1913

John Ruskin and his social message

Colpitts, Robert Alden

Boston University

http://hdl.handle.net/2144/17356

Boston University
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

JOHN RUSKIN AND HIS SOCIAL MESSAGE

Submitted by

Robert Alden Colpitts
(A. B., Colby, 1907)

In partial fulfillment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1913
Ruskin, John: Fors Clavigera (Read extended portions)
Ruskin, John: Modern Painters (Read extended portions)
Ruskin, John: Munera Pulveris Edition of 1891
Published by Chas. E. Merrill & Co.
Ruskin, John: Time and Tide Edition of 1891
Published by Chas. E. Merrill & Co.
Ruskin, John: Unto this Last Edition of 1866
Published by John Wiley & Son

Art and Life: A Ruskin Anthology, compiled by W. S. Kennedy. Published by J. B. Alden. (Read Part 11 pp181-322, on "Social Philosophy" and other portions suggested by topical index)

Benson, A. C. John Ruskin, a study in Personality. Edition of 1911 Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons


Meynell, Mrs. John Ruskin. Edition of 1900 Published by Dodd, Mead & Co.


All of the above books were read in full, save those where note indicates that but portions were read.
Table of Contents

Chapter 1
Ruskin's Early Life and the England of that Day.

Chapter II
Ruskin in Transition from Art Critic to Social Reformer.

Chapter III
Ruskin’s Ideal of Social Reconstruction.

Chapter IV
Ruskin’s Proposed Methods of Social Reconstruction.

Chapter V
Ruskin’s Attempts to put his Social Theories into Practise.

Chapter VI
Ruskin’s Message in the Light of Recent Social Legislation.
CHAPTER 1

RUSKIN'S EARLY LIFE AND THE ENGLAND OF THAT DAY.

The coming of the centenary of the birth of John Ruskin must inevitably produce a revival of interest both in his life and in his teachings. There are several good reasons for this. Ruskin was a prolific writer on a variety of subjects. He was an acknowledged master in the use of words, with a prose style at once elastic and firm; full of beauty, but full also of power; suited to express the refinements of a most delicate and discriminating taste, or to voice the Sinai-thunders of prophetic warning and exhortation. One cannot justly claim acquaintance with the best literature of the last century, and at the same time remain indifferent to the productions of this author. Merely as a master of prose style, he will increasingly invite the study of all who would be familiar with the best in English literature.

He must also receive generous attention from all lovers of the beautiful. For beauty he had a genuine passion and seemed happiest when he was spreading the contagion of its charm to other lives. He made glad boast that it was his chief business to help those who already had ears and eyes, really to use them for genuine seeing and hearing. Few men have so spiritualized beauty.
He endeavored to lift it from the level of the sensuous, and to make it minister to the highest faculties of the human soul. He was art-critic only to become a true art-prophet. For to him, art, in the last analysis, was to be judged altogether in the light of its constructive influence upon character. And seeing that he so enriched the literature of art, and with such radical teaching, he will increasingly invite the study of all real lovers of the aesthetic.

But in all probability more than to others, he will become the cynosure of all eyes to the social workers—to that rapidly increasing number of men and women who are dedicating their lives to the reconstruction of society, along such lines as will give greater promise and hope to its handicapped members.

Each century has some dominant characteristic, and may be roughly summarized in a single phrase. One is a century of discovery. Another is a century of invention. And yet another is a century of scientific progress. The present is preeminently the century of social unrest and attempted social reform. But though belief in the need of a readjustment which shall bring about some sort of social justice is with us of today almost a religion, it must not be overlooked that in Ruskin's day it was far otherwise. Then was there only a vague discontent, widespread certainly, but ill-defined and seemingly almost purposeless; not, as now, a world-wide and determined movement for social
reform. Ruskin was the John the Baptist going before to herald the coming of this change. For while Carlyle with biting satire had been a champion of the spiritual as against the gross materialism of his day, and while he had heaped contemptuous scorn upon the idle and inane rich, and had shown splendid sympathy with the toiling poor, yet he had not attempted any clear analysis of the natural relations between the material and the spiritual, nor of the reflex action of labor upon life. It was reserved for Ruskin to blaze this road "where highways never ran." He was philosopher in that he sought to fathom and interpret the social life of his day. He was prophet in that he put the problems which grew out of that social life, and likewise their solution, in an ethical setting. He sought to bring the entire social life, especially that portion which had industrial connections, into perfect articulation with moral and spiritual laws.

In this praiseworthy effort he was far ahead of his time. Quite naturally he suffered those keen censures and cruel misunderstandings which invariably come to any prophet of a new and better order. And their poignancy was not lessened by the fact that frequently these came from literary colleagues. His views of course were not free from grave exaggeration; such usually characterizes the work of any honest iconoclast. He doubtless frequently followed not only the impracticable, but the fatuous. Parts of his program were but the visions of a
of a dreamer, as he himself, after considerable experimentation, seems to have learned. Too often he failed to make a place in his equation for that not always thoroughly understood quantity which is called human nature—a quantity however that cannot be neglected simply because it is not understood. But after making all these deductions, and no effort should be made to minify them, there still abides true greatness with both the man and his message. Time is vindicating him as a social seer. The somewhat tardy, but now quite general, incorporation of his principles into the social legislation of Australasia, Europe, and America is one of the wonders of the last decade. The initial impulse which he gave to the whole social movement must in time be appreciated. No true history of social reform can be written which does not make honorable mention of his name.

