a new importance of the social question and enlisted the fervent support of Charles Kingsley, English clergyman, who with John M. Ludlow witnessed the fiasco on Kennington Common. So moved were Kingsley and Ludlow by the misguidance and futility of the Chartists' efforts that they, with Maurice, sat up through the night of April 10, preparing a line of action which Kingsley set forth in the following placard:

Workmen of England! You say that you are wronged. Many of you are wronged; and many besides yourselves know it. Almost all men who have heads and hearts know it - above all, the working clergy know it. They go into your houses, they see the shameful filth and darkness in which you are forced to live crowded together; they see your children growing up in ignorance and temptation, for want of fit education; they see intelligent and well-read men among you, shut out from a Freeman's just right of voting; and they see too the noble patience and self-control with which you have as yet borne these evils. They see it, and God sees it.

Workmen of England! You have more friends than you think for. Friends who expect nothing from you, but who love you, because you are their brothers, and

¹⁵ Ludlow, J. M. "The Christian Socialist Movement of the Middle of the Nineteenth Century", Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 77, 1896, pp. 110-11.

who fear God, and therefore dare not neglect you, His children; men who are drudging and sacrificing themselves to get you your rights; men who know what your rights are, better than you know yourselves, who are trying to get for you something nobler than charters and dozens of Acts of Parliament - more useful than this 'fifty-thousandth share in a Talker in the National Palaver at Westminster' can give you. You may disbelieve them, insult them - you cannot stop their working for you, beseeching you as you love yourselves, to turn back from the precipice of riot, which ends in the gulf of distrust, stagnation, starvation.

You think the Charter would make you free - would to God it would! The Charter is not bad; if the men who use it are not bad! But will the Charter make you free? Will it free you from slavery to ten-pound bribes? Slavery to beer and gin? Slavery to every spouter who flatters your self-conceit, and stirs up bitterness and head-long rage in you? That, I guess, is real slavery; to be a slave to one's own stomach, one's own pocket, one's own temper. Will the Charter cure that? Friends, you want more than Acts of Parliament can give.

Englishmen! Saxons! Workers of the great, cool-headed, strong-handed nation of England, the workshop of the world, the leader of freedom for seven hundred years, men say you have common-sense! then do not humbug yourselves into meaning licence when you cry for liberty; who would dare refuse your freedom? for the Almighty God, and Jesus Christ, the poor Man who died for poor men, will bring it about for you, though all the Mammonites of the earth were against you. A nobler day is dawning for England, a day of freedom, science, industry!

But there will be no true freedom without virtue, no true science without religion, no true industry without the fear of God, and love to your fellow-citizens.

Workers of England, be wise, and then you must be free, for you will be fit to be free.¹⁶

The placard was posted throughout London the following day, and its purpose, made clear in the

¹⁶ Charles Kingsley, Letters and Memories of His Life, pp. 95-96.

article, was to find a medium between the Christian Socialists and the Chartists, whom they hoped to dissuade from further revolutionary action, and to direct in pursuit of a universal brotherhood. Their purpose was to educate public opinion in behalf of a Christian Social brotherhood, and to this end, Maurice, Kingsley, Ludlow, Mansfield, Archdeacon Hare, and Reverend Alexander J. Scott met at the home of Maurice on the night of April 12, and decided upon a policy of action. At the suggestion of Maurice and Ludlow they decided to begin a periodical for the artisans and workingmen and a series of Tracts for the clergy and definite Christians. On May 6, 1848, appeared the first of a series of seventeen weekly copies of Politics for the People, the object of which was the consideration of questions of the moment - the extension of the franchise, the relation of labor and capital, education, and the responsibility of the government toward the poor and unfortunate.

The literary productions of the Christian Social movement of 1848 were largely confined to the articles by the leaders contributed to the organ of the movement, Politics for the People. The effort to induce contributions from the workingmen and Chartists met with little success. With the cessation of the

periodical, Politics for the People, in July, 1848, the leaders and advocates of Christian Socialism were confronted with the necessity for a medium of communication, and plans for Tracts for the Times, suggested by Maurice, were made. The Morning Chronicle had published certain articles by Mr. Mahew revealing the "sweated" conditions of labor, and the public had become seriously aware of the loathsome conditions of the working classes. John Ludlow, taking his text from the Morning Chronicle, presented an article in which he proposed reforms of education, politics, social conditions, and industry, and with which he created a favorable opinion for the proposed Tracts. The Christian Socialist leaders agreed to contribute to the Tracts, and in 1850 they were published under the title of The Christian Socialist, a name which gave rise to divergent opinions among the adherents of the movement. Maurice, however, maintained that the title, The Christian Socialist, was the only one that accurately defined the object of the periodical. Ludlow, the editor, defended the title in his first number:

If it be given to us to vindicate for Christianity its true authority over the realms of industry and trade; for socialism its true character as the great Christian revolution of the nineteenth century, so that the title of Socialist shall be only a bugbear to the idle and to the wicked, and society, from highest rank to the lowest, shall avowedly regulate itself upon the

principle of cooperation, and not drift rudderless upon the sea of competition, as our let-alone political economists would have it do; then indeed we shall have achieved our task.¹⁷

As a further vindication of the movement and the title of their publication, Maurice set out the general ideals and meanings of Christian Socialism in his Dialogue between Somebody (a person of respectability) and Nobody (the writer). The first Tract was published by George Bell, February 19, 1850, and during the next nine months was followed by six others. These are:

II. History of the Working Tailors Association, by Thomas Hughes; III. What Christian Socialism has to do with the question at present agitating the Church (the Gorham controversy on baptismal regeneration), by Maurice; IV. The Working Association of Paris, by Ludlow; V. The Society for promoting Working-men's Associations, by Ludlow and Sully; VI. Prevailing idolatries or hints for political economists, by Ludlow; VII. Dialogue between A. and B., two clergymen, on the doctrine of circumstances (important for its reference to Robert Owen's ideas), by Maurice. Number VIII. A Clergyman's answer to the question 'on what grounds can you associate with men generally?' by Maurice, was

¹⁷ Raven, Christian Socialism, p. 156.

added after a year's interval. The Christian Socialist, a Journal of Association, began to appear under the editorship of Ludlow. Its general purpose was to diffuse the principles of cooperation as the practical application of Christianity to the purpose of trade and industry. These periodicals proposed Church reforms, education reforms, social reform, sanitation reforms, reforms of land tenure, the Poor-laws, and housing. The contributors to these periodicals were Maurice, Mansfield, Shorter, who was secretary of the Council of Workingmen's Society, Walsh, Neale, Furnivall, Mrs. Gaskell, social novelist, J. A. Froude, historian, Thomas Hughes, and Charles Kingsley. Numbers of working men contributed essays and poems. The second series of Tracts by Christian Socialists appeared in 1851, and the first of the series was Maurice's A Series on English History by a Clergyman, which dealt with his relation to the principal political parties - Tory, Whig, and Radical - and set forth his political views. The second edition contained Kingsley's Cheap Clothes and Nasty, which was written in white heat against the men and women of leisure who wore fine clothing without a thought for the misery and shame of those who produced them. The third and fourth editions of the Tracts contained reprints of Ludlow's articles on Labor and the Poor, and

the last edition to which the Christian Socialists contributed was Tracts for Priests and People, 1854.

These periodicals and pamphlets were topical in scope, and have little value as literature. That distinction belongs definitely to the novels of Charles Kingsley - Yeast and Alton Locke, which, because of their relation to the Christian Social movement and their representation of the seething state of society in the middle years of the nineteenth century, require close scrutiny.

In the preface to the first edition of Yeast (first published in Fraser's Magazine in 1848 and first edited 1851), Kingsley set forth his purpose in writing it:

This little tale was written to help call the attention of wiser and better men than I am, to the questions which are now agitating the minds of the rising generation, and the absolute necessity of solving them at once and earnestly, unless we would see the faith of our forefathers crumble away beneath the combined influence of new truths which are fancied to be incompatible with it, and new mistakes as to its real essence.

Kingsley was aware of the evils of the religious upheaval. He had in his youth struggled from a wavering faith in his father's faith through a period of doubt to a firm realm of new faith. He sympathized with the unguided youths who were thoughtfully groping through the dead "self-deceiving belief-in-believing" dogmas

of High Church or Evangelical toward a fixed and healthy faith. He saw the youth turning away from the faith of their fathers and wandering toward Romanism, materialism, or unchristian spiritualism, and he wrote Yeast "to turn the hearts of the parents to the children and the hearts of the children to the parents". It was a plea to the Church for a lofty and enlightened Christianity, thoroughly human and divine. To show Kingsley's insight into the period of religious disturbances and doubts, the middle decade of the nineteenth century, we must examine the principal characters of Yeast - Lancelot, the Socratic questioner, Tregarva, the devoutly religious game-keeper, Luke, the ascetic, and Barnakill, the prophet.

Lancelot Smith, the hero of the novel, is Kingsley's diagnosis of "young England". Lancelot is presented to us as a young man, possessing unusual talents that will not be reconciled to a smug complacency. He is eclectic, an artist, a poet, with hidden depths not yet discovered to himself. The deep melancholy and restlessness of his soul are revealed in his answer to Argemone's question as to what men long for: "For what? To be; to be great; to have done one mighty work before we die, and live unloved or loved, upon the lips of men. For this all long who are not mere apes and wall-flies." Conscious

¹⁸ Yeast, p. 30.

of his power for greater worthiness, he seeks, without sympathetic guidance, to be taught, to find a hero. He is unwilling to accept what he cannot believe to be true, but he is miserable, helpless, disgusted, crying aloud for guidance and teaching. He penetrates, with youthful ruthlessness, behind the veils of creeds and systems. In his letters to his Tractarian curate cousin Luke, Lancelot, under the mask of Maurice's philosophy, rebukes the narrow prejudices of the Church. Luke, having heard of Lancelot's fox-hunting and similar pleasures, accuses him of worldliness. Lancelot's reply is a bitter denunciation of the inconsistencies of pious men who condemn the pleasures not to their own tastes, and call the company of sportsmen worldly; yet "do business" with them. Lancelot demands a broader definition of worldly.

In God's name, if the Stock Exchange, and railway staggering, and the advertisements in the Protestant Hue-and-Cry, and the frantic Mammon-hunting which has been for the last fifty years the peculiar pursuit of the majority of Quakers, Dissenters, and Religious Churchmen, are not The World, what is?¹⁹

He found no haven for his discontent in the renunciation of the world, for as yet his worship was for Nature. He was driven about by the vexing disturbances of

¹⁹ Yeast, p. 36.

conflicting religious opinions. His soul cried out for an anchor for his faith, and this he did not find in the liturgy of the Anglican Church, or in the Roman Catholic creed, or in the Evangelical miraculous revelation of God's word. He was not satisfied with gloating sentimentally over the past, but was desirous of learning to work trustfully in the present. His soul cried out against dogmas, creeds, systems, and groped for a religion of men of the present:

I want to hear the Church of the nineteenth century, and no other; I shall be glad to listen to her as soon as she has made up her mind what to say. The Visible Church, it defines as a company of faithful men. But how does it define the Invisible one? The Church, which in every man's mouth has a different meaning. In one book, meaning a method of education, only it has never been carried out; in another, a system of polity - only it has never been realized; now a set of words written in books, on whose meaning all are divided; now a body of men who are daily excommunicating each other as heretics and apostates; now a universal idea; now the narrowest and most exclusive of all parties.²⁰

Finding no solace for his troubled heart in the Church or religious creeds of his day, Lancelot was seeking for faith in some tangible human object. His love for Argemone and his faith in her were his hope of stability and satisfaction. But his love for her was broadening into a love for humanity, and unknown to him, a love

²⁰ Yeast, p. 57.

of God. "But somehow, in the light of his new love for Argemone, the whole human race seemed glorified, brought nearer, endeared to him."²¹ His love was increasing, expanding his capacity for love. He was but yet worshipping the ideal of God in nature and humanity. He required the perfect harmony between spiritual and natural laws and saw in the evils of society infringements of the laws of nature. He was troubled by the inequalities of men, the complacency of the high and the degeneracy of the low. It was at this stage in his spiritual development that two forces began to work in his nature. These forces were in reality new influences. He had come upon Carlyle's exhortation to man - "Ye have forgotten God," and he went to Tregarva, in whose faith he had implicit confidence to discover if possible the source of the gamekeeper's faith. He found in Tregarva's trust in God a simplicity quite free from creeds. Tregarva trusted and believed in God even where he could not know. He sought to reform himself, bring himself into harmony with the laws of nature - the laws of God. In the perfection of himself he saw the gradual growth of man toward God and the realization of a "kingdom of God on earth, as well as in Heaven."²² It was Tregarva's

²¹ Yeast, p. 79.

²² Ibid., p. 155.

clear conception of God's presence in all things, a quickening of God's love in all humanity, that inspired Lancelot to search for a definite, purposeful religion.

At this time Lancelot came into contact with Barnakill, the mystic philosopher, and it was he that clarified Lancelot's difficulties. Barnakill directed him toward a "higher spiritual cultivation in triumphant contact with the fiercest energies of matter"²³. At last through striving after God, Lancelot saw the - "Uncreate in the Create - the Infinite in the Finite -²⁴ the absolute good in that which is like the good." He had learned to reconcile science and faith:

To tame and use alike the volcano and the human heart, where the body and the spirit, the beautiful and the useful, the human and the divine, are no longer separate, and men have embodied to themselves on earth an image of the 'city not made with hands, eternal in the heavens'.²⁵

He had emptied himself before God by renouncing all earthly idols, stripping himself of all personal ambition, in order that he might be filled with the world problem. He had become as a little child asking to be led. His ambitions, hopes, desires were revealed to

²³ Yeast, p. 253.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 258.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 253-254.

Barnakill:

As I live, the height of my ambition, small though it be, is only to find my place, though it were but as a sweeper of chimneys. If I dare wish - if I dare choose, it would be only this - to regenerate one little parish in the whole world.²⁶

The whole of Lancelot's religion and faith was permeated by this desire for activity in social work. He had received the injunction laid upon men, self-righteousness and self-sacrifice. In the restless seeking for truth, the awakened conscience of social obligation in the character of Lancelot, we see the evidences of the social-ethical philosophy of Christian Socialism. The final faith of Lancelot was the acceptance of Maurice's principle that:

Jesus Christ by His Incarnation exalted human nature, consecrated all human relations, claimed supremacy over all realms of human thought and action, founded an ideal spiritual kingdom to be a storehouse of redemption, social no less than personal, forever.²⁷

He had found nothing new, no peculiar doctrines, systems, or creeds. He had found a living temple on the foundations laid already - Jesus Christ - The Man. He was fired with new zeal, a new desire to educate men

²⁶ Yeast, p. 264.

²⁷ Quoted in Stubb's, Charles Kingsley and the Christian Social Movement, p. 89.

to the fullest of their powers and to develop in them a consciousness of their responsibility to God and their fellowman. In Tregarva, the man of genius held low by social injustice, Lancelot recognized the tragedy of his age. In him was kindled the desire to lift men up, to educate them in the use of their natural powers toward the betterment of society. In the use of right training, Lancelot saw the possibility of evolving a perfect society in accord with God's plan. To this end he enjoined the parsons, the landowners, the gentry, the men of talents, and the poor to reform themselves that they might be partakers of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. In Tregarva and in the people of Whitford, Lancelot saw beneath their vanity, jealousy, drudgery, and dull vacuity, the germs of tastes and noble affections. "What right have we," he asked, "to hinder their development?"²⁸ Lancelot, through the doubts and idealism, the alternations of self-satisfaction and self-contempt, the revolt against accepted beliefs, the restlessness and yearning for fixity of conviction, the awakening of social conscience, the humbling contact with lives nobler than his own, the guidance of human affections, the shock of circumstances, gradually formed a Christ-

²⁸ Yeast, p. 195.

centered philosophy.

The character of Lancelot is autobiographical in many respects. Kingsley was here interested primarily with the record of his own spiritual development and the exposition of the theology and philosophy of Maurice. The problem of Yeast was unsolved. Kingsley did not purpose to offer a cut-and-dried system. He offered no remedy for the evils the problem presented, for he believed in the working of reformatory tendencies in men, gradually bringing about practical results in their work. He offered the principles of Christian Socialism as the bases for an enlightened Christianity, which would be human and divine. It was his purpose to guide the tendencies and aims of the disturbed people by stating the data of the problem. "In homely English," said Kingsley, "I have given my readers Yeast; if they be what I take them for, they will be able to bake with it themselves."

Another work of Kingsley's which claims distinction as a literary production of the Christian Social movement is Alton Locke, Tailor and Poet, An Autobiography, published by Carlyle's publishers, Chapman and Hall, in 1850. It was first published anonymously and without a

²⁹ Yeast, p. 273.

preface. Its publication created something of a sensation. It was fiercely attacked by the leading periodicals and condemned as a vehicle of propaganda for the Christian Socialists. The most severe attack was made by William Rathbone Gregg in the Edinburgh, in an article in which he used Alton Locke as a text for the defense of the orthodox political economists. Fraser's review was less severe; but Blackwood's declared it to be "a barefaced impudent assumption of a specific professional who knows no more about tailoring or slop-selling than he has learnt from certain letters in the Morning Chronicle." ³⁰ The Quarterly in 1851, after the authorship had been declared, made a fierce attack upon Kingsley and Maurice in an article by J. W. Croker, entitled Revolutionary Literature. The attacks were of value to the cause of Christian Socialism, for they brought the movement into prominence with the educated people who decided to read for themselves the much berated philosophy of the new sect. The fact that three editions of Alton Locke appeared in less than a year proved that they did read it.

Alton Locke is hardly to be considered a novel; it is essentially a tract, an expansion of Kingsley's pamphlet Cheap Clothes and Nasty, mentioned elsewhere

³⁰ Mrs. Kingsley, Life of Kingsley, p. 249.

in this chapter. Alton Locke is an outburst of righteous indignation against self-satisfied Mammonism. Kingsley tore away the veil from the eyes of the pharisaical, and revealed to them the horrors of competitive industrialism. He stirred the social conscience of England and awakened her to humanity, to the necessity for educating the intellectual element of the working class, who, if left to their conscious and unsatisfied state, would prove dangerous. The purpose of the novel was three-fold - to reform religion, politics, and education. Kingsley's plea to the universities was that they become "places of teaching and training for genius of every rank;" to the student of history, to show what "manner of men turned Chartists and what causes drove them to revolution;" to the working men "that they train themselves in the corporate spirit, and in the obedience and self-control which, as they easily can in associations, and bear in mind always that only he who can obey³¹ is fit to rule." The whole of the story is a plea for understanding between classes of men that the calamity of 1848 may not be repeated. Kingsley, more clearly than any other member of the Christian Social group, saw the inevitable advance of democracy. He realized the

³¹ Yeast, pp. 7, 19, and 20.

futility of trying to check or suppress it; hence he set about to Christianize it. This he proposed to do by educating men in the associative principles that would bring them into a Christian brotherhood. That Kingsley recognized the dangers of the people who were left to ignorance or poor education, is abundantly proved by a study of his character Alton Locke.

Alton Locke was a pale, brooding, sensitive boy when he first came into the possession of the learning he longed for through the canny old Scotch bookseller Sandy Mackaye. The influence of Mackaye upon Alton throughout their long and intimate association was the only influence for good he ever knew. Sent to work in the tailoring establishment of his uncle, Alton, at a tender and impressionable age, was thrown into constant companionship with artisans whose smoldering hatred and antagonism for the upper classes and their knowledge of the flagrant injustices of laissez-faire were fast solidifying into plans for violence and revolution. His sensitive, poetic soul was saddened by the injustice that he discerned in the world about him. His eyes were only seeing what they brought with them the power of seeing. He was galled by the inequalities of men's opportunities that were made possible by the inequality of the distribution of wealth and labor. Crossthwaite, the master tailor with whom he worked, taught him class hatred.

He filled Alton's young mind with thoughts of the injustices of the educational system that permitted the masses, regardless of their capacities for learning, to remain untaught or self-taught. He pointed to the clergy, the guardians of education, as the chief offenders:

They've got the monopoly of education in England, and they get their bread by it at their public schools and universities; and of course it's to their own interests to keep up the price of their commodity, and let no man have a taste of it who cannot pay down handsomely.³²

Alton realized that he was cheated of his birth right, and his heart cried out in bitterness the hatred he felt for those who had cheated him. His seething discontent grew, and with it grew his habit of comparing men's inequalities. He was stabilized somewhat by the Carlylean prophet, Mackaye, whose wise philosophy of self-sacrifice and patience gave Alton many thoughts to ponder. In the slow process of his self-education, his mind was filled with many fancies and dreams. He was captivated by the poetry of Shelley and Byron, and he turned to poetry as an avenue of escape from the suffocating reality about him. Mackaye, realizing the powers of Alton's genius and divining his inner

³² Alton Locke, p. 60.

development, warned him against self-deception:

The hell on earth of being a flunkey, and a hum-bug, and a useless peacock, wasting God's gifts ain your own lusts and pleasures - and kenning it - and not being able to get oot o' it, for the chains o' vanity and self-indulgence. Ay, Shelley's gran'; always gran'; but Fact is grander - God and Satan are grander. All around ye, in every gin shop and castermonger's cellar, are God and Satan in death grips; every garret is a haill Paradise Lost or Paradise Regained; and will you think it beneath ye to be the 'People's Poet'?³³

Alton turned to the writing of poetry in which he pictured the sadness and wrongs of the people. His poems completed, he went to his cousin George in Cambridge to secure the latter's aid in publishing them. The visit to the university and its effect upon him were vivid and varied. He had fallen in love with Dean Winnstay's daughter a year before when they accidentally met in a picture gallery. He was brought into her presence again by his visit to her father in behalf of the publication of his poems. He felt himself inferior to the learned dean and Lord Lyndale, who had offered to help him. Alton's pride and his hatred of servility blinded him to their proffered courtesies and made him shrink from what he felt to be their condescension. Only after long years of misunderstanding was he able to view their reception of him in its true perspective:

³³ Alton Locke, pp. 95 and 101.

Were not those men more experienced, more learned, older than myself? They were my superiors; it was in vain for me to attempt to hide it from myself. They treated me as an equal: they welcomed me - the young viscount and the learned dean - on the broad ground of a common humanity; as I believe hundreds more of their class would do, if we did not ourselves take pride in estranging them from us - telling them that fraternization between our classes is impossible, and then cursing them for not fraternizing with us.³⁴

Distrust of their motives and his desire for success led him to acquiesce in their suggestion to omit the virile and truthful revolutionary tone of his poetry - an act which later proved to be a stumbling block to all his efforts. His idolatry of intellect made him feel a willing humility before the learned dean. It was his desire to be led by a real hero, a man to whom he could bow down in reverence and respect of his intellect, his rightful superiority, without a slavish and vulgar respect for his rank and wealth, that caused him to look for a guide in the dean. He needed the direction of a hero; but, finding none, he turned to Chartism in his despair. His accusations against the clergy in their unused capacity as leaders are as follows:

Everywhere the clergy with a few persecuted exceptions (like Arnold), proclaiming themselves the advocates of Toryism, the dogged opponents of our political liberty,

³⁴ Alton Locke, p. 163.

living either by the accursed system of pew-rents, or else by one which depends on the high price of corn; chosen exclusively from the classes who crush us down, prohibiting all free discussion on religious points; commanding us to swallow down, with faith as passive and implicit as that of a Papist, the very creeds from which their own hard examples, and their scandalous neglect, have, in the last three generations, alienated us; never mixing with the thoughtful working men, except in the prison, the hospital, or in extreme old age; betraying in every tract, in every sermon, an ignorance of the doubts, the feelings, the very language of the masses, which would be ludicrous, were it not accursed before God and man.³⁵

Alton's respect for the Church was decreased by its exclusiveness. He despised the clergymen for their superficiality and aloofness. He discerned in his cousin George's adherence to the creed a worship of the system instead of a search for truth. He despised himself for his betrayal of the workers, his selling his talents for popularity and self-indulgence. He had tried to serve truth and Mammon and had drunk deep of the cup of disappointment. His own class defiled him and scorned him for his pharisaism. To regain his station with them and their faith in him, he volunteered to go to the village workers near the home of Dean Winnstay and speak to them in behalf of the Chartists' cause.

³⁵ Alton Locke, p. 192.

Oh! there is in the intellectual workman's heart, as in all others, the root of Pharisaism - the lust after self-glorifying superiority, on the ground of genius. We too are men; frail, selfish, proud as others. We are not yet thorough democrats, my brothers; we do not utterly believe our own loud doctrine of equality.³⁶

In his anger, despair, and impetuosity he kindled the laborers to mutiny and violence which he was unable to check. The very crowd he had led to violence turned against him and let him go to prison for three years to suffer for their actual deeds. The years of prison life without understanding guidance made him bitter and cynical. Upon his release, he joined the ranks of the Chartist petitioners and sanctioned the actions of the physical-force members. On the eve of April 10, Alton and Crossthwaite went to Mackaye and disclosed the plans of the Chartists. Mackaye tried to dissuade them from the foolish step, and Crossthwaite accused him of infidelity to the cause. To the accusation Mackaye made a characteristic reply to the Chartists.

Tell them that one who saw Liberty afar off, and seeing her was glad, as for a bonny bride, an' followed her through the wilderness for threescore weary waeeful years - sends them the last message that e'er he'll send on airth: tell 'em they're the slaves of warse than priests and kings - the slaves o' their ain lusts an' passions - the slaves o' every loud-tongued knave an' mountebank that'll pamper them in their self-

³⁶ Alton Locke, pp. 275-276.

conceit; and that the gude God'll smite 'em down, and bring 'em to nought, and scatter 'em abroad, till they repent an' get clean hearts and a richt speerit within them, and learn His lesson that He's been trying to teach 'em this threescore years - that the cause o' the people is the cause o' Him that made the people; an' woe to them that take the deevil's tools to do His work wi! Gude guide us - Saxty years o' madness! saxty years o' madness! How long, O Lord, before Thou bring these puir daft bodies to their richt mind again?³⁷

This final farewell from Mackaye and the failure of the Chartists' rebellion, of which Kingsley's graphic description is given in the preceding chapter, turned Alton's heart from the pursuit of revolution and class strife. He learned from Elinor the key to his life's mission. She revealed to him the giver of all good gifts - Christ:

She spoke of Him as the great Reformer and yet as the true Conservative: the inspirer of all new truths, revealing in the Bible to every age abysses of new wisdom as the times require: and yet the indicator of all which is ancient and eternal - the justifier of His own dealings with man from the beginning. She spoke of Him as the true demagogue - the Champion of the poor; and yet as the true king, above and below all earthly rank; on whose will alone all real superiority of man to man, all time-justified and time-honored usages of the family, the society, the nation stand, and shall stand forever. Look at the great societies of our own day, which however imperfectly, still lovingly and earnestly do their measures of God's work at home and abroad; and say, when was there ever real union, cooperation, philanthropy, equality, brotherhood among men, save in loyalty to Him - Jesus who died upon the Cross.³⁸

³⁷ Alton Locke, p. 130.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 339.

In this account of the literary activities of the Christian Socialists we have departed from the strict sequence of events. We must now turn to the Associations for a study of the practical application of their principles. No phase of Christian Socialism developed more rapidly than the first eight of the Associations. During the summer of 1849 John Ludlow, Archdeacon Hare, Sully, Mansfield, Scott, Thomas Hughes, Charles Kingsley, and a few Chartist leaders, met at Maurice's house to discuss plans for organizing associative societies in several different industries in order to test their principles. They were to observe these associations and to modify their methods to suit the practical needs as they arose. Before the establishment of the Cooperative Association of Tailors in Castle Street, London, in 1851, the Promoters had no definite constitution. They were a group of friends who met weekly for the purpose of discussing business plans or more often for religious and social purposes. Though such an informal body was capable of supervising the few Associations they had established, the growth and the expansion of the groups demanded or necessitated a more formal management. Charles Sully, the paid secretary of the Promoters and acting manager of the Associations, planned the constitution; and in 1850, it was published as Tract V.,

containing an account of the history of the Society and model laws for Associations. The fundamental principle of the Society was stated to be "the practical application of Christianity to the purpose of trade and industry;" its objects were set forth in the following statement:

It is now our business to show by what machinery the objects of Christian Socialism can, as we believe, be compassed; how working men can release themselves, and can be helped by others to release themselves, from the thralldom of individual labor under the competitive system; or at least how far they can, at present, by honest fellowship, mitigate its evils. In offering this machinery to others we are bound to protest against the idolatry of social mechanism, which imagines society as a mere assemblage of wheels and springs, and not as a partnership of living men, which takes account of the form alone, and not the spirit which animates it.³⁹

This warning is characteristic of Maurice, whose hesitancy throughout the movement was due to his fear of mechanizing the society to the neglect of its broader purpose of character-building. Ludlow felt the necessity for the warning, and he published it with the formal scheme. A brief summary of the latter is given.

The society was composed of all engaged in the movement. It met on the first Wednesday of each month to discuss topics relative to its objectives; the second Wednesday of each month was given to lectures

³⁹ Tract V.

and discussions. The executive work of the Society was divided between a Council and a Central Board. The purpose of the Council was to transact business between the Society and the Associations and the Associations and the public, to collect and administer funds, and to diffuse the principles of cooperation. The Council was chosen by joint action of the Promoters; Maurice was always president, and the body consisted of twelve ordinary members and an unlimited number of honorary members. It held its meetings weekly, and employed paid secretaries. The Central Board represented the Associations recognized by the Society, and was composed of all the managers of the different groups and a delegate chosen from each of them. The duties of the Central Board were to regulate the relations of the different Associations and the united Associations' relations with the public. In 1852, the Council and the Central Board, which had before met separately, met jointly. The Associations were controlled Councils of Administration, consisting of their managers, a chairman, a treasurer, a secretary, and a specified number of associates. They were left free to manage themselves but were directly responsible to the Council and the Central Board, who gave instructions for conducting the business of the groups. New Associations were required

to serve a probationary term of two years, but during this time they enjoyed all the privileges of the regular Associations except in the matter of voting. Wages were paid in accord with the labor and talent expended. The idea of a scale of equal wages was contrary to the principles of the organizations because it would result in taking from the industrious, the talented, and the strong to give to the weak, the idle, and the inefficient. The plans of the Association were a fair day's work for a fair day's pay and the biennial division of profits minus the operating expenses. The Associates were restricted to a ten-hour day, were required to do all work on the premises of the Association, were to observe Sunday, and were not permitted to make the Association an agent of a political agitation. Such was the constitution devised from the combination of Sully's practical experience, Ludlow's legal knowledge, and Maurice's idealism.

Business was brisk, and during 1850 eight Associations were founded. The names of these give us an idea of the fields of industry covered by the Promoters. The first was the Cooperative Association of Tailors in Castle Street, London; the next three were cobblers' organizations, the Ladies' and Gentlemen's Working Boot and Shoemakers Association, the Gentlemen's Working

Boot and Shoe and Strong Shoemakers Association, and the West End Working Bootmakers; the next three were builders' organizations, the Working Builders, the North London Working Builders, and the Pimlico Working Builders; the last of the groups were the Working Printers' Association and the Working Bakers' Association. In addition to these the North London Needlewomen's Association and the East London Needlewomen's Home Work Shop Association were affiliated to the Society. In 1852 the Ladies Guild was begun under the management of Mrs. Caroline Southwood Hill, whose famous daughter Octavia had joined it. Although the Guild ceased in 1856, its influence in bringing Octavia Hill into a connection with the principles of Christian Socialism, which she acknowledged years later, was important.

The modern socialists' criticism of Christian Socialists is that the latter did not devote themselves more enthusiastically to Trade Unionism. In the light of the history of their connection, this criticism is unjust. The ill-organization of the trades gave the Christian Socialists an opportunity to expand their idea of association. In 1851, a circular was sent to the Trades Union Societies to secure their support for

40 Maurice, C. E. Life of Octavia Hill, p. 330.

a Central Cooperative Agency. A committee was formed consisting of Neale, Hughes, three business partners, ten members and managers of the Associations, Newton and Allan of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, George A. Fleming, president of the National Association of United Trades, Thornton Hunt and Richard Hart, friends of cooperation, and Thomas Shorter of the Promoters. They delegated the work to an Acting Board of eight members, and the propaganda for the Central Agency began. Their purpose was published in the Christian Socialist for November, 1851. It was an urge for the unions to adopt, instead of their defense policy, the principles of association. The lockout strike in 1851 gave the Christian Socialists their opportunity. They discussed the moral issues at stake, preached the principles of association, and did much to establish a just relation between the warring factors of society.

The Central Cooperation Agency was established. Its aim was to unite the Associations into a single body. Neale was the greatest contributor to the plan. His idea was to centralize the interests and capital of the Associations, for he saw in the multiple expansion of these the danger of rivalry and strife. The influence of the Central Agency could hardly be overestimated. It gave solidarity and unity to their aims,

and was the chief force in securing the Industrial and Provident Societies Act of 1852, which gave the whole cooperative movement its status. The Society was forced to revise its constitution and restate its policy. A meeting was held, and the name was changed into the Association for Promoting Industrial and Provident Societies. A preamble to its revised constitution was stated thus:

The Promoters of Working-Men's Associations, having united for the purpose of applying the principles of Christianity to trade and industry, and desiring to state more definitely what those principles are, as they find them set forth in Christ's gospel, that they may serve as the basis of a society to be formed for the objects after mentioned, declare: -

1. That human society is a body consisting of many members, not a collection of warring atoms.
2. That true workmen must be fellow-workmen, not rivals.
3. That a principle of justice, not of selfishness, must regulate exchanges.⁴¹

The practicability of the associations proved unsuccessful, and the Society failed. The leaders had learned that the chief difficulty arose from the lack of education in associative principles; so they turned to the most significant phase of their work-education.