That Ruskin should become such a loyal champion of England's poor, appears the more remarkable in the light of his inheritance and early environment. He was in large measure the child of generous opulence and culture. The father was a wealthy wine merchant, who in pursuit of his trade traveled extensively in England and on the Continent, being accompanied usually by both the mother and the son. The home, evidently well-governed, was the center of that refinement which comes from acquaintance with the best in religion, art, and literature. There was abundance of means to gratify every reasonable desire;
and the son lived such a sheltered life that he attained his manhood without having come in contact with the stern side of life. He was, therefore, wholly unfamiliar with the sharp and cruel struggles of the handicapped toilers who in mill and factory were carrying on the rapidly developing industrial life of the nation. Because of this lack of touch with the submerged people his efforts at social amelioration were often criticized as unreal and insincere. "At twenty," he wrote, "I had never seen death,---nor had I ever seen, far less conceived, the misery of unaided poverty!" He declares that his father's ideal for his son's future was that he "should enter at college into the best society, take all the prizes every year, and a double first to finish with; marry Lady Clara Vere de Vere; write poetry as good as Byron's, only pious; preach sermons as good as Basuet's, only Protestant; be made at forty, Bishop of Winchester, and at fifty, Primate of England." All of which compels a student to marvel how, out of such opulent inheritance and environment, and away from personal and parental ambitions, there should come such a flaming prophet and friend of England's poor.

Turning from this brief survey of some of the domestic forces which played upon and helped to mould the young reformer, it will be of benefit to study somewhat carefully the industrial and social life of that period. Indeed, this is necessary if one

1 Praeterita i 431  
2 Praeterita i 141
is at all to understand the real setting of his work.

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries saw England in transition from the mediaeval to the modern. That transition had several marked characteristics, one of the most pronounced being the new ideal of government. After the accession of Henry VII the sphere of government was constantly extended until it gave regulation to almost all economic interests. This was in accord with the spirit of the age which in political affairs expressed itself in a change from absolutism to constitutional government. Naturally this resulted in a strengthening of government and an enlargement of its functions. The law of 1571, passed to encourage the industry of making woolen caps, may be cited to illustrate this tendency. This law required that every person of six years old and over should wear on Sundays and holy days a woolen cap made in England. Thus the nation at that time was accepting to the full the policy of paternalism in government.

A reaction, however, was to be expected. Accompanying the great economic changes of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, known as the "Industrial Revolution", was a marked change in the ideals of government. There was a decided swinging back from the exaggerated paternalism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There appeared a very general conviction that men should be industrially free to do as they chose, so long as they do not flagrantly infringe upon the rights of others.
This view found expression in the writings of all the leading economists of the day—notably Smith, Mill, Malthus, and Ricardo. Thus Adam Smith writes in his "Wealth of Nations", "The patrimony of a poor man lies in the strength and dexterity of his hands; and to hinder him from employing this strength and dexterity in what manner he thinks proper, without injury to his neighbor, is a plain violation of this most sacred property. It is a manifest encroachment upon the just liberty both of the workman and of those who might be disposed to employ him." These economists endeavored to construct their teachings upon an impregnable scientific foundation. They not only asserted that it was unjust to interfere with men's natural liberties, but even attempted to show by an analysis of natural laws, that government interference was absolutely powerless to remedy the defects to which it addressed itself.

Thus the England of Ruskin's early manhood had entirely accepted the "laissez-faire" doctrine of non-interference. She had adopted the policy of complete individualism—of universal and unrestricted competition. Every man was to remain "unrestricted, undirected, unassisted, so that he might be in a position at any time to direct his labor, his ability, his capital, his enterprise, in any direction that might seem to him most desirable." Individualism and competition were given largest acceptance and practice.

But this economic theory, though universally applied, failed
to produce anything approximating ideal social conditions. There was, to be sure, a vast increase of wealth, and England came to industrial supremacy. But this supremacy was purchased with an appalling price. Masses of the people were reduced to almost hopeless misery. The few possessing resources of coin or intellect were able to adjust themselves to the new conditions; but the many who possessed scant resources, and who were accustomed to the fostering influences of the old paternalism, could not easily make adjustment to the new industrialism, and were too often reduced to a poverty almost indescribable. Women and children were brought under the yoke of bondage not yet wholly lifted. Hours of labor and conditions under which toil was carried on were regulated only by the selfish interests of employers. In the great industrial centers the condition of the poor workers became a festering wound for the healing of which there seemed to be no physician. "The mills were small, hot, damp, dusty and unhealthy.---The rapid growth of the manufacturing towns---made rents high, and consequently living in crowded rooms necessary. The factory towns---were filthy, crowded, and demoralizing, compared alike with their earlier and their present conditions." 1 This was the England of the early nineteenth century. She could make proud boast of industrial progress. But she had not yet begun to recognize the great laws by which a nation's industries react upon the life of the people. She did not appreciate that

1 Industrial and Social History of England pp 237, 238
the new industrialism was giving birth to many and mighty social problems. It was in the mid-sea of these problems that Muskin came to manhood. It was to an attempted solution of them that he dedicated the later years of his unselfish life.
Whosoever has followed Ruskin at a distance, rather than near at hand, has probably thought of him chiefly as a student and critic of art. That he was something of a master in this direction is of course true; but that this was his chiefest contribution to human welfare is by no means true. To art studies he gave his earlier years, and all of his work in that direction was animated by the most intense moral passion. But about 1860 there came a marked change in his mission and message. He became greatly interested in the conditions of life and work of England's poor, especially those who were engaged in industry. From that time to his death, his pen, his voice, and his wealth were devoted to their welfare.