In the early constitution of the Christian Socialists provision had been made for education. That the

⁴¹ Raven, Christian Socialism, 1848-1852, p. 307.

leaders had realized from the start the importance of education is evinced by their early provision for the night school at Little Ormond Street. They realized that the failure of the cooperative activities was largely due to the lack of education in associative principles among the workingmen. The experience that had taught them the need for education had also given them the basic principles for the program which they adopted. The greatest impetus to the new venture came from the workingmen themselves, who, upon the receipt of the news of Maurice's expulsion from King's College, petitioned him to become Principal of the Working Men's College. The campaign was begun through a series of articles written for the Christian Socialist and through lectures. On October 30, 1852, Maurice gave his inaugural address at their new headquarters in Red Lion Square; on November 2, they began their first term with one hundred and seventy-six students. A history of the College is not our chief concern here, but a limited survey of the fields of study and the personnel is essential to an understanding of its effect upon subsequent reforms and policies. Maurice lectured on St. John's Gospel, Political Terms As Illustrated by English History, and the Reign of King John As Illustrated by Shakespeare's Plays; Ludlow on the Law of Partnership. Hose directed the study of

geometry; John Westlake and Richard Buckley Litchfield, arithmetic and algebra; Brewer, the geography of England; Hughes, amusements; and Ruskin, a new recruit who taught in the College until 1860, taught drawing. Neale, Grove, Kingsley, and Lloyd Jones were later connected with the lectures at the College. Both women and men were privileged to attend the classes at first, but with the definite establishment of the women's educational program, women no longer attended.

The Working Men's College was a new venture and was the most definite and constructive step in the attempt to embody, in a concrete form, the principles of Christian Socialism. This group was not interested merely in the technical training of the peculiar abilities of the individual, but also in the development of the qualities essential to social membership. The leaders purposed to bring the lower and upper classes into harmony, and to unite their efforts to establish a universal brotherhood under the leadership of Jesus Christ. To this end they taught the principles of cooperation, developed character, and instilled a humanitarian spirit in their students. They combined the best in the teachings of the reformers - the German Marx, the French Faurier and Le Blanc, and the English Owen and Grey. They did much to bring the Church into

a closer union with secular life, to instill the principles of cooperation, to establish universal education, and to evolve a social-ethical philosophy. Their influence is traceable in the works of Ruskin and Mrs. Humphrey Ward, which will be discussed in succeeding chapters.

CHAPTER III

JOHN RUSKIN: CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM IN THE TRANSITIONAL PHASE

To the student of Christian Socialism the years from 1840 to 1880 are important for the light they throw upon the growth of the socialistic theories initiated in the early forties and the changes in the general outlook of the economists of the period. This period of transition marks a decline in the attempts at direct participation in social and economic events, and initiates the period of scientific study of social and economic phenomena. The combined efforts of the Unionists and the Christian Socialists were rather successful. These early reformers succeeded in providing sanitary reforms in dwellings and factories, better wages, and greater educational facilities for the laborers. The final justification for their efforts was realized in the improved moral life of the class for whom they spent their time, their money, and their energies. Under improved conditions, the workers developed a greater sense of obligation toward themselves and toward society. Their moral growth is traceable in the expansion of the powers of their institutions of self-help and mutual aid. The Church and the

political economists accepted their fundamental principle that the ultimate value of reform or change was determined by its effect upon human character. The Christian Socialists and their allies succeeded in making a dent in the shield of the orthodox economists, and raised the value of life above property; and socialism, which at first was met with scorn and derision, found an accepted place in the social sciences.

One of the most important figures in the years of transition was John Ruskin, art critic, teacher, draughtsman, writer, and philanthropist. He found that the basic principles of the Working Men's College corresponded with his own idea of bringing together the rigidly divided classes into a common social life and pursuit of culture higher than that of the current business of the day, and he threw himself enthusiastically into his teaching. He was a teacher in the college from 1854 to 1860, and gave his time, his talents, and large sums of money to promote its success. Prior to his connection with the college, he met Carlyle and Maurice. The former exerted a strong influence over the whole of Ruskin's policies and beliefs. Although Ruskin differed from Maurice in matters of religion, he was deeply in sympathy with Maurice's social-ethical ideals. From his experience with the workingmen with whom he came in contact

during his teaching, and from his association with the leaders, Maurice, Ludlow, and Kingsley, Ruskin gained his first impulse in the direction of social reform. Like the other great reformers of the period, he was indebted to the Christian Socialists for his theories of reform and to Carlyle for his ideals. This indebtedness is seen in his teaching of the gospel of truth and justice and in his practical application of that gospel to life.

Ruskin's early works were really sermons in art, for whatever he taught was in relation to life. The greatest productions of his early years: Modern Painters in 1843, The Seven Lamps of Architecture in 1849, and the Stones of Venice in 1851, embody his gospel of truth, sincerity, and nobleness as he learned it from Carlyle, and his protest against Sham was comparable to his master's. He founded his "Gospel of Art" upon principles of life; he preached that art was not an end in itself, but the instrument wherein moral, intellectual, and social ideals were expressed. His works are saturated with moral and social fervor. He maintained that art found its only right to exist in its power to inspire the artist's regard for duty and humanity. He recognized the moralization and socialization of all art in its power to affect human life - domestic, social, political,

and religious. He was always conscious of the presence of the Deity in all art; for to him, art was the revelation of the spiritual and moral, and was a declaration of the eternal beauty and perfection of God's work. The final test of art was the spirit which it expressed and the ultimate effect it produced upon the workman. To him, art was the open book to the history of the moral greatness and moral degradation of the past, and the study of art in its relation to life was the safest means for arriving at a true evaluation of moral and spiritual greatness:

The book I called the Seven Lamps was to show that certain right states of temper and moral feeling were the magic powers by which all good architecture without exception had been produced. The Stones of Venice had from beginning to end no other aim than to show that Gothic architecture of Venice had arisen out of, and indicated in all features, a state of pure national faith and domestic virtue; and that its Renaissance architecture had arisen out of, and all its features indicated, a state of concealed national infidelity and domestic corruption.¹

To this doctrine that "art is religion", Ruskin remained true throughout his life; and he was faithful in performing his mission - to raise the veil from the eyes of men and to reveal to them the ultimate facts of God's order of society. He taught men the moral history of men

¹ Ruskin's Works, Vol. X, "Crown of Wild Olives", pp. 52-53.

through represented facts and ideas in the different stages of art and architecture. He gives us his own purpose in the following quotation:

In all my past work, my endeavor has been to show that good architecture is essentially religious - the production of a faithful and virtuous, not an infidel and corrupted people. Architecture has always been the manly language of a people inspired by resolute and common purpose, and rendering resolute and common fidelity to an undoubted God.²

Gradually, from his meditation upon art as the representation of the "common purpose" and "common fidelity" of men, Ruskin was drawn to the contemplation of man, morality, and social institutions; and he devoted the remainder of his life to teaching a new "Gospel of Work and a regeneration of the Social Organism".³

In his social-ethical theories and principles of reform, Ruskin is more obviously indebted to Carlyle and the Christian Socialists than in his earlier works; however there is a strong evidence of Carlyle's influence throughout. Ruskin had little faith in the possibility for reform through new laws and enlarged liberties. He believed that reform like charity should begin at home. He accepted the principles laid down by Carlyle and the Christian Socialists that every man

² Works, Vol. X, "Crown of Wild Olives", p. 54.

³ Harrison, Frederick. Studies in Ruskin, p. 62.

was responsible for his own salvation and was also his brother's keeper. It was impossible for Ruskin to conceive a sound society based on the false principles of competition and selfishness. True reform as Ruskin conceived it was the development of the human heart in obedience, justice, and compassion. The disorder of society, according to Ruskin's theory, was the result of man's disobedience to God's will. He taught that, without strict obedience to the will of God, perfect justice between men, and compassion - fellow-feeling - for those who were improvident, no perfect reform could be accomplished:

One thing we know or may know, if we will, - that the heart and conscience of man are divine; that in his perception of evil, in his recognition of good, he is himself a God manifest in the flesh; that his joy in love, his agony in anger, his indignation at injustice, his glory in self-sacrifice, are all eternal, indisputable proofs of his unity with a great Spiritual Head; that in these, and not merely in his more availing form, or manifold instinct, he is king over the lower animate world; that, so far as he denies or forfeits these, he dishonors the Name of his Father, and makes it unholy and unadmirable in the earth; that so far as he confesses, and rules by, these, he hallows and makes admirable the Name of his Father, and receives, in his sonship, fulness of power with Him, whose are the kingdom, the power, and glory, world without end.⁴

Ruskin was never a fanatical reformer, a slave to a fixed idea, but he was a strong defender of the good and a

⁴ Fors Clavigera, Vol. II, p. 407.

persistent denouncer of the evils that he perceived. He never lost faith in the necessity of education as the method of redress for the social evils which arose out of the pillage of the laborers by the idlers. His social mission was distinctly an ethical rather than a political one. He held fast to the true ethical teaching,⁵ "to see life steadily and see it whole". He recognized the evil of social dishonesty as the source of social disorder, and spent an ample share of his energy in teaching the central relations of the social body and the specific needs of these. The unity of his system is traceable in the plea for honesty and justice in the transactions between men. The development of his social-ethical system or plan is traceable in his works:

Modern Painters taught the claim of all lower nature in the hearts of men; of the rock, and wave, and herb, as a part of their necessary spirit life; in all that I now bid you to do, to dress the earth and keep it, I am fulfilling what I then began. The Stones of Venice taught the laws of constructive art, and the dependence of all human work or edifice, for its beauty, on the happy life of the workman. Unto this Last taught the laws of that life itself, and its dependence on the Sun of Justice; the Inaugural Oxford Lectures, the necessity that it should be led, and the gracious laws of beauty and labor recognized, by the upper, no less than the lower, classes of England; and, lastly, Fors Clavigera has declared the relation of

⁵ Hobson, John Ruskin Social Reformer, p. 47.

these to each other, and the only possible conditions of peace and honor, for low and high, rich and poor, together in the holding of that first Estate under the only Despot, God, from which, whoso falls, angel or man, is kept, not mythically nor disputably, but here in visible horror of chains under darkness to the judgment of the great day: and in keeping which service is perfect freedom, and inheritance of all that a loving Creator can give His creatures, and an immortal Father to His children.⁶

He did not abandon the teachings of his early critical works in which he defined and evolved a morality of society, but in his later writings the emphasis is placed on the practical application of his morality. A brief resume of the topics of his works, from 1864 to 1877, will give us a clear insight into the development of his system of social reform. Munera Pulveris and Unto this Last, published in 1862, set forth the essential conditions of moral culture necessary to produce the true Political Economy; Sesame and Lilies (1864), was a continuation of these; The Crown of Wild Olive (1864) has as its special theme the definition of work as the making of wealth, not profit, and condemns profit as the false motive of industry; Time and Tide (1867) is the central work of Ruskin's social teaching. It contains the three basic principles for a sound society which Ruskin incorporated in his practical experiment - a modified Guild System, Captains of Industry,

⁶ Fors Clavigera, Vol. IV, p. 51.

and State Regulation of Marriage and Population. Fors Clavigera is a miscellany of his thoughts on social reform, and its chief aim was to stir the hearts of men with zeal for social betterment and to secure their help in his plan for an experiment in practical reform. The general growth of Ruskin's thought and work from "Nature to Art, through Art to Human Life, in the Art of Life a growing sense of the demands of Eternal Law in the making and governance of Human Society"⁷ is given in Fors Clavigera.

For his doctrine of work as the remedy of evil, Ruskin was indebted to Carlyle, who taught the salvation of man lay in his duty to do the work that lay nearest him. Ruskin expanded this premise by limiting and defining the work done. To him it was not sufficient that men worked, but it was necessary that they did good work. He saw the root of the holiest truth and the healthy sign of progress necessary to the strength and happiness of men in their perfecting the manner, and accomplishing the ends of the life of work which circumstances had determined. His conviction of the utility of keeping class distinctions both in work and life is so marked and plays so prominent a part in his scheme

⁷ Fors Clavigera, Vol. IV, p. 51.

that it confirms his policy that the transference from one grade of society to another would be rare and exceptional. The strength and happiness of men did not consist in their striving for higher places or rank, but in their being content to do their work well. Like Carlyle, Ruskin recognized the necessity for a large body of unthinking workers, toilers in servile labor. To mitigate this condition, he proposed the employment of criminals in dangerous and painful work. In a highly organized state, mechanical and foul employment would take the nature of punishment or reward.

Of merely rough (not mechanical) manual labor, especially agricultural, a large portion should be done by the upper classes; bodily health and sufficient contrast and repose for the mental functions being unattainable without it; what necessarily inferior labor remains to be done, as especially in manufactures, should, and always will, when the relations of society are reverent and harmonious, fall to the lot of those, who, for the time, are fit for nothing better.⁸

The right to labor or do useful work was the inherent right of men, and the duty of the State was to provide the opportunity of useful employment. Ruskin condemned all useless and false labor as the worst form of theft practiced upon men. To the field of ignoble work, Ruskin relegated all useless employment; that is,

⁸ Works, Vol. X, "Munera Pulveris", p. 92.

employment which produced that which was valueless in maintaining life, and poor or false work which cheated by adulteration of product. To the question - What is good work? - Ruskin answered in accord with his gospel of truth and justice:

Wise work is, briefly, work with God. Foolish work is work against God. The real "good work" is, with respect to men, to enforce justice, and with respect to things, to enforce tidiness and fruitfulness.⁹

The first obligation of man was "to do good work whether you live or die," and the first obligation of the State was to prevent, by wise laws, useless and foul labor or labor which produced no means for sustaining life and was done for profit. The work which men did to furnish necessities or conveniences for human consumption, and the motives of production and the relations between employers and employees, form the basis for Ruskin's indictment of current Political Economy.

Ruskin's qualifications for this singular task have been questioned by the public, which has not correctly estimated his natural and acquired habits of penetrating and minute criticism. If we are to arrive at a just and true estimate of his Political Economy, we must examine the qualities that fitted him for his

⁹ Works, Vol. X, "The Crown of Wild Olive", p. 36.

task of criticizing the alleged fallacies of the existing mode and for defining a true Political Economy.

Ruskin was a trained specialist, first of all, in the finer qualities of production, and second, in the capacity for consumption. He was himself a fine workman, a keenly observant student of nature and man, and a widely experienced man in the concrete facts of agriculture, architecture, and the process of production and consumption of goods. He was gifted with a keenly analytical mind, and an innate honesty and sincerity unimpaired by academic, political, or economic interests.

His first criticism of the economic philosophy or science of the period was that the title, Political Economy, was wrongfully assumed, but the basis of his attack was the acceptance of the theory of the "economic man", man actuated solely by wages. Ruskin refuted the idea of money-getting as the only incentive to industry, and recognized the function of the "affections" in relation to production and consumption. He drew distinctive differentiations between Mercantile Economy, which assumed that man was merely a "getter" and "spender" of money, and Political Economy, which dealt with man as an organic whole, a conscious, rational, and emotional being. Ruskin denounced competition as the true relation between capital and labor. He recognized the

importance of social affections not as "disturbing"
¹⁰
 and "accidental elements", but as constant and vital
 elements of society. He believed that, although the
 interests of the master and the servant were diverse,
 they were not essentially opposed. It was always to
 the interest of both that the work be honestly done
 and justly paid for. "In the division of profits,"
 said Ruskin, "the gain of the one may or may not be
¹¹
 the loss of the other."

The circumstances influencing reciprocal interests
 were varied, and rules of expediency were futile. "No
 human actions ever were intended by the Maker of men to
 be guided by balances of expediency, but by balances of
 justice. All right relations between master and opera-
 tive, and all their best interests, ultimately depend
¹²
 on these." The economic policy of the negation of the
 soul of the laborer as the motive power of his work
 was, to Ruskin, a false economy; for, in his belief, the
 servant could be brought to his greatest strength only
 by his affections. The universal law of the whole
 matter was laid down by Ruskin thus: "Assuming any given
 quantity of energy and sense in master and servant, the

¹⁰ Works, Vol. X, "Unto this Last", p. 13.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 15.

¹² Ibid., p. 16.

greatest material result obtainable by them will be, not through antagonism to each other, but through affection for each other.¹³ The means for producing this relationship were two; namely, the fixing of wages so as not to vary them with supply and demand, and the engaging of laborers for permanent employment. Ruskin advocated equal pay for workmen of the same field irrespective of their diligence, but he admonished employers to use only good workmen. The speculation in labor made possible by the unrestricted competition of the laborers was dishonest and unjust. The master had two distinctive duties: to establish a noble commercialism and to humanize trade.

In true commerce, as in true preaching, or true fighting, it is necessary to admit the idea of occasional, voluntary loss; that six-pences have to be lost, as well as lives, under a sense of duty; that the market may have its martyrdoms as well as the pulpit; and trade its heroisms, as well as war.¹⁴

Through noble self-sacrifice, paternal vigilance, and complete honesty, the masters were to establish harmony in industry and genial relations between themselves and their workmen. They were to turn their minds from "money getting" to the nobler task of "wealth getting;"

¹³ Works, Vol. X, "Unto this Last", p. 20.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 26.

and the distinction here drawn between "riches" and wealth presents the text for Ruskin's second attack on the Political Economy of the Utilitarians.