In order to understand this transition and the causes which underlay it, a brief outlook upon those years devoted to art study and criticism is necessary. It has already been noted that his childhood was passed in an atmosphere of refinement such as would lead naturally to a life of culture. While yet young, he had ambitions to attain to prominence as a poet. Though these ambitions were to suffer disappointment, he early did some pretentious work in prose which attracted wide attention because of its genuine literary merit, and the wide study of art of which
it gave evidence; and also because of the daring art principles which it set forth. When he was twenty-four he published the first volume of "Modern Painters", and this was soon followed by four companion volumes, by the "Seven Lamps of Architecture" and by the "Stones of Venice."

The key to his interest in art work has been given by Mr. Ruskin himself. He was an intelligent and minute lover of nature. He declares that the beginning of his work depended primarily not upon his love of art, but upon his love of mountains and sea. The "patience in looking, and precision in feeling" which marked his early nature study, and the "absolute accuracy of diction" taught by his mother, are set forth as the great helps to his power of keen analysis and lucid expression.

The basic effort in all his studies is to emphasize the relations between true art and life--between art and character. He insisted that "realism", or the study of the facts of life, and "idealism", or the use of the imagination to beautify, are by no means contradictory. He taught that all art must tell the truth--must be based upon a patient and accurate study of its subject-matter in nature. He heaped generous praise upon Turner because he held that his canvasses were thus truthful far more than were those of the post-Raphaelite schools of Italy and England. That he built his combined "realism" and "idealism" upon a foundation of "moralism" his own words declare.
'The picture which has the nobler and more numerous ideas, however awkwardly expressed, is a greater and better picture than that which has the less noble and less numerous ideas, however beautifully expressed.'

1. "Perfect taste is the faculty of receiving the greatest possible pleasure from those material sources which are attractive to our moral nature in its purity and perfection.

2. "Ideas of beauty are the subjects of moral but not of intellectual perception."

It is thus clear that in all his art studies Ruskin had an intense moral passion. Behind canvasses and columns and arches and domes he sees humanity. And whatever fails to make contribution to human welfare is unworthy art. For while technique is of consequence, yet the supreme thing is the message to which technique gives expression. "All art which involves no reference to man is inferior or nugatory, and all art which involves misconceptions of man, or base thought of him, is in that degree false and base."

4. "In those books of mine their distinctive character is their bringing everything to a root in human passion or human hope. Every principle of painting which I have stated is traced to some vital or spiritual fact; and in my own works on architecture, the preference accorded finally to one school over another is founded on a comparison of their influence on the life of the workman."

But about 1850 Ruskin turned from the congenial field of
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aesthetics to that of social criticism. At first glance this seems a singular step. But viewed in the light of the motif of his art work, it was by no means illogical. Indeed it was inevitable. His deepest and most vital interest was always in human life and human character and in the forces operating upon and determining the nature of those. Profoundly interested himself in the beautiful in nature and art, he became greatly aroused over the apparent indifference which the great majority of the common people displayed toward these. This to him was an almost unpardonable fault. What explanation was to be had for it? At first he assumed that it was largely because their attention had been directed to poorer art, and they had been led to accept wrong art principles. These seemed possible of correction. So he zealously set about the enunciation of what to him were correct art principles, and the direction of the people to his own greatly admired Turner and his colleagues. But he soon discovered that these efforts failed utterly to provoke any general extension of interest.

What then was the difficulty? The real trouble lay deeper than any vindication of Turner or any particular school. It was of the people themselves. And yet, not wholly the fault of the people. Their failure to respond to the high and holy call of beauty was not so much because they lacked powers of appreciation, as because they were so over-burdened and bound by
the fetters of daily toil. Their lives were so brutalized and coarsened by long hours of unremitting labor, by the heartless conditions under which that labor was done, and by the hovel environment which their poverty compelled them to endure, that they were thus utterly unfitted to make any appreciative response to the challenge of the beautiful, either in nature or in art.

"It is not the love of fresco that we want; it is the love of God and His creatures; it is humility, and charity, and self-denial and fasting; it is a total change of character. You want neither walls, nor plaster, nor colors---it is Giotto and Ghirlandago and Angelico that you want, and that you will and must want until this disgusting nineteenth century has--I can't say breathed, but steamed its last:"

"For my own part I will put up with this state of things, passively, not an hour longer. I am not an unselfish person, nor an evangelical one; I have no particular pleasure in doing good; neither do I dislike doing it so much as to expect to be rewarded for it in another world. But I simply cannot paint, nor read, nor look at minerals, nor do anything else that I like,---because of the misery that I know of, and see signs of, where I know it not, which no imagination can interpret too bitterly."

Toward the end of 1857, he wrote to his friend, Charles Eliot Norton, at Cambridge, Mass., "It must be a grand thing to be in a country that one has good hope of, and which is improving;

1 Collingwood, "Life and work" Vol.1 p 126
2 "Fors", first letter
instead of as I am, in the position of the wicked men in one of
the old paraphrases my mother used to teach me.

"' Fixed in his house he leans; his house
And all its props decay;
He holds it fast, but while he holds,
The tottering frame gives way.'"

Then later in this letter, he somewhat softens the mournful out-
look, while he again adds, "Truly, however, it does look like a
sunset in the east today."

Three years later he wrote to the same friend, "When I
begin to think at all, I get into states of disgust and fury at
the way the mob is going on (meaning by mob chiefly the aris-
tocracy) that I choke and have to go to the British museum to
look at penguins till I get cool."

Thus Ruskin's changed mission and the logical steps by
which he came to it, become clear. He saw the masses denied that
soul elevation through the medium of reflection upon and love for
the beautiful, which he so greatly enjoyed and which he believed
was a God-given right to all. On the one hand were to be seen
all the woes of hopeless misery and poverty: on the other hand
multiplied luxuries and often vulgar ostentation. From these
his soul recoiled. He could not turn back. He must go forward
to the crossing of his Rubicon, to the dedication of his future
to the redress of social wrongs and the reconstruction of the whole
social order.
CHAPTER 111
RUSKIN'S IDEAL OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION.

Passionate social reformer though he was, and versatile critic of almost every feature of the existing social order, yet Ruskin never set forth a full, complete and systematic body of teachings, such as might naturally have been expected from him. He first gave expression to his social message in, "Unto This last," published in 1860. This was doubtless inspired by the strikes then prevalent among the laborers of England, and especially among those engaged in the building trades. The first three chapters were published by his friend Thackeray in the Cornhill magazine." These, however, provoked such a storm of ridicule, that Thackeray reluctantly wrote that only one more chapter would be printed. Not only were scorn and derision directed at the economic and social philosophy set forth, but Ruskin was advised to return immediately to his art-studies. And in many of the criticisms there lay evidently a none too-well concealed implication that he was utterly unfitted for the new task to which he was addressing himself.

But Ruskin had "put his hand to the plough" and would not turn back. He gave his message somewhat fuller elaboration in
"Time and Tide", published in 1867; in "Munera Pulveris", published in book form in 1872; and in "Fors Clavigera", an extended series of "Letters to the workmen and Laborers of Great Britain," appearing from 1871 to 1884. The fundamental motive of these was a desire to ameliorate the widely prevalent social misery. That he tenaciously held to the general outline of his first published message is apparent from his statement made in 1888, that he should be satisfied that all the rest of his books should be destroyed rather than his "Unto This Last."

A cursory glance at the orthodox political economy of that day as taught by Ricardo, M'Culloch and James Mill will reveal how revolutionary were the views which the new reformer advocated. In the first place he protested against the limitations which those writers imposed upon the subject. With them, political economy had to do only with industrial science—with raw material, with the labor employed thereon and with the completed product. And they offered vigorous opposition to the widening of its scope so as to include what they contemptuously termed the sentimental relations of industry. In a measure, they thus isolated that part of life devoted to the production of commodities, ignoring completely the relations between that portion, and the rest of the life of the individual engaged therein, as well as ignoring the influence of industry upon society. To them the ultimate was commodities rather than the influences which the production of
commodities exercised upon the lives of the producers.

Against this interpretation Ruskin hurled both ridicule and argument. He assailed it as inexcusably narrow, declaring that instead of being a true science of political economy, it was but a science of commercial wealth, since it dealt only with reality as "utilities embodied in material objects and possessing a money value." He grounded his system in life, making that the final goal toward which everything must move. "The real science of political economy, which has yet to be distinguished from the bastard science, as medicine from witchcraft and astronomy from astrology, is that which teaches nations to desire and labor for the things that lead to life; and which teaches them to scorn and destroy the things that lead to destruction." "This is the object of all true policy and true economy: 'utmost multitude of good men on every given space of ground'—imperatively always, good, sound, honest men, not a mob of white-faced thieves."

Any other treatment than this, he regarded as unscientific because it lacked unity, taking into account only a segment instead of the full circle of life. Into the mercantile and the industrial the whole range of social affections articulate. One's labor links itself necessarily with his total life. Attention must be given not only to the products of industry but also to the influences which the processes of production exert upon the people. The prosperity of a nation cannot be determined by the ledger columns which give
the total values of commodities produced. The final criterion is the quality of the mental and moral and physical life of her citizens. Does the labor of the people tend to make this life rich and strong? Humanity must not be considered in the light of a money-making machine alone. The social affections must ever be considered, for they "operate chemically" making complete change in one's whole character. To neglect these is to neglect one of the chief elements in the problem.

And just because Ruskin saw that the "social affections" were not being considered; because he saw on every hand men and women and little children being brutalized by the heartlessness of the industrial--because all about him was helpless misery and despair rather than happiness and contentment, his prophetic soul could not keep silent. He began and carried on his holy crusade with the battle-cry, "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."

Again, the old economic school of Mill and Ricardo put vast emphasis upon the value of competition in production and
distribution as a factor in determining both wages and prices. Each man was to be left free and undisturbed without any interference from the state. It was claimed by Adam Smith that the "invisible hand" of a man's own self-interest would inevitably guide him in the way that would be for his own and society's welfare.