His second proposal for reform in Political Economy was the substitution of a vital standard of value for the money-standard. To the "orthodox" economists, value of merchandise was the money it would bring were it sold, but to Ruskin value of a thing was determined by its power to sustain life. According to the mercantile economists there was no intrinsic value in a commodity - whiskey and good books were equal in value so long as they commanded the same price. Ruskin substituted a subjective human standard of value for the commercial standard. He also defined wealth in terms of human life. He refuted the idea that wealth was the accumulation of objects with exchange value, and maintained that true wealth was moral power derivable only from happy, noble, useful individuals. To him wealth was well-being, life:

In fact, it may be discovered that the veins of wealth are purple - and not in Rock, but in Flesh - perhaps that the final outcome and consummation of all wealth is in the producing as many as possible full-breathed, bright-eyed, happy-hearted human creatures.¹⁵

¹⁵ Works, Vol. X, "Unto this Last", p. 41.

Ruskin's chief service to mankind is that he humanized Political Economy, laid an ethical basis for social life, and foreshadowed and pointed out the way to the science of social humanity; and in this connection let us examine his social economic theory.

The foundation of his social theory is the organic relation between life and labor and between production and consumption. In Munera Pulveris he stated the distinction between value and cost thus: "Value is the life-giving power of anything; cost the quantity of labor required to produce it." ¹⁶ To Ruskin the "real" value of goods is their power to satisfy "good" human wants or their life-giving power. The value of a thing was determined by the number of people who could use it. Therefore the science of political economy was necessarily a science respecting human capacities, dispositions, and moral values. To possess real value a commodity led to life and not to destruction. "Usefulness", said Ruskin, "is value in the hands of the valiant; so that this science of wealth being, as we have just seen, when regarded as the science of Accumulation, accumulative of capacity as well as of material, when regarded as the Science of Distribution, is distribution, not absolute, but discriminate; not of

¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 24.

everything to every man, but of the right thing to the right man.¹⁷ The production of a thing of value necessitates the production of the capacity to use it; hence production cannot be independent of consumption. When the intrinsic value of a thing is joined to the aptness of the user, there is wealth. Ruskin maintained that there could be no wealth independent of the capacity for using - "nor can any noble thing be wealth, except in the hands of a noble person".¹⁸ The manner and issue of consumption were the real tests of production. Profit from labor is not wealth; intrinsic value alone is not wealth, but "life is wealth". The object of political economy is to use everything nobly, to create a greater capacity for wise consumption. As consumption or use is the aim of production, so life is the aim of consumption. In its final analysis Ruskin's political economy is his theory of wealth.

There is no wealth but life. Life, including all its powers of love, of joy, and of admiration. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings; that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personal, and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others.¹⁹

¹⁷ Works, Vol. X, "Unto this Last," p. 69.

¹⁸ Ibid., "Munera Pulveris," p. 25.

¹⁹ Ibid., "Unto this Last," p. 83.

Political economy, according to Ruskin's theory, has as its first object the regulation of a society or State; and by the maintenance of the State, he means the support of its population in a healthy and happy life. The object of all political economy is not the accumulation of money, but the extension of life at the highest level.

In connection with the principal objective of political economy, let us examine the principles of government as laid down by Ruskin: "The government of a nation consists in its customs, laws, and councils, and their enforcements."²⁰ Ruskin discusses these factors of government, and gives the just function of each in the regulation of the state. To him, custom represents the moral sensibility of the nation, its attainment of high ethical training in "grace", "pitifulness", and "peace". He condemns the insensibility of the upper classes to the misery, squalor, and poverty they ignore. To permit poverty, filth, and disorderliness is to dishonor the whole of the social body and to bring disgrace upon the whole body politic. In the well-regulated state, Ruskin saw the inevitable division of labor according to inequality of capacities -

²⁰ Works, Vol. X, "Unto this Last," p. 83.

the ruling and the servant classes. The just separation of these two elements by a perfect educational system, devoted to the development of men according to their tastes and faculties, is the only possible means for securing healthy and harmonious government. The laws of the nation should sustain the customs of the people. The nation's laws wisely express its precepts by statutes and by the assignment of rewards and penalties. The laws of precept or ordinance should have special reference to youth, and be strict educational laws which govern and train the young in the wise observance of right and justice. Of the importance of this fact Ruskin said:

Make your educational laws strict, and your criminal ones may be gentle; but, leave youth its liberty, and you will have to dig dungeons for age. And it is good for a man that "he wear the yoke in his youth": for the reins may then be of silken thread; and with sweet chime of silver bells at the bridle; but, for the captivity of age, you must forge the iron fetter, and cast the passing bell.²¹

All law must be just and right in order to insure right rule, and it should not be perverted from its mission of "right doing". Just law alone can insure justice - the just ordering of things submitted to it. The principal objective of law is to secure to every man his rightful share of what he has produced. Ruskin enlarged

²¹ Works, Vol. X, "Munera Pulveris," p. 95.

the function of law thus:

The object of law is not only to secure to every man his rightful share (the share, that is, which he has worked for, produced, or received by gift from a rightful owner), but to enforce the due conditions of possession, as far as law may conveniently reach; for instance, that land shall not be wantonly allowed to run to waste, that streams shall not be poisoned by the person through whose properties they pass, nor air be rendered unwholesome beyond given limits.²²

Laws should furthermore teach men to discern worth and to reverence their true counselors and governors. In the choice of wise counselors as their leaders, men are able to erect just governments and to maintain high standards of life. The failures of governments are due to the lack of nobleness, obedience, and reverence of the many foolish who should be ruled, and the few wise who are rightful rulers. In this criterion for the governed and the governing, Ruskin followed closely Carlyle's idea of rule by the aristocracy of talent, but in the elaboration of the theory, Ruskin presented a plan for a practical true social order.

In Unto this Last, Ruskin proposed that the Government undertake the regulation of the production and sale of the necessities of life, but in Fors Clavigera and Time and Tide he set forth a plan resembling the

²² Works, Vol. X, "Munera Pulveris," pp. 95-96.

medieval guild. Certain rules relating to work and property were laid down. Every individual was to work, at what he could do best, for the common good instead of for individual profit; but he was to receive the goods that he honestly produced and knew how to use. Ruskin proposed an educational, industrial, and government plan that would so order society as to maintain the greatest number of happy and noble human lives. The basic principles on which Ruskin established his ideal social order were "that every citizen should be well-born and well educated." To secure the first of these he stated a definite plan for regulating marriage and reproduction. Of his proposed educational system more will be said later in this chapter. The question now is. How was this educated citizenry to be directed in establishing a true social order? Ruskin recognized the inherent inequalities of men and refuted the idea of a natural equality; nevertheless, he realized that the division of society into rigidly separated castes tended to hinder the members of society in their efforts to render the best work of which they were capable for the good of the social group. The medium between State Socialism and Medieval Feudalism was the Guild; therefore Ruskin chose the guild system as the best plan for his society. Under the guild system every man was to

work, and men were to form guilds representing their different crafts. Membership in these was to be optional. The guides of these producers were to have control of retail trade, and employ retail dealers as their salaried officers; necessary public works were to be owned and operated for public profit. Wares were to be warranted to prevent adulteration; prices, wages, and profits were to be fixed annually. The affairs of each firm were to be reported and their books audited yearly. If liabilities exceeded assets by one hundred pounds, the guild was to be declared bankrupt.

In the organization of agriculture, Ruskin insisted upon two basic reforms: the fixity of rent and security of tenants' improvements. The plan as a whole was feudalistic, with responsibilities vested in the landed aristocracy, and security of tenure provided for the tenants. In Time and Tide, Ruskin set forth his ideal of land control and tenure thus:

The right action of the State respecting the land is, indeed, to secure it in various portions to those of its citizens who deserve to be trusted with it, according to their respective desires and proved capacities; and after having so secured it to each, to exercise such vigilance over his treatment of it as the State must give also to his treatment of his wife and servants; for the most part leaving him free, but interfering in case of gross mismanagement or abuse of power. And in the case of great old families, which always ought to be, and in some measure, however decadent, still truly are, the noblest monumental architecture of the kingdom,

living temples of sacred tradition and hero's religion, so much land ought to be granted to them in perpetuity as may enable them to live thereon with all circumstance of state and outward nobleness; but their incomes must in no wise be derived from the rents of it, nor must they be occupied (even in the most distant and subordinately administered methods) in the exactions of rents. That is not noblemen's work. Their income must be fixed and paid by the State, as the King's is.²³

The duties of these state-maintained landlords were those of warrior and lawyer. They were to act as paternal guards over those who were directly their proteges - the laborers of their land. The landlords were responsible for the administration of justice among the peasants, the improvements of their estates, and the examples of their chivalry. They were to keep order among the lower classes and to raise them, by wise guidance, to the highest level of which they were capable. Their function in the field of agriculture was the same as that of the masters of industry in the field of industrialism. In his insistence upon the abolition of the competitive system, rent and interest, and the establishment of labor as the basis of exchange, public ownership and control of public property in a limited sense, Ruskin approached very near the socialistic policies of the Marxian school. The stress he laid upon the religious authority as a vital factor in

²³ Works, Vol. VIII, "Time and Tide", p. 100.

producing the true cooperative character possible in his "Christian Brotherhood", was a policy closely allied to the Christian Socialists. Ruskin had little or no patience with "liberty" and "equality" as proclaimed by democracy. The only genuine freedom he recognized was to be gained through strict obedience to known laws and reverence for the authority of appointed leaders. Social order was possible only when built upon authority of superiors, and reform was possible only through appeal to the heart and intelligence of the rightful rulers. True progress, to Ruskin as to his master, Carlyle, and his coworkers, the Christian Socialists, was possible only through the moralization of the ruling classes and their cooperation in establishing equality of opportunity for social service, which was the only equality possible. Ruskin's social ethics laid the foundation for the "progress of all through all, under the leadership of the best and wisest". The chief instrument for securing sound social progress, according to Ruskin, was education; therefore he laid down specific rules for an educational system.

Ruskin condemned the idea of education conceived in terms of lucrative employment and social ambition:

What is sought is an education which shall keep a good coat on my son's back, which shall enable him to ring with confidence the visitor's bell at double-

belled doors, which shall result ultimately in the establishment of a double-belled door to his own house.²⁴

Ruskin had no patience with the commercialization of ideas, and his criticism of the educational system of his day was deep and fundamental. He denounced competitive examinations, the penurious attitude of the State toward maintenance of schools, the method of teaching facts instead of human life, and the practice of ignoring the vital moral needs for true education. Ruskin believed that the very aims of education were defeated under the stereotyped system of education. His statement of the essential objectives is as follows:

The entire object of true education is to make people not merely do the right things, but enjoy the right things - not merely industrious, but to love industry - not merely learned, but to love knowledge - not merely pure, but to love purity - not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice.²⁵

The true aim of education, according to Ruskin's belief, was to train men to be happy, beneficent, and industrious. Let us examine carefully his plan for the realization of this aim. Manual instruction was to be an important and basic function of education not

²⁴ Works, Vol. X, "Sesame and Lilies", p.

²⁵ Ibid., "The Crown of Wild Olive", p. 46.

merely as a means for physical exercise, but as a chief instrument for teaching the systematic nature of matter in relation to human service. The knowledge thus gained would give personal experience and contact with material facts of life. It would be furthermore a practical means for discovering the natural aptitudes of children and would afford opportunity for individual expression. Ruskin sought to humanize education and to make it the chief instrument for moral and physical training. The means for cultivating all the faculties of mind, body, and spirit were provided. The school was to be the most important building, impressive in its beauty and dignity of architecture; it was to be, in truth, a library of the best books, an art gallery of great models, and a museum of natural objects and minerals. The subjects of the usual courses studied in schools now were included, but the method of teaching proclaimed by Ruskin was far in advance of even our present methods. By association with the beautiful in his surroundings, the child was to be taught the love and admiration of beauty; by practical service to his associates, he would learn moral truths; and by physical training, he would learn the essentials of health and hygiene. "And finally, to all children of whatever gift, grade, or age, the laws of Honor, the

habit of Truth, the Virtue of Humility, and the Happiness of Love",²⁶ was to be taught.

Ruskin was not satisfied with preaching doctrines. He was eager to put his ideas into practice, and in 1874 he began a series of practical experiments based upon his social-ethical teaching. He realized that absolute justice was unattainable under the industrial system of his age, but he was unwilling to acquiesce in the standards of commercialism, and he set up a code of conduct which he followed in all his private dealings. He sought to deal fairly with others, and in accord with his theory of sound wages, he fixed the salaries of his domestic servants so as to permit them to do their work in comfort and with good will toward their master. In buying and selling he eschewed all bargaining; he bought and sold at what he considered a fair price. In publishing his books he followed his code of commercial ethics. He published and sold them without employing the means of competitive bargaining. He considered his fortune a public trust and used it accordingly, giving sums to philanthropic enterprises he deemed worthy. He enabled Miss Octavia Hill to carry out her plans for better housing of tenants; he subscribed

²⁶ Fors Clavigera, Vol. IV, pp. 369-370.

to pure food funds, and gave large sums of money to the Charity Organization Society of London. He endowed Oxford and Cambridge with gifts of the works of Turner and other noted artists, including himself. He provided many objects of natural history, installed libraries and cabinets of mineral specimens, and organized classes for teaching drawing in several schools and colleges. In all, his private and public philanthropies absorbed the sum of one hundred and fifty-seven thousand pounds, land, and houses which he inherited from his father, and large sums of his own money earnings. In many philanthropic endeavors Ruskin was an innovator and a pioneer. At Oxford he organized gangs from the ranks of the unemployed workmen and set them to work to clean and beautify streets in London; he established a model tea-room to encourage the sale of pure food products at a small margin above cost; he organized a group of Oxford students to repair a road near Hinksey, out of Oxford. The greatest of his social experiments was the organization of the Guild of St. George, a society for the purpose of carrying to the highest point of development the institutions of hereditary property and family life. In Fors Clavigera the early history of the company is given in detail.

The Guild of St. George rested upon the basic

principles of Ruskin's philosophy; namely, the necessity for practical religion, labor, truth, and honesty in a true social order. To determine further the philosophy of the society, let us examine the creeds and resolutions set forth by Ruskin and subscribed to by every member of the Guild. They are thus stated:

I. I trust in the living God, Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things and creatures, visible and invisible.

I trust in the kindness of His law, and the goodness of His work.

And I will strive to love Him, and keep His law, and see His work while I live.

II. I trust in the nobleness of human nature, in the majesty of its faculties, the fulness of its mercy, and the joy of its love.

And I will strive to love my neighbor as myself, and, even when I cannot, will act as if I did.

III. I will labor, with such strength and opportunity as God gives me, for my own daily bread; and all that my hands find to do, I will do with all my might.

IV. I will not deceive, or cause to be deceived, any human being for my gain or pleasure, nor hurt, or cause to be hurt, any human being for my gain or pleasure; nor rob, or cause to be robbed, any human being for my gain or pleasure.

V. I will not hurt or kill any living creature needlessly, nor destroy any beautiful thing; but will strive to save and comfort all gentle life, and guard and perfect all natural beauty, upon earth.

VI. I will strive to raise my own body and soul daily into all the higher powers of duty and happiness; not in rivalry or contention with others, but for the help, delight, and honor of others, and for the joy and peace of my own life.

VII. I will obey all the laws of my country faithfully, and the orders of its monarch, and of any person appointed to be in authority under its monarch, so far as such laws or commands are consistent with what I suppose to be the law of God; and when they are not, or seem in any wise to need change, I will oppose them loyally and deliberately, not with malicious, concealed, or disorderly violence.

VIII. And with the same faithfulness, and under the limits of the same obedience, which I render to the laws of my country, and the commands of its rulers, I will obey the laws of the Society called of St. George, into which I am this day received; and the orders of its masters, and all persons appointed to be in authority under its masters, so long as I remain a Companion, called of St. George.²⁷

The financial side of the company as reported in Fors Clavigera is an attestation of the sincerity and pertinacity of Ruskin. He sought at the outset to establish confidence and secure support by giving a tithe of his own income, which amounted to seven thousand pounds. Despite Ruskin's noble effort and generous example, the public remained unmoved. The whole of the sum collected (excepting Ruskin's gift of seven thousand pounds which had been spent for stock) amounted to three hundred and seventy pounds, and only seven persons had enlisted as yearly subscribers to the fund. After a futile attempt to launch the project in 1875, the Guild purchased a farm of fourteen acres, named Abbeydale, and situated near Sheffield in 1877. The cost for the land was two thousand, two hundred, and eighty-seven pounds. The purchase was made, and the money was to be paid out of the funds of the Guild to be derived from their labor and the tenth or tithe that each was re-

²⁷ Fors Clavigera, Vol. III, p. 40.

quired to pay to the Guild. The tilling of the land was a failure, due to the lack of concentrated effort and capital. Most of the Companions of the Guild resigned, and efforts were made to work the land by more efficient outside management. As a whole the agricultural project was a failure, but in other aspects the Guild was successful.

The most serviceable outcome of the work of the Guild is the Ruskin Museum at Sheffield. It had long been Ruskin's desire "to furnish an exemplar of a true museum as a treasury of art and a means of delight and instruction in the finer sorts of human work"²⁸. He collected valuable productions of art, sculpture, drawing, and objects of natural history (minerals, gems, etc.) and skillfully arranged and classified them with a view to presenting them in an instructive manner. The rooms were utilized to an advantage in presenting the works so as to impress the visitor with a sense of the natural surroundings, and the walls were inscribed with suggestive and stimulating texts from Ruskin's writings. The original plan of the museum has been faithfully continued by Ruskin's successors, and to-day it stands as a monument to his genius and humanity.

²⁸ Hobson, John Ruskin, Social Reformer, p. 291.

Of the practical social industrial reforms of Ruskin, the most successful were the hand-weaving linen industries at Langdale and Laxey in the Isle of Man. The revival of these handicrafts was for the purpose of employing skilled laborers who would work for the pleasure of good workmanship and to provide good work for those who would appreciate it. The Home Arts and Industrial Association, which holds annual exhibitions and gives annual reports, is a result of this influence of Ruskin.

It is difficult to estimate the influence of Ruskin upon the modern age, for he is yet too near; but it is not a difficult task to trace his direct influences upon many of the commonplace humanities of our present age. In view of the fact that many of the reforms he proposed have been enacted to check the evils he prophesied, it is possible to suppose that in the course of time his ideals of a perfect social order, a spiritual brotherhood, may be realized. Whether this is realized we cannot escape the debt of gratitude we owe John Ruskin for his fearless attack upon the materialistic ethical standards of his day and his exposure of the evils of industrialism. He penetrated to the depths of the sophistry of the age; he saw the waste of human life and the weakening of the moral stamina resulting from

mechanization of labor and the selfish competition of trade; and he recognized the fact that the sources of the evils were the stupidity, insensibility, and greed of the upper classes and the lack of discipline in the lower classes. Ruskin was conscious of existing wrongs, and for forty years he labored diligently to point the way to a true social order founded upon justice and productive of happy, healthy human lives. That his labors were productive of good is evidenced by the enactment of many of his remedial measures of reform; namely, old-age pensions, provisions for protecting laborers' lives, provision for national education, and improvement of the housing of the working classes.

Ruskin was the source from which men and women desirous of a better world and yearning to strive toward its attainment, drew the inspiration for their good works. Ruskin awakened noble natures to noble endeavor. His influence inspired the work of Arnold Toynbee in East London, the beginning of an extensive settlement work which drew into its service such devoted and noble natures as that of Mrs. Humphry Ward, whose work will be the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

ARNOLD TOYNBEE AND MRS. HUMPHRY WARD:

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM IN A LATER PHASE

The purpose of this thesis has been to trace the influences which emanated from the little band of Christian Socialists of 1848 and which affected in a great measure the works of philanthropic men and women who labored to alleviate the conditions resulting from the industrial and social revolutions. These revolutionary upheavals set to work new forces which shifted the English point of view in the religious and material world. We have noted in preceding chapters how the early Christian Socialists, Carlyle, Maurice, and Kingsley, struck at the materialism of the eighteenth century and strove to direct the forces of democracy and to impregnate these forces with a conscious religious fervor for social well-being. In such men as Carlyle, Kingsley, and Ruskin the function of government was held to be paternal or patriarchal. They rallied to support the traditional divisions of society, and sought to revive, in the "natural" aristocracy, the responsibility of rule and in the laborers the responsibility for reverence and obedience to their superiors, which had characterized the medieval guild systems. In

the doctrine of the early Christian Socialists emphasis was placed upon the individual's duty toward other individuals, but in later development the responsibility of each to each and each to all was stressed.

The greatest exponent of the later phase of Christian Socialism was Arnold Toynbee (1852-1883), fellow and tutor at Balliol College, Oxford, 1873 to 1883. With the beginning of his lectureship in 1878, Toynbee threw himself whole-heartedly into a career of intense educational and social activities. His gifts were rare, and his enthusiasm for social and religious reform was unbounded. The springs of his genial heart were touched by the appeal of such a nature as Ruskin, with whom he was associated. He entered into Ruskin's schemes and projects for directing the revolutionary forces of the period into channels of purposeful, united effort to improve the external conditions of men and to bring men of different classes into a common citizenship. Toynbee was a public-spirited man. He was a Poor Law Guardian, a Cooperator, and a Church Reformer. He was interested in and sympathetic toward the Trades Unions and Friendly Societies and all activities toward an ideal social life. He worked with the Charity Organization Society and with the vicar of Whitechapel in East London. Toynbee's sympathies were always with the poor, and his

desire to be personally acquainted with them led him to a close association with Canon Barnett and the district of Whitechapel. Like the early founders of the Working Men's College, Toynbee realized the great need for close association between the educated and wage-earning classes. Through his great personal charm and transparent sincerity he exercised a strong influence over the youths of Oxford. He impressed them with their civic duties and awakened in them an enthusiasm for social reform.

Toynbee was not a socialist in the continental sense, and he rejected the Tory Socialist idea of a paternal government. He favored state intervention in matters of prime social importance, but he urged a limited state action because he saw in that direction a possible lessening of the independence of the individual. He believed democracy a force for uniting the classes and eventually making for a higher social order. Whereas under the feudalistic guild system the union between employer and workman rested upon the workman's dependence, under democracy the union rests upon equal citizenship of a free state. Toynbee was an advocate of fraternal government. His idea of the vast social order is expressed in the following excerpt from his works:

We are all now, workmen as well as employers, inhabitants of a larger world; no longer members of a single class, but fellow-citizens of one great people: no longer the poor recipients of a class tradition, but heirs of a nation's history. Nay more, we are, no longer citizens of a single nation, we are participants in the life of mankind, and joint heirs of the world's inheritance. Strengthened by this wider communion and ennobled by this vaster heritage, shall we not trample under foot the passions that divide, and pass united through the portals of a new age to inaugurate a new life?¹

Toynbee's desire for a noble and unified society in which the sharp lines of social castes were erased found no realization in the Owen cooperative societies. The latter was a plea for men to separate from the larger society, the State, into small communities in which they could regain the ideal brotherhood. Toynbee's plan of cooperative societies was to find this larger citizenship within the community life of the State. "The problem for us," he said, "is not to re-create union at the cost of national life, but to reconcile the union of individuals with national life; not to produce union at the cost of independence, but to reconcile union with independence."²

To Toynbee the function of the State was to secure freedom by compulsion; by the organized power of the

¹ Toynbee, The Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England, pp. 217-218.

² Ibid., p. 244.

people, which is the State, men are free to find their places - to do as they like within the invisible network of compulsion which in reality is the State, the end of which is to promote the material ends of life and the highest form of life. "As the State secures freedom by compulsion, the Church teaches the right use of freedom by persuasion."³ The functions of these corporate bodies are ultimately the same - to secure a deeper, wider personal life. Religious aims should be in accord with the aims of the State, and spiritual and material well-being should be linked in a union of purpose to spiritualize life. This union of church and nation is possible only through a Christianity in harmony with human life and progress. Toynbee defines the higher Christianity thus:

We recognize now that divine truth is not the jealously guarded treasure of a sect, but the common heritage of mankind, not a light held up by priests before a forsaken multitude, but that inner light which illumines the face of the whole people.⁴

Toynbee, like Jowett and Green, had embraced the idea of a liberal theology and had recognized the imperative need for a vitalized Christianity that would

³ The Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, p. 253.

⁴ Ibid., p. 257.

meet the needs of all men, would ennoble their lives, and would lead them to a higher spiritual and material life. Toynbee held that religion was the basic force of man's life - not an intellectual force, but feeling - a power "not ourselves which makes for righteousness". He believed there was in the hearts of all men a Divine power to grow toward God in love and service. He refuted the Positivists' belief that men are impelled by humanity for humanity's sake, and maintained that we serve humanity for the love of God.

It was the desire to serve humanity for the love of God that impelled Toynbee to take up social work. Like Ruskin he recognized the difficulties of a life of high ethical standards for the workers whose emotions were stunted and trampled down by the humdrum routine existence of industrialism, and he put forth all his effort to raise men out of the degradation and ignorance which was their inheritance from the industrial revolution. He sought to unite the antagonistic forces of society in a common brotherhood. His knowledge of conditions of industrial life were gleaned from his personal contacts with conditions in Whitechapel and his work as lecturer in the manufacturing centers. His sympathies for the poor were deep; his plans for their development were extensive; his efforts in their behalf had moved

many and awakened a deeper consciousness of social responsibility, but his death in 1883 cut short his fruitful and promising career. Toynbee Hall, erected in East London under the auspices of Canon Barnett of Whitechapel and Toynbee's followers at Oxford, commemorated Toynbee's ideals and efforts. The settlement founders held fast to a practicable approach to the life and problems of the times. They organized clubs, classes, lectures, concerts, and other educational and recreational activities; but their chief aim was to become a part of the life of the community and to study the needs of the people they served. They were invested with unspoiled confidence in the contribution a people of a locality might make. They drew their impulse from religious and ethical sources, but rejected all sectarian bias and intent. The success of the settlement movement was phenomenal. From 1884, the date of the founding of Toynbee Hall, to 1890, six settlement houses were erected: Oxford House in Bethnal Green, the Women's University Settlement in Southwark, Mansfield House in Canning Town, Newman House, and University Hall, Bermondsey Settlement, founded by Mrs. Humphry Ward, who became the moving force in the widespread social settlement work of the period.

The most outstanding personality of the period of development of the Settlements in London was Mrs. Humphry Ward (nee Mary Arnold), daughter of Thomas Arnold and granddaughter of Arnold of Rugby. Mary Arnold was born in Tasmania in 1851. From her parents she inherited the very essence of the religious upheavals of the period. Her mother was a strict Calvinist; her father, a sentimental idealist vacillating between Roman Catholicism and Anglican Liberalism and in whom the religious unrest of the mid-Victorian period was recapitulated. Mary Arnold was a passionate, imaginative, wilful child. Her early training was a desultory affair at Miss Clough's school at Eller How. At nine she was sent to Miss Davie's school at Shiffnal in Shropshire, and in 1864 she entered Miss May's school near Clifton. Her father's reversion to Anglicanism in 1865 and the family's removal to Oxford opened a new field for the development of Mary Arnold's unusual powers.

Her life at Oxford from 1867 to 1881 was fruitful and awakening. Her entrance into the life of Oxford was during the period of religious controversy which equalled in intensity and depth the Tractarian controversy of 1845. The freedom of the mind began to be insisted upon, not only in the realm of science,

but in the whole field of the interpretation of the scriptures. The liberal school of theologians led by Benjamin Jowett and Mark Pattison and other writers in Essays and Reviews (1860), no longer accepted the theory of the inspirational origin of the scriptures, and insisted upon the historical criticism of the Bible as of any other book. Under these influences Mary Arnold spent the impressionable years of her life from sixteen to twenty. Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln, for whom she cherished a deep admiration and regard, encouraged her to apply her talents to research and critical study. "Get to the bottom of something," he would say to her; "choose a subject and know everything about it."⁵ This exhortation caused her to plunge into the study of early Spanish Literature, and by 1869 she had acquired a reputation as a critic and had published A Westmorland Story. Neither work, however, was a forecast of the future.

Mary Arnold was married in 1872 to T. Humphry Ward, a writer and critic of promising note. They were both engaged in writing, but Mrs. Ward found time for practical work in a different direction. She took a leading part in the movement for higher education for

5 Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 21.

women, and by 1873 a plan for organizing lectures for women residents of Oxford was well under way. These lectures were to have no connection with the University classes, but were, no doubt, the nucleus of the later co-educational work. The first lectures were held in the Clarendon Buildings in 1874. Their success encouraged the expansion of the courses offered and the addition of further courses through the winters from 1874 to 1877, when the committee expanded into an "Association for the Education of Women". In 1879, under the direction of Mrs. Ward, a special committee was formed to collect funds for establishing a "Hall of Residence" for the women of Oxford. As secretary of the committee Mrs. Ward carried the greater part of the burden of correspondence and arrangements, but by 1879 her labors were crowned with success, and Somerville Hall was opened to women students. She remained an active member on the committee for arranging lectures long after she left Oxford. She had won her first laurels in carrying out a program of public work which was to stand her in stead in years to come when by devious paths she arrived at the greatest work of her career.

The course of Mrs. Ward's work was changed in 1877 by her acceptance of an offer from Dean Wace,

general editor of the Dictionary of Christian Biography, to take a large share in writing the lives of the early Spanish ecclesiastics. This research into the early history of the Spanish Church deepened and intensified her interest in the problems of Christianity. She recognized the importance of the problem and its solution, and her antagonism toward the arrogance of Pusey and the orthodox party impelled her to rally to the cause of those who earnestly but blindly sought religion. Her first thrust at the orthodox religionists was an anonymously printed pamphlet, entitled Unbelief and Sin.

In 1881 Mrs. Ward moved to London, where Mr. Ward was employed on the staff of The Times. The new venture enlarged their circle of friends. Through her success in the work completed for the Dictionary of Christian Biography, Mrs. Ward was asked to join The Times staff as review critic of French and Spanish literature. She was asked by Mr. Morley, editor of The Macmillan Magazine, to contribute similar work for them. From 1881 to 1884, she was employed as a literary critic, the work for which her Oxford friends had deemed her destined, but in 1884 she published her first novel, Miss Bretherton, which marked a turning point in her career. The general criticism of her

first venture in novel-writing was that she was too didactic and intellectual. She frankly received the criticism, but entered with unabated zeal into the task of a new novel upon a subject that had lain near her heart since the publication of the little pamphlet Unbelief and Sin. Her interest in the religious problems, though seemingly set aside by other interests, was too deeply rooted to remain dormant for long.

In 1885 she began Robert Elsmere, a novel in which she portrayed the struggles of a soul in its attempt to reconcile the dogmas of accepted creeds and the wider aspects of Christian faith. Mrs. Ward, like her Christian Socialist predecessors, recognized the continuity of Christ in all human society moulding it to His will. Her religious views are set forth in the following excerpt from a letter to her father:

The Empire built up the Church out of its own substance, and destroyed itself in so doing. I cannot help feeling that as far as organization and institutions go it is very true, though I would never deny that God was in the Church, as I believe He is in all human society. Everything from the critical and scientific standpoint, seems to me so continuous and natural - no sharp lines anywhere - one thing leading to event, belief to belief, - and God enwrapping and enfolding all.⁶

6 Trevelyan, Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 48.

It was this belief in the evolution of a new and broader Christianity that would meet the needs of an age no longer satisfied with the dogmatism of old creeds that led her to write Robert Elsmere. The novel was not published until 1888, and it created a furor of criticism. The principal points of controversy are traceable in the letters exchanged by Gladstone and Mrs. Ward, a few fragments of which will give us the salient points in the new faith and religion as conceived by Mrs. Ward and the points of difference from the old as conceived by Gladstone:

I don't believe in any new system, ... I cling to the old. The great traditions are what attract me. I believe in a degeneracy of man, in the Fall, in sin - in the intensity and virulence of sin. No other religion but Christianity meets the sense of sin, and sin is the great fact in the world to me.

I suggested that though I did not wish for a moment to deny the existence of moral evil, the more one thought of it the more plain became its connection with physical and social and therefore removable conditions. In myself I see a perpetual struggle, in the world also, but through it all I feel the 'Power that makes for righteousness'. In the life of conscience, in the play of physical and moral law, I see the ordained means by which sin is gradually scourged and weakened both in the individual and in the human society.⁷

That Mrs. Ward's mind was turning to the teaching of the simpler Christian ideals through organizations

⁷ Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 59.

and societies is evident. These ideas she put into the mouth of Robert Elsmere again and again. It is as if she felt an impelling need for combined efforts of the new faith. Elsmere's reply to old Macdonald's inquiry as to whether the former contemplated starting a new sect sets forth Mrs. Ward's conception of the needs of the new Christianity:

If you like, ... I have no fear of the great words. You can do nothing by despising the past and its products; you can also do nothing by being too much afraid of them, by letting them choke and stifle your own life. Let the new wine have its new bottles if it must, and never mind words. Be content to be a new sect, conventicle, or what not, so long as you feel that you are something with a life and purpose of its own, in this tangle of a world.⁸

Her purpose in writing Robert Elsmere, aside from defining and setting forth the doctrines of new faith, was to challenge the doubtful who were living unsatisfied in the old creeds but afraid to push on to firmer faith. She urged them to take stock of what they had left of their religion and to join with others for the purpose of life and conduct. "It is the levity or the cowardice that will not think, or the indolence of self-indulgence that is only too glad to throw off restraints, which we have to fear. But in truth for

⁸ Ward, Robert Elsmere, Vol. II, p. 371.

religion, or for the future, I have no fear at all.
 God is his own vindication in human life.⁹"

The idea of a "New Brotherhood" with which she ended Robert Elsmere struggled in the author's mind for expression. A visit to Toynbee Hall interested and impressed her deeply, and aroused vague disturbing ideas of the possibilities in that field. Upon her return to London in 1889 she was consulted by Lord Carlisle and Mr. Stopford Brooke in regard to founding a settlement in South London similar to Toynbee Hall in East London. She undertook the task, and the years 1889 and 1890 were devoted to the establishment of a "Hall of Residence" in London. Mrs. Ward was aided in this project by a group of men and women consisting of the following: Dr. Martineau, Dr. James Drummond, of Manchester College, Oxford, Mr. Stopford Brooke, Lord Carlisle, Rev. W. Copeland Bowie, Dr. Estlin Carpenter, Mr. Frederick Nettlefold, the Dowager Countess Russell, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, and Dr. Blake Odgers, Q. C., who acted as treasurer. The aims of the new movement were definitely religious and social, and were set forth in the original circular of the settlement thus:

⁹ Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 68.