Ruskin, on the other hand, regarded unrestricted competition as a poison in the industrial system, an unmixed evil. It was of benefit neither to the work nor to the workers. When the worker was so motivated, or rather so driven, he would lose all of that fine delight in his task which is ever an important factor. He would be aiming at quantity rather than excellence of product, and would not be moved by the inspiring thought that he was making vital contribution to the welfare of society, and therefore must do his best. All of which led Ruskin to declare that competition could be defended on neither moral nor utilitarian grounds. "Government and co-operation are in all things the Laws of Life; Anarchy and Competition the Laws of Death."1

Equally vigorous was his denunciation of competition as a means of determining wages. His opponents argued that the operation of the "natural" law of "supply and demand" would secure to the laborer a naturally just wage. Ruskin contended that "The abstract idea of just or due wages---is that they

1 Unto This Last p 102
will consist in a sum of money which will at any time procure for (the laborer) at least as much labor as he has given. And this equity---of payment is observe, wholly independent of any reference to the number of men who are willing to do the work."

"The natural and right system respecting all labor is that it should be paid at a fixed rate, but the good workman employed, and the bad workman unemployed. The false, unnatural and destructive system is when the bad workman is allowed to offer his work at half-price, and either take the place of the good, or force him by his competition to work for an inadequate sum."

"In practice, according to the laws of demand and supply, when two men are ready to do the work, and only one man wants to have it done, the two men underbid each other for it; and the one who gets it to do is underpaid. But when two men want the work done, and there is only one man ready to do it, the two men who want it done overbid each other, and the workman is overpaid."

The goal toward which Ruskin moved is thus clearly seen. He desired that the nation's life should be so ordered as to produce the supreme riches, which, to him, consisted in "the greatest number of noble and happy human beings"---the production of "souls of good quality". To this end he strove that industrial life should be so ordered that so far as possible all who toiled should possess a happy and contented mind, that

1 Unto This Last p
2 Unto This Last p 14
3 Unto This Last p 82
they should be able to prosecute their work under the most friendly conditions, have generous time from labor for cultural pursuits, and be paid wages adequate to enable them to procure from others such services as would make life to be worth while. This was the worthy goal toward which he set out. It is now in order to glance at some of the methods by which he hoped it might be reached.
First of all, Ruskin urged that far greater care should be given to the securing of the right sort of human material. Indeed to him this was fundamental. A Nation should give not less attention to the production of sound human beings, than it would give to the breeding of sound flocks and herds. The vital importance of this made him impatient with those who, because of prudishness, or stupidity, gave it no serious consideration. A virile and useful society cannot be developed from children who are ill-born. Transmission of hereditary disease must be prevented. Criminals must be denied the responsibilities and duties of parenthood. The race at its fountain head must be kept, so far as possible, unstained. Hence the authority of the state should be so exercised as to give to all marriages a wise supervision. "It is enough, I think, to say here that the beginning of all sanitary and moral laws is in the regulation of marriage, and that ugly and fatal as is every form and agency of licence, no licentiousness is so mortal as licentiousness in marriage.----Permission to marry should be the reward held in sight of its (a nation's) youth during the entire latter part of the course of their education; and it should be
granted as the attestation that the first portion of their lives has been rightly fulfilled. — The granting of it should be a public testimony to the fact that the youth or maid to whom it was given had lived — a modest and virtuous life, and had attained such skill in their proper handicraft, and in arts of household economy, as might give well-founded expectations of their being able honorably to maintain and teach their children.\footnote{Time and Tide pp 151 and 152}

But it is not enough that the state exercise reasonable precautionary measures, that only desirable children shall be born. It must assume the responsibility for providing each child with a free technical and liberal education. And though this does not necessitate the separation of the child from its home, it does sim, nevertheless, at a very definite and minute supervision of the child's life by the state. This education must purpose the harmonious development of all of the child's powers. It must seek the cultivation of body and mind and heart.

A somewhat different curriculum was advised for the schools of the city from that used in the schools of the country. After a secure foundation of general culture had been laid, there was to be built upon it a sound technical education, by which the child should be prepared for its life work. For one of Mr. Ruskin's favorite theories was that every child should be taught how to do some definite work. Furthermore, not only would this supervision of the child's education fit the child for a place in life, but if
properly exercised it would discover for what particular work the child was best adapted.

Just at this point is found one of those seeming inharmonies which has subjected Ruskin's teachings to the charge of being utterly inconsistent. But upon more careful investigation the inharmony is seen to be more apparent than real. Always he expressed the most utter contempt for the doctrine of equality. Thus in speaking of America he says, "The Americans as a nation set their trust in liberty and in equality, of which I detest the one and deny the possibility of the other." On occasion he seems to sanction a system of caste so firm as to make it almost impossible for a youth to pass from one stratum to another. He did not by any means regard all labor as equally honorable; indeed the more lowly kinds of toil he considered little better than a form of slavery, for both mind and body. Children of unskilled laborers were likely to be fitted only for unskilled labor, while on the other hand the children of the professional and ruling classes were naturally fitted to care for the professions and for administrative work. "I know—the unconquerable differences in the clay of human nature; and I know that in the outset, whatever system of education you adopted, a large number of children could be made nothing of."

If Ruskin had paused here he might well have been charged with inconsistency. For one could pertinently inquire why a

---

1 Time and Tide p 128
system of education should be devised to discover, and then cultivate, the natural aptitudes of a child, if those aptitudes were always predetermined by the work in which the child's parents were engaged. But Ruskin taught no such determinism as this, and any such representation of him is manifestly unfair.

"This enormous difference in bodily and mental capacity has been mainly brought about by difference in occupation, and by direct maltreatment; and in a few generations, if the poor were cared for, their marriages looked after, and sanitary law enforced, a beautiful type of face and form, and a high intelligence, would become all but universal."  

To get the coarse and uninviting work of the world done he suggests as a possible solution that Christian and altruistic people voluntarily undertake to do a certain portion thereof. Evidently, however, he feared such a display of true brotherhood would not be realized, for he adds that probably there would always exist a large class of the mentally feeble or inefficient who would be fitted only for drudgery. Besides this the punishment of crime could be arranged by assigning the worst criminals to the hardest and most dangerous sort of toil, and thus grading the work according to the nature of the offense committed.

Another feature strongly advocated by Ruskin was strict supervision of labor. This supervision sought to secure two important results. It aimed first at the welfare and happiness of

1 Time and Tide p 129
the laborer, and in order to secure these both the hours and the conditions of labor were to be carefully watched. The worker was not to be mechanized. The second objective of this supervision was the production of goods of such excellent quality that the producer would find delight in their manufacture, and the consumer in their use.

While at first Ruskin favored the state exercising this supervision alone, he later somewhat modified this teaching. This fact, however, should not be interpreted as any departure from his belief in the widest paternalism to which he always held. He advised the laborers in each particular field of industry to bind themselves together into "Laborers' Guilds or Unions." Through these organizations, oversight could be had of all phases of industrial life, but especially of the quality of the goods produced. Such organizations would not be intended to prevent those outside their membership from engaging in the same pursuits. Naturally, however, those laborers without would be deprived of certain advantages which the members would enjoy. And furthermore the consumer would be more likely to purchase goods produced under the careful supervision of the Guilds, inasmuch as this would almost inevitably guarantee a better quality of work.

As has been before suggested, Mr. Ruskin was a sincere believer in a natural aristocracy growing out of inheritance, aptitudes, and culture. To this aristocracy the work of the professions, of the fine arts and of government was to be committed.
Those engaged therein were to be supported by the state, in order that they might be freed from the chilling influences which an uncertain income would produce, and which would prevent the best and fullest work. This was but a reappearance of his teaching relative to the more humbler toilers. His persistent advocacy for them was that they might have a regular and sufficient wage to enable them to perform their daily work with contented and happy minds.

But while Ruskin advocated limitation of hours of labor, and the most favorable conditions of toil, he strenuously opposed all forms of idleness. And, to him, the idle rich were more of a menace than the idle poor. Shirkers, and confirmed idlers, were to be dealt with in the most heroic fashion. If one were unable to secure employment for himself, the state should see that some employment was provided. "Any man, or woman, or boy, or girl, out of employment, should be at once admitted at the nearest government school, and set to such work as it appeared on trial they were fit for, at a fixed rate of wages determinable year."\(^1\)

When the laborer, either through accident or sickness, or ill-health, has become incapacitated for further effort, he must not be permitted to suffer. The state owes him attention and support. This was universally recognized as a duty of the state to certain classes of its citizens, even to some who by virtue of superior education and large salary had been able to make provisions

\(^1\) Unto This Last Preface
for such emergencies. Why, Ruskin asks, is there any more disgrace in receiving aid from the parish than a pension from the central government? And he answers his own question by declaring that if there be any disgrace, it is with the latter class which has been the more able to care for itself.

"A laborer serves his country with a spade, just as a man in the middle ranks serves it with a sword, pen or lancet; if the service is less, and therefore the wages during health less, then the reward when health is broken, may be less, but not, therefore, less honorable; and it ought to be quite as natural and straightforward a matter for a laborer to take his pension from his parish--as for a man in higher rank to take his pension from his country."

Again, Ruskin advocated a sympathetic oversight of each individual and family such as would emphasize the idea of human brotherhood. As he looked about he saw multitudes of lives in which no one appeared to have the least interest, save those who wished to convert them into productive labor. The prevailing individualism, with its heartless competition, was utterly forgetful that man was a "social animal," craving friendship. To him, it seemed an infinitely worse condition than prevailed in the feudal era, for then, even the most lowly serf felt that he belonged to some one who had a personal interest in him and who, if need were, would give him protection; but the industrial era was permitting
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individuals and families to grow up in ignorance, to dwell in deepest poverty, and to drop into death, without society displaying any concern whatsoever. This, he declared, should have immediate correction. Some sort of ecclesiastical, or, better still, of state oversight should be exercised, which would show a friendly concern for the welfare of each individual and family. Thus would be given such helpful instruction and sympathy as would give inspiration to all, but especially to the very poor and the lonely.

Perhaps in nothing has Mr. Ruskin been more persistently and unfairly misrepresented than in his attitude toward machinery. It has been declared over and over again by prejudiced critics that he opposed the use of all machinery. Such statement is entirely false. He viewed machinery, as indeed he viewed everything, wholly in the light of its influence upon human life. But he held that the multiplication of machines had resulted, too largely, in the machanization of the laborer, which had been carried so far that it was robbing the laborer of the larger intellectual stimulus. Instead of one man doing all the various parts of work in the production of a commodity, as he had done under the old system, and consequently having a just pride in the finished product as his own handiwork, he now performed but one simple part of the work of production; or, even more truly, he but tended a machine while it did the work. This extreme division of labor
Ruskin held to be injurious to the welfare of the toilers, and declared that such limitations would have to be imposed upon the use of machinery as would correct this evil.