1. To provide a fresh rallying point and enlarged means of common religious action for all those to whom Christianity, whether by inheritance or process of thought, has become a system of practical conduct, based on faith in God, and on the inspiring memory of a great teacher, rather than a system of dogma based on a unique revelation.

2. The Hall will endeavor to promote an improved popular teaching of the Bible and the history of religion.

3. It is intended that the Hall shall do its utmost to secure for its residents opportunities for religious and social work, and for the study of social problems.¹⁰

Mrs. Ward successfully resisted the persuasion of her associates to ally the Settlement with a religious sect.

The project was launched in 1890 amid criticism and praise. The program of lectures was immediately begun. In the Biblical sphere courses in both Old and New Testament criticism were given by Mr. Wicksteed, Dr. Carpenter, M. Chavannes, Mr. Hargroves, Prof. Knight, and Dr. Martineau. In the non-Biblical sphere Mrs. Sidney Webb (nee Potter) lectured on the Cooperative Movement, Mrs. T. H. Green on the Development of English Towns, Mr. Graham Wallas on The English Citizen, Mr. Brooke on The English Poets of the Nineteenth Century, and the Warden, Mr. Wicksteed, on Dante and Political Economy. The lectures were attended by

¹⁰ Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, pp. 83-84.

large numbers, and the work was successful. During the first year the Residents secured Marchmont Hall in Tavistock Square, which they used for their regular social activities. Under the direction of Alfred Robinson, successful boys' clubs and men's clubs were organized, and a beneficial program was carried through. Mrs. Ward's chief interest in Marchmont Hall was the opportunity it afforded for religious teaching; but her faith in the religious purpose was unwarranted, for the real progress of the movement lay in its possibility for social work. The interest evinced at the Hall of Residence was soon transferred to the larger social program of Marchmont Hall, and Mrs. Ward, recognizing the futility of trying to force a union of purpose of the two groups, resigned herself to the inevitable, and threw herself enthusiastically into the development of such branches of her purpose as could be furthered.

She set to work to interest the friends of her early efforts in subscriptions to a fund for a new Settlement. The goal was made attainable by a gift of seven thousand pounds from Mr. Passmore Edwards in 1894. The Duke of Bedford gave a site for the building and contributed eight hundred pounds to the building fund. The contract for the building was let

in 1895 to two youngsters of University Hall. The building cost was set at twelve thousand pounds, and additional cost for equipment amounted to five thousand pounds. Mrs. Ward donated one thousand five hundred pounds, and Passmore Edwards contributed another four thousand pounds. By 1896 the building was well under way. The Settlement was formally opened in 1897. It rested on a purely secular basis, but the Council agreed to Mrs. Ward's plan "to promote the study of the Bible and the history of religion in the light of the best available results of criticism and research"¹¹.

Her plans were not to rest here, and with each accomplishment new fields of action were opened to her. At Marchmont Hall she had begun an experiment in a children's playroom. She organized a group for Saturday mornings, but lack of space hampered progress. In the new Settlement she transplanted the idea and extended it for the purpose of attracting children away from the London Streets. These organized recreation hours from five-thirty to seven-thirty in the evenings were relegated to the younger members of the Council, but Mrs. Ward was always the motivating power. She formed a special committee (The Women's

¹¹ Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 121.

Work Committee), of which she was chairman, to watch over the work. She took charge of a class of boys from the ages eleven to fourteen, to which she read aloud from Kipling and Stevenson or talked of travels or the affairs of the day. The playrooms grew in popularity, and the number who attended by 1902 reached 1200. From this work she turned to the plan for reaching the crippled children of London.

The Settlement was practically vacant during the day, and the opportunity for utilizing it was great. Mrs. Ward had heard of the classes for crippled children carried on at Stepney, and of the Women's University Settlement at Southwark; she made inquiries concerning the work, and drafted her plans. She obtained the assistance of the London School Board for carrying on a Crippled Children's School at the Passmore Edwards Settlement. She assigned a committee to investigate the neighborhood. The hospitals, the School Board, and the Invalid Children's Aid Association assisted Mrs. Ward and her coworkers in visiting and canvassing the London district. They brought to light cases of children's neglect that struck the heart and excited the deepest pathos. In 1898 Mrs. Ward presented the facts revealed by the research to the London School Board, and asked them to supply equipment and teachers

for the Crippled Children's School. She promised to provide free rooms at the Settlement, a special nurse, and an ambulance for conveying the children to and from their homes. She met with indifference, but by 1899 the plans for the work were accepted and approved by the School Board. Mrs. Ward arranged to provide warm lunches for the children at a slight expense to their parents; but convinced by her experiment of the necessity of a varied and larger diet, she persuaded the School Board to aid her in providing the extra food. She was not satisfied to help only so small a number of the eighteen hundred children listed by the investigation to be in need of such care. She persuaded the School Board to join her in providing other Centres, and by 1901 four sites were decided upon, and four Crippled Children's Schools were begun. Her faith in the work was expressed in the following excerpt from a letter to The Times:

The happiness of the new schools is one of their most delightful characteristics. Freed from the dread of being jostled on stairs or being knocked down in the crowd of the play ground, with hours, food, and rest proportioned to their needs, these maimed and fragile creatures begin to expand and unfold like leaves in the sun. And small wonder! They have either been battling with ordinary school on terribly unequal terms, or else, in the intervals of hospitals and convalescent treatment, their not uncommon lot has been to be locked

up at home alone, while the normal members of the family were at work.¹²

After 1903 the School Board and the Education Committee of the London Council gave their whole-hearted support to Mrs. Ward's work, and assisted her in spreading the schools for the unfortunate children. By 1909 there were thirty Centres and twenty-four thousand children enrolled. The traditions of the Passmore Edward's Settlement school were perpetuated in the succeeding establishments.

Mrs. Ward was inspired by a noble humanitarianism, and her clear-sighted vision of what might and ought to be done for the uplifting of those less fortunate than herself urged her to unceasing battle with the indifference and complacency of her age. She was open-minded and quick to seize the ideas of others and turn them to practical account. A striking example of this fact was the beginning of the Vacation Schools at the Settlement. Mrs. Ward read an article by Henry Curtis, in Harper's Magazine, which gave an account of the New York vacation schools, and she immediately set to work to incorporate the idea in the Settlement program. She organized play centers under the supervision of Mr.

¹² Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 140.

Holland and Miss Churcher. The purpose of this was to attract the children of London who had no prospects for a vacation in the country and to turn their energies to wholesome paths of freedom and enjoyment. Mr. Holland organized classes of manual training, and games for physical exercise for the boys; Miss Churcher directed the girls in domestic work; a kindergarten was equipped for the little ones; the library offered opportunities for recreational reading; classes for musical and aesthetic training were given, and a play ground was equipped for games. The growth of the Vacation School affirmed its success, and the interest evinced by the parents of the district was substantial proof of their appreciation. The Vacation School served a noble purpose. It rescued the little ones from the "weight of chance desires" of the London streets and directed their energies toward valuable, wholesome, and pleasurable use of idle hours. The marked contrast between the clean, happy, well-mannered children of the Vacation School and the dirty, querulous waifs of the streets was a generous reward for the labor the project entailed.

Convinced of the value of the Vacation School, Mrs. Ward began her campaign for enlisting the public authorities in the work. The transference of the power

of the London School Board to the London County Council was an unfortunate hindrance to her hopes. From 1903 to 1910 the Passmore Edwards Vacation School and the "Holiday School" at the Browning Settlement were the only efforts in this direction. In 1910 Mrs. Ward succeeded in persuading the London County Council to undertake the work. Six Schools were opened, but by 1912 these were permitted to drop. Mrs. Ward formed a "Play Centres Committee", and this group persuaded the London County Council to provide certain city schools for use from five to seven o'clock in the evenings during the vacation months. Eight schools were opened and eight hundred pounds granted for their maintenance. Mrs. Ward selected with care the superintendents of these Centres, and invited the children whose parents were employed until seven or later. By the end of the year the attendance reached six thousand. Mrs. Ward had struck upon a real need, and fired by the realization, she strove to establish permanently the Centres. She attempted again and again to secure an Act of Parliament recognizing the principles of the work, and in 1917 her hopes were realized. The Board of Education thenceforward agreed to pay half the "approved expenditures" of the Evening Play Centres.

In behalf of the children of the London streets,

Mrs. Ward worked with a consuming interest. Her intelligence, her vigilance, and her indomitable will enabled her to carry the work through in the face of ignorance, complacency, and often open defiance; but her labors extended above and beyond the settlement work. She made for herself a place of honor and distinction among the literary figures of the age. Her choice of the novel as her medium of expression indicates the pre-eminence of that form of literature in the nineteenth century, a highly speculative period in English thought. Toward the middle of the Victorian age a conflict between the rationalism of Huxley, Spencer, and Wallace and the idealism of Carlyle, Ruskin, and Arnold was at its height. Humanitarianism and individualism were the theme, social justice the cry, and economic opportunity the aim of the period. The literature reflected the spirit of the people, and depicted the existing evils of social life. The poets and novelists embodied the revolutionary tendencies which grew as a protest against the wage slavery that had resulted from the Industrial Revolution. In the novel, which had become the medium of expression, the greatest changes were apparent. The great novelists, Dickens and Thackeray, portrayed the social discontent occasioned by the conflict between the classes; and the lesser novelists, Kingsley,

Mrs. Gaskell, Reade, and Mrs. Ward, were clearly fighters in the cause of social reform. In the novel of the later nineteenth century intellectual controversy and didacticism displaced creative art. By 1890 the novel definitely became the mouthpiece of the age, and was utilized for the purpose of moulding and directing contemporary thought and popularizing ideas.

Mrs. Humphry Ward, who lived in close touch with the ruling powers and the intellectual and religious turmoil of the age, was uniquely suited for her self-appointed task of dramatizing fashion and popularizing current ideas. Although she was never a great artist in the creative sense, she was a sufficiently gifted writer to attract persons of high intellectual attainments and to evoke their concern for the solution of problems of society and politics. Mrs. Ward was a publicist and a good citizen, and her novels, though they are little more than theses upon controversial topics, are impartial exhibitions of her sense of mission and her appreciation of what is morally good. Stephen Gwyn said of her: "There is no ignoring her well-nourished public spirit and her services as a good citizen; but that she would sooner found an influential sect than write a supremely good book shows

her a publicist rather than a great novelist."¹³ It is this aspect of her novels rather than their literary qualities that comes within the scope of this study.

Although Mrs. Ward wrote three novels before 1892, Marcella, published in that year, is the first of her works in which her social-ethical theories are pronounced. In Marcella the scene is laid in London and in rural England; the characters are drawn from the different social strata - the nobility, the gentry, the social reformer, and the peasantry. The central theme of the story is the problem of social adjustment. In the love story of Marcella Boyce, daughter of a decadent squire, and Aldous Raeburn, heir of Lord Maxwell, we are brought into contact with the disturbing and unsettling forces of English life in the later nineteenth century. Aldous Raeburn represents the best aspects of a rapidly disappearing landowner and public custodian of the noblest strains of English culture and aristocracy. Marcella Boyce, on the other hand, represents the changing and unsettled spirit of the age. She is first presented to us as a proud, brilliant, self-willed girl living at Mellor, her father's neglected estate. She has brought with her radical ideas which she has gained from her association with the members of the Venturist Society of London, a

¹³ Gwyn, Mrs. Humphry Ward, pp. 119-120.

group of Socialist devotees. These friends have filled her impressionable mind with hostility toward her own class, and fired her with enthusiasm for social reform. Edie, Louie, and Antony Craven, the sister and brothers with whom she lived in London, have instilled in her the teachings of Marx and Lasalle, and have enlisted her to work among the London poor. Through her work, there is born in her a sense of hitherto unsuspected social power. Marcella differs from her London friends in ambition, instincts, and tastes, and is destined to find in the wider social contacts of her life as heiress of Mellor the fallacy of much that she adheres to. In her development, all the forces of English life are brought to bear upon her. In tracing her development in its relation to other characters of the story, we may arrive at a just estimate of the author's opinion of the conflicting social ideas of her day.

At Mellor, Marcella Boyce entered into projects for improving the conditions of the village tenants, but neither her father nor her mother approved her plans. She joined with Harden, the vicar, and his sister in their attempts to alleviate the suffering of the poor. In London she had listened to the Socialists' discussion of the agricultural peasants'

dependence and their suffering at the hands of the landowners, but here she was brought face to face with them in the flesh. She recognized her responsibility toward these people and earnestly and seriously sought means for helping them.

She had tried to live with them ever since she came - had gone in and out of their cottages in flat horror and amazement at them and their lives and their surroundings; alternately pleased and repelled by their cringing; now enjoying her position among them with the natural aristocratic instinct of women, now grinding her teeth over her father's and uncle's behavior and the little good she saw any prospect of doing for her new subjects.¹⁴

In her heart she vowed to be their friend and champion, and ultimately to redeem them from their degradation.

Marcella took a special interest in Jim and Minta Hurd. Jim Hurd, a little dwarfed, red-haired man of violent Irish temper, had incurred the ill will of the game-keeper of Maxwell Court and had been found guilty of poaching. His record for shiftlessness and improvisation was commonly known, but Marcella, touched by Minta's devotion to Jim, endeavored to reclaim him. She gave Hurd much instruction in the socialist views she herself held and supplied him with radical literature. To his impoverished mind and sullen spirit these

¹⁴ Marcella, p. 30.

new ideas only awakened a spirit of class hatred and revenge. Toward the rich and the law Jim possessed the morals of a slave, who having had no part in making the law, breaks it with glee. He was, on the whole, insensible to Marcella's nobler intents and deceived her with little compunction:

It made him uncomfortable, certainly, that Miss Boyce should come in and out of their place as she did, should be teaching Willie to read, and bringing her old dresses to make up for Daisy and Nellie, while he was making a fool of her in this way. Still he took it all as it came. One sensation wiped out another.¹⁵

Under pretence of cobbling, he continued to poach, and he experienced an inward glee in outwitting Westall. The enmity between Westall and Hurd was of long standing and deep intensity. It sprang from the age-old jealousy of unequal power among men of the lower class. Westall had been made game-keeper at Maxwell Court, and had become the tyrant over his former associates - the oppressor of the oppressed. The enmity between the two men eventually led to the tragedy that changed the lives of all the principal characters of the story.

Marcella's engagement to Aldous Raeburn, heir to Maxwell Court, in whose theories she recognized vast

¹⁵ Marcella, p. 131.

differences from her own, was not successful. She was growing restive, and her conviction that she could not persuade and influence him to disregard his instinctive but deep convictions of Toryism made her an easy prey to the audacious, insincere radical politician, Wharton. He posed as a socialist, experimented in cooperative farming on his estate, and championed the radical demands of the Unionists. His dislike for Aldous Raeburn, in whom he recognized a formidable political opponent, made him desirous to thwart Raeburn's plans by playing upon the sympathies and philanthropic ardors of Marcella. By the happy chance of Hurd's murder of Westall in a poaching fray Wharton became the champion of Marcella's opposition to Raeburn. He defended Hurd, but failed to secure his freedom. He resorted to asking Marcella to secure Lord Maxwell's and Raeburn's signatures on a petition for Hurd's release from the death penalty he had received. Marcella made the petition a point of decision in her own affairs; and when Raeburn refused to ask for a mitigated sentence for Hurd, Marcella broke her engagement to Raeburn. Wharton played his political cards well. By subtle insincerities and brilliance of leadership he rose to a position of signal honor in Parliament. His success was phenomenal, and he was selected to lead the powerful Labor Party;

but on the very eve of his greatest success, his financial straits pressed him to accept a bribe which resulted in detection and ruin. Marcella learned of Wharton's treachery in time to save her from the fatal act of accepting him. She saw in his fall the wreck of all the idealistic theories that had won her to him. Through his whole vibrant scheme of socialism, philanthropy, and idealism, she discerned the false spirit of the man. Bereft of honor and sincerity, the masterful gifts of intellect and leadership in the man became stumbling blocks in the path of progress. Her heroic efforts to discover a system failed, but each step was an advancement; for as her old enthusiasms were swept away, ideals, more logical and attainable, replaced them. She saw her whole life in a different light. She accepted the proof that there were insurmountable barriers between classes and that her duty and opportunity were subject to and a result of her social heritage. The realization opened the way to love, and she took her place beside her husband, Aldous Raeburn.