Such machinery as was actually needed, he believed could be largely driven by either wind or water. His chief opposition was to steam-driven machinery, because he believed the use of such machinery to be contrary to human welfare. Coal must be mined to make the steam. And coal mining with its manifold evils he considered to be unsuitable work for any human being. Then, too, the burning coal filled the atmosphere with smoke and dirt, begriming everything and constantly spreading its black cloud across the country's beauty; and to destroy the beauty of nature was for Ruskin to destroy one of the most nourishing foods for the human soul. He further based his opposition to steam-driven machinery on the ground that the great industrial centers which it developed made impossible, by their foul air, their cheap and ugly architecture, and their general squalor, a happy, a healthy, and a contented people.

And now as one makes hasty review of the message of this greatest social prophet of the last century, two words stand forth in clear outline. These words are, humanity, and justice. What is right? What is for the welfare of society? These are his twin questions. And with him, as with every true prophet, what is the one, is at the same time the other. Standing with him at the fur-
face of his own soul, heated seven times hotter than was wont as he looked out upon the awful wretchedness and misery of the submerged industrial classes, one can appreciate the genuine agony which he experienced. One can understand the burning words with which he strove to stir England to a new industrial and social life. "The end and the moth have cells for each of their young, but our little ones lie in festering heaps, in homes that consume them like graves; and night by night from the corners of our streets, rises up the cry of the homeless, "I was a stranger and ye took me not in."1

"How far is it lawful to suck a portion of the soul out of a great many persons in order to---make one very beautiful soul? We live, we gentlemen, on delicatest prey, after the manner of weasles; that is to say, we keep a certain number of clowns digging and ditching---in order that we being fed gratis, may have all the thinking and feeling to ourselves."2

"The guilty thieves of Europe, the real sources of all deadly war in it, are the Capitalists—that is to say, people who live by percentages on the labor of others; instead of by fair wages for their own."3

"For my own part I will put up with this state of things—not an hour longer.---I simply cannot paint, nor read, nor look at minerals, nor do anything else that I like---because of the misery that I know of, and see signs of where I know it not,
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which no imagination can interpret too bitterly."

The passion which these burning words reveal makes it clear that Ruskin could say, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel of social amelioration."
CHAPTER V

RUSKIN'S ATTEMPTS TO PUT HIS SOCIAL THEORIES INTO PRACTICE.

One's life is the final test of one's teaching. How nearly does conduct conform to message, is a fundamental question. Under this query Ruskin's work by no means breaks down. It is hard to say whether one's surprise is greater at the daring and iconoclastic message which he uttered, or at his courageous and generous attempts to square his conduct by that message. He gave unstintedly of his time, by free lectures before working men, to carry forward the campaign of education which he had advocated. He founded institutions which he believed would greatly elevate the toiling masses, giving most generously to their support. He gave bountifully to indigent relatives and acquaintances. Worthy calls even for strangers were not allowed to pass unheeded. He inherited a fortune of nearly one million dollars, and had a considerable income from his prolific pen, yet at his death he left little save his charming home at Coniston.

As has been noted before, Ruskin utterly disbelieved in determining wages by competition. He held that wages should be not the least sum for which the particular service could be procured, but rather a sum sufficient to enable the worker to live in contentment, and to procure from others such services as would make life worth while. As proof of his sincerity, he never inquired as to the wages offered in the open market, but paid what he thought was just, considering the ser-
vant's interests, as well as those of himself. "I pay my servants exactly what wages I think necessary to make them comfortable. The sum is not determined at all by competition; but sometimes by my notions of their comfort and deserving, and sometimes by theirs."

Then he was making purchases, especially of things of large value, he did not pay what the article would bring in the open market, but rather what he conceived it to be worth, taking into consideration the amount and quality of labor devoted to its production. Thus frequently when he had opportunity to purchase a work of art or a collection of minerals for but a fraction of their actual worth, he either paid a larger price or refused to buy, because though able to pay the smaller price asked, he was unable to pay the larger price which he considered just and fair.

It is of special interest also to observe with what care Mr. Ruskin sought to apply his own teachings to the printing, the distribution and the sale of his books. That these might be conformed to his wishes, he kept, so far as possible, their entire control within his own hands. Only material of good quality entered into the books. When possible, hand-made paper was used. He insisted that the mechanical work should be well done. All the processes were carried on with an eye to the physical, mental and moral well-being of the workers. Middle-
men were allowed neither commissions nor profits. Indeed the whole system of middlemen's profits, and unknown commissions, were to him an abomination. The purchaser of one volume could buy as cheaply as could a bookseller, though he bought many volumes. This scheme of publishing and distributing was modified in later years. It was a most desirable change, since it brought a reduction of prices, and consequently a far wider reading of his message.

But the chief social experiment in which Mr. Ruskin engaged, was the St. George's Company or Guild. The early part of "Fors" tells of his passionate desire to find some practical ways of relieving the distress and misery which were all about. Later letters give details of the scheme which he was maturing.

Mention has already been made of his ardent dislike of the then rapidly multiplying industrial centers, and of his belief that such concentration exerted an unwholesome influence upon the life of the people. He was pained to see many persons turning from country life, and agricultural pursuits, to these congested cities. Agriculture he considered as the true basis for a strong, self-supporting, national life. How could the people be taught this truth, and the drift to the industrial centers be halted?

The St. George's Company was to be the reply. A tract of land was to be purchased. Cultivation was to be carried on by
hand labor so far as possible, and when the use of machinery was unavoidable, it was to be water-driven. The laborers were to have the most favorable conditions of employment, and the children were to receive a general and technical education.