The story of Marcella is a statement of Mrs. Ward's conviction that power must be placed in the hands of those who are trained to use it. Rather than a socialistic plan of government, she favored the retention of the cultural and social greatness of England. She

believed that the ideal social order must come through the nobility's solemn acceptance of its obligation as the natural custodian of English greatness. She was convinced that to uproot the traditional aristocracy and to disintegrate the vast estates of the landowning gentry would result in chaos and irreparable loss of that which was most worthy of preservation. Her purpose was to inspire the ruling classes and to awaken in them a greater sense of responsibility toward their fellow-man, and to teach the laborer to live in "admiration, hope, and love". The development and extension of powers in the characters of Marcella and Aldous Raeburn was made possible through their marriage. To this strong, silent, diffident, conservative man Marcella brought her buoyant, generous enthusiasm for unconventional change. In a perfect love their natures were tempered and expanded to include the noblest qualities of each. The further development of the two characters is given in Sir George Tressady, Mrs. Ward's second social political novel.

In the novel Sir George Tressady (1897) Mrs. Ward has ably depicted the social life she knew so well. The setting, as in Marcella, is in London and at English country seats. The characters are principally men and women of the upper order, with a few peasants and lower

class people thrown in for the purpose of contrast. The principal action of the story centers about the Maxwell Bill, a special factory act for East London, touching for the first time the grown man. The Bill provided for legal prevention of home-work or "sweating" in the clothing industries. The fight for the Bill forces party alignments and brings into play the different factions of government, and in the play of character upon character and faction upon faction Mrs. Ward manipulates her cards adroitly and reveals the game of politics.

Sir George Tressady, a young Englishman of birth and talent, returned from India to take up his duties in the political world. He entered Parliament as a member of the conservative reactionary group, led by Lord Fontenoy, a zealous and indefatigable worker. Fontenoy was aware of Sir George's abilities, and he endeavored to arouse his young friend's enthusiasm for the fight against the Government of the Liberal Conservatives led by Maxwell.

This wretched Government, ... is in power by the help of a tyranny - a tyranny of Labor. They call themselves Conservatives - they are really State Socialists, and the mere catspaws of the revolutionary Socialists. You and I are in Parliament to break down that tyranny, if we can. This year and next will be all-important. If we can hold Maxwell and his friends in check for a time - if we can put

some backbone into the party of freedom - if we can rally and call up the forces we have in the country, the thing will be done. But to succeed, the effort, the sacrifice, from each one of us, will have to be enormous.¹⁶

Sir George, however, was not possessed with any fanaticism or enthusiasm for "causes". He accepted his political views as a matter of fact and enlisted himself with the party most congenial to his aristocratic tastes. He maintained a cynical and superficial attitude toward life and refused to accept without reservation others' claims to deep sincerity. To feel deeply the responsibility laid upon him by his election to Parliament was not in keeping with his skeptical nature. He considered it a pleasant and new adventure. He was glad to succeed for the sake of success; he desired to be considered a formidable foe in debate; but his convictions were not deeply rooted. He considered Fontenoy a taskmaster, and to his leader's zeal he gave small measure of fidelity; but he gave as much as in him lay. He embraced the ideals of the reactionary party - to uphold property, and to put down low-born disorder and greed. By nature and training he was in sympathy with their creed.

¹⁶ Ward, Sir George Tressady, p. 39.

They abhorred equally a temporizing conservatism and a plundering democracy. They stood frankly for birth and wealth, the Church and the expert. They were the apostles of resistance and negation; they were sworn to oppose any further meddling with trade and the personal liberty of master and workman, and to undo, if they could, some of the meddling that had been already carried through.¹⁷

These policies Sir George accepted with equanimity until he was stirred by forces outside himself to a deeper realization of his obligations to humanity.

Aldous Raeburn, Lord Maxwell, represented the Liberal Tory. His conservative principles had undergone a great change since his marriage to Marcella Boyce. Her eager enthusiasm for reform, together with the influences of their mutual friend, Edward Hallim, had prepared him for the inevitable changes of democracy. He recognized the rule of the people as a force bringing with it the ordering and moralizing of the worker's toil. He refuted the idea of a Socialist or Collectivist system of government in which the rights of private possession were omitted.

Possession - private and personal possession - from the child's first toy, or the tiny garden where it sows its passionately watched seeds, to the great business of the great estate, is one of the first

¹⁷ Sir George Tressady, p. 85.

and chiefest elements of human training, not to be escaped by human effort, or only at such cost as impoverishment and disaster.¹⁸

He held tenaciously to the belief that private property should be held in limitation by the authority of the common conscience. He realized that science had brought a vast extension of the individual power of humanity and that it had laid an obligation on the State to protect the weak from their weakness, the poor from their poverty, and to forbid the accumulation of wealth at the expense of the individual's moral well-being. He sanctioned the freedom of the individual only in its limitation to the welfare of the community.

Bring the force of the social conscience to bear as keenly and ardently as you may, upon the separate activities of factory and household, farm and office; and from the results you will only get a richer individual freedom, one more illustration of the divinest law man serves - that he must die to live, must surrender to obtain.¹⁹

Raeburn was richer in experience and more confident of his policies. Through his wife he was persuaded to experiment in social projects. He had converted Mellor, his wife's inherited estate, into a socialistic farm; the rate of wages paid was far above the standard, and the farmers were organized into community laborers

¹⁸ Sir George Tressady, p. 124.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 126.

working for the advancement of the group. The plan had proved successful and convincing to Raeburn, and his desire to hasten the just relationship between the employers and employees resulted in his drafting and supporting the Maxwell Bill. Lord and Lady Maxwell had embraced a policy of Tory-Socialism in which they combined the best features of the opposing factions. They fought to retain the best of their aristocratic heritage and to broaden and extend it by adopting democratic and socialistic policies that tended to humanize their creed. Aldous Raeburn, Lord Maxwell, was a splendid example of the fine old Tory gentleman, the ideal of Carlyle, Ruskin, and Kingsley, tempered by an enlightened humanitarianism. Through his wife's deep and sympathetic love the finer, nobler traits in him were nourished and developed, and the haughty conservatism was chastened and subdued.

Marcella Boyce, Lady Maxwell, had developed into a woman of social distinction and political power. Her beauty, intellect, and generosity had made her a forceful influence in the world in which she moved. Hers and her husband's aims were one; and in him she sought the realization of that power for leading and directing the social good. Through her friendships with leading characters of the opposition forces she

allied them with her husband's interests in the effort to carry the Maxwell Factory Bill. Her influence upon George Tressady was the force which awakened his soul. He had listened to praise and blame of her in the first months of his parliamentary career. His first contact with her, in which they debated the issues upon which they differed, left him conscious of a strange power of sincerity and genuineness in her. He was drawn to her despite his vague dislike.

Lady Maxwell's fine eyes and stately ways were humanized after all by a quick responsiveness, which for most people, however critical, made conversation with her draw like a magnet.²⁰

It was this force in her that attracted and impelled young Tressady. Marcella had found him a nature of a different stamp from those of his party with whom she found no footing even for argument. Her nature was inventive and poetic, and the rich fulfillment of her husband's love had only increased her eagerness to serve and to give. She was eager to give to Tressady, in whom she detected flashes of enthusiasm, a deeper sense of his power to serve his fellowman. And what was his reaction to this lovely creature's interests in him? The association revealed to him her deep

²⁰ Sir George Tressady, p. 110.

convictions and sincerity, and awakened in him hidden depths of interest, power, principles. He began to look upon the business of politics with a different feeling. He recognized in it his power to serve in solving the difficulties of a complex social order. Marcella's sense of the great injustice and exploitation of the poor aroused in him a spirit of social concern. Her zeal to spur him to the nobler acts of which she deemed him capable made her blind to the power her sympathetic womanhood could have over him. As the time for the voting on the Maxwell Bill grew nearer, the political faction to which Tressady belonged became more and more the most formidable opposition to the measure. In these days, too, Sir George was more frequently in Marcella's company. He watched her anxiety and desire for the measure increase. The consciousness of her concern for the poor with whom she worked aroused new thoughts in Sir George. She led him into strange new paths of human experience, and through it all her warm, eager, woman's heart touched and changed him. He began to see the future through her eyes, to interpret the Maxwell Bill as she did, and to long for a part in the work that meant so much to her.

He felt the woman's heart, oppressed with a pity too great for it; the delicate, trembling consciousness,

like a point in space, weighed on by the burden of the world; he stood, as it were, beside her, hearing with her ears, seeing the earth spectacle as she saw it, with that terrible second sight of hers: the all-environing woe and tragedy of human things - the creeping hunger and pain - the struggle that leads no whither - the life that hates to live and yet dreads to die - the death that cuts all short, and does but add one more hideous question to the great pile that hems the path of man.²¹

Through his love for Marcella, his human pity was aroused. The last full measure of devotion was his to give, and he deserted his party to turn the vote in favor of the Maxwell Bill.

In the novel Sir George Tressady, Mrs. Ward has given her readers a portrait of the social-political life of her day. She has laid before us, in the characters of Raeburn, Marcella, Sir George Tressady, and Fontenoy, prototypes of the period. The upper order of society is depicted in minute detail, and we are able to discern the social, religious, and moral influences at work in the minds and hearts of these Englishmen. Aside from her achievement of preserving a section of English life and thought for posterity, Mrs. Ward has rendered a valuable service for her contemporaries. She was a thorough student of the question of her day - the necessity for social reform - and in

²¹ Sir George Tressady, pp. 314-315.

the presentation of the Maxwell Bill in the story of Sir George Tressady she succeeded in arousing interest in similar reform measures affecting the actual life of the period. She was a careful student of the political factions of the period, and in the characters of Fontenoy, Lord Maxwell, Sir George Tressady, and Bewick, the socialist radical, she has depicted the strength, the sincerity, the weakness, and the dangers of these factions.

Lady Rose's Daughter (1903) is a satire in which Mrs. Ward revealed her awareness of the political and social intrigues perpetrated to enhance selfish ambition for power. The field of the novel is the polite world in which the complacency of the upper class was continually disturbed by the middle class which sought to rise and establish itself by fair or foul means. In the rapid ascendancy of Lady Rose's daughter, Julie Le Breton, a companion of Lady Henry, Mrs. Ward depicted the struggle between the upper and middle classes of society. Lady Henry, an aristocrat of unquestionable social prestige and power, established a salon to which the socially elite and the commandants of political power were allied. Age and semi-blindness forced Lady Henry to rely upon Julie Le Breton for contact with the questions of the moment. Miss Le Breton, an

illegitimate child of the disavowed daughter of Lord Lackington and Marriott Dalrymple, a consummate radical, was a woman of unusual intelligence and charm. Lady Henry's tyranny chafed the proud spirit of Julie Le Breton, who refused to humble herself or to feel herself socially beneath the proud, arrogant old woman. Julie's desire for social success led her to defy conventional decorum and to practice intrigue. Her acceptance into the world of Lady Henry aroused the latter's fierce jealousy and suspicion. An unfortunate love affair between Julie and Captain Warkworth, an adventurer and an ambitious egoist, who accepted Julie's efforts to secure him a position of signal honor through her social alliances, led to a final break between Lady Henry and Julie and the discovery of Julie's real identity. Warkworth's unpopularity reflected upon Julie, who entered into a secret and "immoral intent" alliance with him. Jacob Delafield, nephew of Lady Henry and heir to the dukedom of Chudleigh, rescued Julie from Warkworth's influence and married her. The marriage raised Julie to the position of Duchess of Chudleigh, and completed her triumph over Lady Henry. Her triumph, however, had its touch of bitterness, for she suffered from the knowledge that Delafield, who had married her to protect her from her own weakness, no longer needed

what he had once desired - her love. When Delafield spoke to her of his aversion to the position in which he found himself as the Duke of Chudleigh, Julie realized the vast gulf between their natures:

She had not grown to maturity inside, like Delafield; but as an exile from a life which was yet naturally hers, an exile full sometimes of envy, and the passions of envy. It had no terrors for her, - quite the contrary - this high social state. Rather, there were moments when her whole nature reached out to it, in a proud and confident ambition. Nor had she any mystical demurrer to make. The originality which in some ways she richly possessed was not concerned in the least with the upsetting of class distinctions; and as a Catholic she had been taught loyally to accept them.²²

Julie was aware of their differences, but she loved him, and "her warm and living thoughts spent themselves on one theme only - the redressing of a spiritual balance"²³. For love of Delafield, Julie stood ready to renounce the realization of her social ambition, to stand by her husband, and to be guided by his judgment of right and justice.

Jacob Delafield was disturbed by the responsibilities of his social position. He was a nobleman in whose heart the teachings of Ruskin and Tolstoy had taken deep root. In his nature were vast potentialities

²² Mrs. Ward, Lady Rose's Daughter, pp. 450-451.

²³ Ibid., p. 451.

for human good. "On the one hand he was a robust, healthy Etonian, and on the other hand he was a man²⁴ haunted by dreams and spiritual voices." He dreamed of casting aside the trite conventions of society and longed to penetrate to its deeper truths. He was a philanthropist, a socialist, and an experimenter, and he was defiant toward the artificialities of society. Jacob Delafield visualized a better, nobler life for man, and dreamed of becoming the brother of the many instead of the few.

The story as a whole is a treatise on the conflict between the old and the new - a clash of the aristocratic exclusiveness of the world of Lady Henry with the democratic freedom of the world of Jacob and Julie. Mrs. Ward has shown the imperative need for the fusion of the two forces. She has set forth with intelligence and sincerity the inevitable alterations of social standards. In all her novels, whether in matters of persons, principles, or institutions, she depicts the eternal conflict between the old, established authorities and the new; and in the story, The Coryston Family, she has succeeded admirably.

The Coryston Family (1913) opens upon a scene with

²⁴ Lady Rose's Daughter, p. 199.

which Mrs. Ward was perfectly familiar and which she described with sympathy and understanding:

The hands of the clock on the front of the Strangers' Gallery were nearing six. The long-expected introductory speech of the Minister in charge of the new Land Bill was over, and the leader of the Opposition was on his feet. The House of Commons was full and excited. The side galleries were no less crowded than the benches below, and round the entrance-door stood a compact throng of members for whom no seats were available. With every sentence, almost, the speaker addressing the House struck from it assent or protest; cheers and counter-cheers ran through its ranks; while below the gangway a few passionate figures on either side, the freebooters of the two great parties, watched each other angrily, sitting on the very edge of their seats, like arrows drawn to the string.²⁵

Mrs. Ward delights to project herself and her readers into the political milieu, and to lay before them the issues of the moment. She has at her finger tips, as it were, all the tricks of the political game, and she adroitly presents, with a minimum of partisanship, all sides of the questions. Although she tactfully avoids conclusions as to the questions she treats, she successfully propagates ideas and principles. Her chief concern was to interpret the England of her day, and this she did with intelligence and insight.

In The Coryston Family Mrs. Ward returned to the question of the rights of landlords and of property.

²⁵ The Coryston Family, p. 1.

She did not deal with the evils of bad landlords, as in Marcella, but with the evils that might arise, from the most conscientious motives, on a well-ordered-estate. Her interest in the land question no doubt was due to the Liberals' Land League measure of 1913. In her presentation of the question, Mrs. Ward for the first time expressed her allegiance to a definite policy:

Destroy the ordered hierarchy of English land, and you will sweep away a growth of centuries which would not be where it is if it did not in the main answer to the needs and reflect the character of Englishmen. Reform and develop it if you will; bring in modern knowledge to work upon it; change, expand, without breaking it; appeal to the sense of property, while enormously diffusing property; help the peasant without slaying the landlord; in other words, put aside rash, meddlesome revolution, and set yourselves to build on the ancient foundations of our country what may yet serve the new time! Then you will have an English, a national policy. It happens to be the Tory policy.²⁶

It is plain that Mrs. Ward had more confidence in the gradual change within the rights of property than in the revolutionary changes that threatened the very basis of traditional landlordism. Her policy of reform was not a plan to disintegrate but to regenerate the landlord privileges. This regeneration she believed

²⁶ The Coryston Family, p. 5.

could be brought about through education of the ruling class in matters of social humanitarianism.

In the characters of Lady Coryston and Lord Newbury Mrs. Ward portrays typical adherents to a Tory fanaticism. Lady Coryston, a woman of indomitable will, stood for the Tory principles with the pride of her race. She championed the rights of her class, the privileged few, the hierarchy of the land, the Church, and the Crown. Her Tory allegiance was strengthened by her determination to hold the rights and privileges of inheritance against the invading forces of a growing democracy. She felt that her duty in the ranks of opposition to a rapidly developing modernism was to fight no less than men, and she vowed to do all in her power as a voteless woman to crush out the revolution that threatened her class. She did not flinch from using whatever power she had to coerce those who dared oppose her, and when Lord Coryston, her eldest son, declared himself a socialist, she disinherited him.

Lord Coryston was a rebel. He hated all forms of tyranny and intolerance.

He was one of those mercurial men who exist in order to keep the human tide in movement. Their opinions matter principally because without them the opinions of other men would not exist. Their function is to provoke. And from the time he was a babe

in the nursery, Coryston had fulfilled it to perfection.²⁷

He had become a socialist while at Cambridge and was a supporter of the Liberal party. He denounced property, favored taxing the landlords into a state of bankruptcy, and opposed the authority of the Church and the aristocracy. He had the will and determination of his mother, and upon learning of his disinheritance he determined to settle near her and to fight her principles. He was determined to subject her to the same scrutiny and attack that he used against others whose principles and practices he despised. He took his stand against Lady Coryston and stirred up all the smoldering discontent on the estate of Lady Coryston. He tried to form a union among the laborers; he championed the dissenters against the Church school on the estate; he made inquiries into the state of the cottages; and he supported the Glenwilliam Land League. Of course he incurred the ill will of the landlords, but he also aroused the suspicion of those he sought to help. They thought his opposition to his mother unnatural and doubted his sincerity. He spared no one, and his intolerance of those whose ideas he opposed was, in itself, a tyranny. Lady

²⁷ The Coryston Family, p. 29.

Coryston bore her son's cynicism stoically and with no signs of giving in. His brothers and sister looked on with disgust, but their absorption in their own affairs left them little time to ponder over the breach between Lady Coryston and Corry.

Marcia had become engaged to Edward Newbury, only son of Lord Newbury. Edward Newbury, like his father, was a mystic who had absorbed all the characteristics of the High Anglican tradition:

He was a joyous, confident, devoted son of the English Church; a man governed by the most definite and rigid beliefs, held with a pure intensity of feeling, and impervious to any sort of Modernism.²⁸

He was a good companion, a handsome fellow, and a man of the world, but hidden beneath his outward appearance of geniality and generosity was a note of the inexorable which in time might arouse the hatred of Marcia.

At bottom she is a pagan, with the splendid pagan virtues, of honor, fairness, loyalty, pity, but incapable by temperament of those particular emotions on which the life at Hodden Grey is based.²⁹

They had yielded themselves to love without thought of the differences in their natures, but Marcia began to recognize in him characteristics which would eventually

²⁸ The Coryston Family, p. 110.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 154.

drive her to rebellion. The crisis in their affairs was reached through the affairs of John Betts and his wife, tenants of Newbury's, who, because of their marriage in opposition to Newbury's religious creed which forbade the marriage of divorced people, were dismissed from the estate. Marcia, moved by pity for the Bettses, tried to persuade Newbury to permit them to stay on the experiment farm to which Betts had devoted his life. Newbury was implacable; and when Marcia heard of the double suicide of John and Mrs. Betts, she broke her engagement to Newbury. Lord Coryston aroused the ill will of the neighborhood against the Newburys, and used the Betts case as a firebrand against his mother's principles.

Lady Coryston, defeated by Coryston's refusal to carry out her Tory principles, turned to Arthur, her youngest son, for support. He defeated her hopes by falling in love with Enid Glenwilliam, daughter of Lady Coryston's hated political enemy. She attempted to thwart Arthur's affairs, and he renounced his political career and accused her of meddling in his private affairs and domineering over her family. Lady Coryston died realizing that she had driven her children from her by her determination to dominate their lives and wills. "She had no doubts about her place and prerogative

in the world, no qualms about her rights to use them
 as she pleased."³⁰

After one has read The Coryston Family, one is inclined to believe that Mrs. Ward was less convinced of the rights that property conveyed. Her sympathies were always with the land-owning aristocracy, but she anticipated with regret their disintegration and defeat:

How much longer will this rich, leisurely, aristocratic class with all its still surviving power and privileges exist among us? It is something that obviously is in a process of transmutation and decay; though in a country like England the process will be a very slow one. Personally I greatly prefer this landlord stratum to the top stratum of the trading and manufacturing world. There are buried seeds in it, often of rare and splendid kinds, which any crisis brings to life - as in the Boer War; and the mere cult of family and inheritance implies, after all, something valuable in the world that has lately grown so poor in cult.³¹

Mrs. Ward's answer to her question is that the duration of the established order of society will be determined by the aristocracy. If they were to remain the stewards of England's greatness, they would have to be worthy of their task. Their authority no longer rested on their inherited title; the forces of democracy were

³⁰ The Coryston Family, p. 349.

³¹ Ibid., p. 157.

rising as a mighty tide ready to sweep away their tyrants and oppressors. The aristocracy dared not suppress and ignore the demands of the enfranchised populace. The aristocrats could maintain themselves only by an unselfish service for humanity - by an unselfish and sympathetic guidance of the revolutionary forces of the new world. The safety of the nobility no longer lay in the power of the Lady Corystons, who sought to stifle and suppress, but in the heart of those who sought to "spread the knowledge of the higher pleasures and of a true social power among the English working class".³²

Mrs. Ward's idealism is that of a bygone generation. She did not advocate Communism but an enlightened and humanized Toryism. She disliked raw, new things that had no ancestry, and she had little confidence in the power of democracy to weld the opposing forces of society into a harmonious whole. She rather looked to the perfection of the individual as the means for evolving an ideal social order. Like Ruskin, Mrs. Ward realized the effect of environment upon the individual, and she turned to social settlement work as a means for spreading culture among those who in their newly-won freedom

³² Trevelyan, The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward, p. 130.

threatened the destruction of the aristocracy which they neither understood nor appreciated. Like Kingsley, she recognized the obligations of the privileged few toward the unprivileged many; and she exhorted the stewards of England's freedom to humanize and christianize democracy. Like Carlyle, she exhorted the aristocracy to make itself an essential part of the social body and to utilize its vast powers of leadership. She believed in a social brotherhood and worked to attain it through the deepening and extension of social work. Mrs. Ward was a public-spirited woman of high intellectual attainments and deep, sympathetic passion for human justice. She was conversant with the vital social and political questions of her day. As a propagandist, she used her novels to force a "breach in the traditional ranks of the old political parties - a breach large enough to admit those revolutionizing political influences which in our own day have transformed the United Kingdom". Although her claim to a place of distinction in the realm of creative art is slight, no one can justly deny her a place of pre-eminence in the ranks of those who labored to obtain a higher, nobler social order wherein the individual

³³ Speare, The Political Novel, p. 267.

might live in a nobler relation to his fellowman. She was not a great novelist, but a good and noble woman, actuated by a broad, practical humanity.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A restatement of the objectives of this study and a review of the facts taken into consideration in arriving at these objectives seem warranted at this time. It will be recalled that the industrial revolution in England and the resulting economic upheavels took place at a time when the political economy of Adam Smith and the Manchester School had scarcely ever been challenged. The function of political government under this system is designated by the proverbial laissez-faire. Contradictory to the materialistic conceptions embodied in this theory of social and economic philosophy was the idealism of Carlyle. Equally pernicious, in Carlyle's opinion, was the related concept of political democracy. To him democracy was the enthronement of sham, the false definition of liberty, and the impediment to forces working for right and justice. He denounced democracy and socialism as expediencies and not remedies of the evils of competition. Carlyle's message was addressed to the hearts of men. It was a message of self-renunciation and self-sacrifice. He preached a doctrine of work - the performance of duty - as the first obligation of man to God. Carlyle believed the first duty

of man was to believe in God, and his second duty was to work for the fulfillment of God's plan. He had no faith in democracy but a mystic reverence for the individual. He held fast to the paternal theory of government based both on the rights of heredity and on the rights of talent. This right carried with it the obligation of unselfish and unremunerative leadership. Carlyle based his social-ethics on the perfection of the individual by calling him to forego selfish interests and personal aggrandizement in favor of social service to mankind. Carlyle's teaching inspired a movement for social righteousness which found expression in the Christian Social movement of the nineteenth century.

Inspired by the passionate idealism of Carlyle a group of socially minded Christian leaders set themselves in vigorous opposition to Enlightened Selfishness as a motivating principle of society. For the much vaunted laws of political economy and the sacrosanct competitive system of the disciples of Adam Smith they sought to establish the Golden Rule as the nexus between man and man in all relations. They exerted a strong influence toward directing the currents of unrest to a higher social order and toward keeping them identified with a distinctly Christian philosophy.

The term Christian Socialism is not to be confused with the Collectivism of Karl Marx or with the English Utopianism of Robert Owen. The movement was primarily religious, and proposed to vitalize Christianity by making it a livable creed essential in the development of human relations. It was moreover a protest against the formal theology of Newman and the High Church Party. It was an attempt to establish the authority of Christianity over trade and industry. The term socialism as applied to the teachings of the Christian Socialists included little or nothing of the program of the revolutionary socialist party, but expressed the ideal of just and affectionate relationship of masters and men. Maurice and Kingsley expressed the idealism of Carlyle. They recognized the importance of the individual in the scheme of progress, and laid stress upon the development of the human heart in obedience, justice, and compassion. They, too, favored and advocated paternal government and looked askance at the social democracy of the period as a corrective of the evils of social and economic injustice. They differed from Carlyle, however, in their attempt to establish a spirit of Christian brotherhood between the warring factions of society and to reconcile science and faith. These early Christian Socialists were actuated by a desire

to evolve a social order consistent with Christ's promised kingdom upon earth, and their purpose was to socialize Christianity; that is, to establish society upon the principles of Christian faith, with Christ as the acknowledged head. Like Carlyle, they did not advocate the removal of class distinctions, but of class rivalry. The Christian Socialists appealed to the Christian faith of men as the solution; whereas Carlyle appealed to the conscience and common humanity of men. Although their methods of procedure were different, the end and aim of Carlyle and the Christian Socialists was identical. They purposed to establish a right and just relationship between men. Carlyle proposed to do this through the leadership of a noble and conscientious aristocracy of talent; the Christian Socialists sought to accomplish it through a hierarchy of Christian leaders actuated by a spirit of Christian faith and humanitarianism. They adhered to the social ethics of Carlyle, but extended his policies to include a more definite program of social reform. They organized industry into associative and cooperative bodies based upon the principles of Christian brotherhood and actuated by the Golden Rule.

The last phase of Christian Socialism was more directly allied to Carlyle than to the early Christian

Socialists in that it was less concerned with humanizing Christianity than with the humanizing of men's relations. This group of public-spirited men and women, the chief exponents of which were Ruskin, Arnold Toynbee, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, did not assume the name Christian Socialists, but their policies definitely allied them with this group. Their work was cast in the decades between 1880 and 1920, and was somewhat influenced by the scientific sociological theories of Tolstoy and Morris. They were, however, in the main, advocates of the same principles and theories advanced by Carlyle and the early Christian Socialists. They, too, believed that progress toward a true social order was possible only through the moralization of the ruling class. They championed the regulation of society so as to maintain human life at a high level and to produce a wider, deeper, personal life of the individual. They, like their predecessors, Carlyle, Maurice, and Kingsley, did not advocate the leveling of class barriers. They did not sanction the democratic theory of economic equality nor the revolutionary theories of socialism, but they did sanction paternal government by the hereditary aristocracy who were obligated to render an enlightened and unselfish service. Like Carlyle, Ruskin, Toynbee, and Mrs. Ward considered the aristocracy the

public custodians of England's greatness. They enjoined them to use their power for human service as a public trust. By the right of their inheritance they were obligated to promote high moral and ethical relationship between the classes of society, and this they were to do by pursuit of a noble and unselfish service to mankind. This last phase of Christian Socialism was ethical rather than religious, but throughout the whole of the Christian Social movement there was a deep idealism of an inner righteousness, a glow of the spirit of modern Christianity which seeks expression in social service.

In this summary I have endeavored to trace out in a concise and condensed form the ethical principles comprising the Christian Social movement, which emanated from Carlyle and influenced to a great degree the literary contributions of Kingsley, Ruskin, Arnold Toynbee, and Mrs. Humphry Ward.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atlantic Monthly, Volume 77. Houghton Mifflin Company,
Boston and New York, 1896.

Bald, Marjorie A. Women Writers of the Nineteenth
Century. University Press, Cambridge, 1923.

Bosanquet, Helen. Social Work in London 1869 to 1912;
a History of the Charity Organization Society.
John Murray, London, 1914.

Brownwell, W. C. Victorian Prose Masters. Charles
Scribner's Sons, New York, 1925.

Carlyle, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Carlyle. Edin-
burgh Edition. 30 volumes. Charles Scribner's
Sons, New York, 1903. Vol. II.

Carlyle, Thomas. Past and Present. E. P. Dutton and
Company, New York.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Chartism". Critical and Miscellaneous
Essays. Centenary Edition. 5 volumes. Chapman and
Hall, London. Vol. IV.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Signs of the Times". Critical and
Miscellaneous Essays. Works. Edinburgh Edition.
30 volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York,
1903. Vol. II.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Life of John Sterling". Works.
Edinburgh Edition. 30 volumes. Charles Scribner's
Sons, New York, 1903. Vol. XI.

Cook, E. T. Studies in Ruskin. Monroe and Allen,
n.d.

Cross, Wilbur. Development of the English Novel. The
Macmillan Company, New York, 1919.

Dawson, W. J. Makers of English Fiction. T. H. Revell
Company, New York, 1905.

Dictionary of National Biography. 24 volumes. Smith,
Elder and Company, London, 1909.

- Durant, Will. Philosophy and the Social Problem. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1919.
- Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. Simon and Schuster. New York, 1927.
- Elton, Oliver. A Survey of English Literature. Macmillan and Company, New York, 1920.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. 24 volumes. Fourteenth Edition. The Encyclopedia Britannica Company, Ltd., London, 1929.
- Fields, Annie. Letters of Sarah Orne Jewett. Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1911.
- Goose, Sir E. W. Silhouettes. W. Heineman, Ltd., London, 1925.
- Gwyn, Stephen. Mrs. Humphry Ward. Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Harris, Frank. Contemporary Portraits. Vols. I, III, and IV. M. Kennerly, New York, 1915.
- Harrison, Frederick. Studies in Early Victorian Literature. Edward Arnold, London, 1901.
- Hobson, John Atkinson. John Ruskin, Social Reformer. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1898.
- Houston, Percy Hazen. Main Currents of English Literature. F. S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1926.
- James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. Longman's, Green and Company, New York, 1925.
- Kingsley, Charles: His Letters and Memories of His Life. Edited by His Wife. Scribner, Armstrong and Company, London, 1877.
- Kingsley, Charles. Yeast: A Problem. E. P. Dutton and Company, New York.
- Kingsley, Charles. Alton Locke: Tailor and Poet. E. P. Dutton and Company, New York.
- Larson, Laurence M. History of English and British Commonwealth. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1924.

- Lowell, James Russell. My Study Windows. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1899.
- Maurice, C. E. Life of Octavia Hill as Told in Her Letters. Macmillan and Company, London, 1913.
- Maurice, Frederick Denison. The Kingdom of Christ, or Hints on the Principles, Ordinances, and Constitution of the Catholic Church. 2 volumes. E. P. Dutton and Company, New York.
- Maurice, J. F. Life of F. D. Maurice; Chiefly Told in His Own Letters. 2 volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1884.
- Miller, George M. The Victorian Period. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1930.
- Moody, William Vaughn and Lovett, Robert Marys. A History of English Literature. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926.
- Moore, P. E. Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1908.
- Morley, John Viscount. Critical Miscellanies. Macmillan and Company, Ltd., London, 1923.
- Moulton, Charles Wells. The Library of Literary Criticism of English and American Authors. 7 volumes. Henry Malkan, Publisher, New York, 1910.
- Osgood, Charles Grosvenor. The Voice of England: A History of English Literature. Messrs. Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York and London, 1935.
- Phelps, William Lyon. The Advance of the English Novel. Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, 1923.
- Politics for the People. Published by J. W. Parker, London, 1848.
- Raven, C. E. Christian Socialism 1848-1854. Macmillan and Company, Ltd., London, 1920.
- Ruskin, John. Works. Edited by an Oxford Pupil. 12 volumes. John W. Lovell Company, New York, 1880.

- Saintsbury, George. A History of English Literature in the Nineteenth Century. Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.
- Schapiro, J. Salwyn. Modern and Contemporary European History. Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1918.
- Seligman, Edwin R. A. and Johnson, Alvin. Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 14 volumes. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934.
- Sharp, Evelyn. The London Child. John Lane the Bodley Head, Limited, London, 1927.
- Somervell, D. C. English Thought in the Nineteenth Century. Longman's, Green and Company, New York, 1929.
- Speare, Morris Edmund. The Political Novel, Its Development in England and America. Oxford University Press, New York, 1924.
- Stubbs, Charles William. Charles Kingsley and the Christian Social Movement. Blackie and Son, London, 1899.
- Thorndike, Ashley A. Literature in a Changing Age. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1920.
- Toynbee, Arnold. The Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England. Longman's, Green and Company. London, 1908.
- Traill, H. D. and Mann, J. S. Social England. 6 volumes. Cassell and Company, New York, 1904. Vols. V and VI.
- Trevelyan, Janet Penrose. The Life of Mrs. Humphry Ward. Constable and Company, London, 1923.
- Walker, Hugh. Literature of the Victorian Era. University Press, Cambridge, 1913.
- Waller, A. W. and Ward, A. W. The Cambridge History of English Literature. 15 volumes. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1907. Vols. XII, XIII, XIV.
- Walpole, Hugh. The English Novel. The University Press, Cambridge, 1925.

Ward, Mrs. Humphry. A Writer's Recollections. 2 volumes. Harper and Brothers Publishers, London, 1918.

Ward, Mrs. Humphry. Complete Works. Smith, Elder Edition. 20 volumes. Smith, Elder and Company, London. n.d.