As the scheme developed, plans were made to reclaim barren land. Homes were to be built by the tenants for themselves. All produce of the land, save a tithe which should go to the Guild, was to come to the tenants. An artisan class was to be added later, that the society might be able to maintain itself. Indeed St. George's was to be the actual ideal Commonwealth. A reading of some of the articles which "Companions of the Guild" were expected to sign, will reveal something of the burning passion for social righteousness and human uplift that inspired the endeavors of Ruskin.

"Article 1. I trust in the living God, Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things and creatures, visible and invisible,—And I will strive to love Him, and keep His law, and see His work while I live."

"Article II. I trust in the nobleness of human nature, in the majesty of its faculties, the fullness 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."

"Article IV. I will not deceive, or cause to be deceived, any human being for my gain or pleasure; not 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."

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

But evidently the enthusiasm of Mr. Ruskin for the scheme was not shared by many others. His own contribution was swift and generous—about $50,000. A year later he declared that "Not a human creature, except a personal friend or two, for mere love of me, has answered."

At the end of three years, during which he had received about $600, he wrote, "Had I been a swindler the British public would delightfully have given me two hundred thousand pounds instead of two hundred, of which I might have returned them, by this time, say, the quarter in dividends; spent a hundred and fifty thousand pleasantly, myself, at the rate of fifty thousand a year, and announced, in this month's report, with regret, the failure of my project, owing to the unprecedented state of commercial affairs induced by strikes, unions, and other illegitimate combinations among the workmen."

At the end of four years he had received about $1850 contributed by twenty-four persons. This necessitated delay in launching the project. He was too wise to make a premature beginning and thus endanger the capital. In 1875 a gift of
three acres of rocky land with eight dilapidated cottages was received. In 1877 a small farm of fourteen acres near Sheffield was purchased. During the same year twenty acres of woodland were contributed and later other small portions of land were added. But the experiment was by no means the success which Mr. Ruskin had hoped. It must be noted, however, that this partial failure in no wise disproved the truth of any of his cardinal principles. It proved only that no one was willing to help him test the validity of those principles.

The St. George's Society, however, was not founded in vain. It was parent of the Ruskin Museum at Sheffield which is an unique memorial to this greatest social prophet of the last century. Here, according to the wish of its founder, are gathered the very best things of nature speaking to human life; and also the products of the finest human skill, challenging man to do his noblest and his best. About the walls are placed some of the choicest selections from his writings. And so closely have his wishes been complied with, in the selection and arrangement of materials, that his very spirit seems to dwell therein.

One other experiment, to which Ruskin gave both heart and purse, may be mentioned here. He advocated that workers should learn to do skilled work by hand, not only because of the better quality of goods produced in that way, but also because such work greatly stimulated and broadened the intelligence of the workers.
The rapid introduction of machinery was bringing decay to all hand-industries. Especially was this true of weaving and spinning. Mr. Ruskin became greatly interested in the struggle which the hand-workers in this industry, in the Isle of Man, were making in their competition with steam-driven machinery. At Laxey he had a water-mill erected. He encouraged the farmers to do much of their weaving and knitting at home; and he urged all to do their work so honorably and faithfully that their product would be of the very best quality.

Hot, even to scorching, sometimes, were the words he uttered. This, he felt, was no time for temperate suggestion or mild remonstrance. When he looked about him, and saw the needless and increasing suffering of the poor, his heart burned with righteous wrath, and his prophetic soul was aflame with its message of indignant protest. Time is vindicating both message and messenger. His words have found a mark, and that not alone among the ignorant and the oppressed, but also among those of wealth and education. Slowly, at first, but nevertheless surely, Mr. Ruskin's ideas were rooting in good ground. "Less a builder than a sower" he may have been. But the sowing was necessary, and his age has been the seed-time for many reforms of which our own age will see the harvest home. Greater interest by the employer in the general welfare of his workers begins to be manifest. Profit-sharing is practiced here and there. And earlier than the most sanguine disciple of Ruskin had dared to hope, England's Parliament
has enacted practically every important feature of his philosophy into a comprehensive program of social legislation. To the study of that legislation the next chapter will be devoted.
CHAPTER VI
RUSKIN'S MESSAGE IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT SOCIAL LEGISLATION.

John Ruskin died in January, 1900. Doubtless, like many other reformers, he considered that he had signally failed in the work which he had endeavored to do. Rarely, however, has the work of a prophet so speedily borne fruit. Within a dozen years of his death the England, which in moments of despair he had regarded as almost hopelessly and heartlessly indifferent to her poor and unfortunate classes, was directing the major part of her legislative activities to the uplift of these classes. Intrenched privilege, which so long had remained unmolested that it had become arrogant and impudent, was being called to give an account of its stewardship. The government itself was undergoing such modifications as would make possible the admission thereto of the poor man; and a scheme of social legislation more radical and comprehensive than that of any other nation of the world—far more so than that of the young America in which Ruskin professed in his somewhat gloomy letters to Mr. Norton to have such hope—was being enacted.

It would be just, neither to Mr. Ruskin, nor to his successors, to make the claim that, wholly, or even chiefly, he was responsible for this forward movement. Anything like an adequate survey of the
field must make an accounting of the influences of Maurice, Kingsley, Westcott, Clifford Hughes, Campbell, and others from the ranks of the clergy; and of Lord Shaftesbury, George Bernard Shaw, G. H. Wells, Sidney Webb, and Annie Besant, from among the laity. These, according to their ability, have served, doubtless, with the very fullest devotion. But unquestionably, the beginning of this social upheaval was with Ruskin and Carlyle. Emanating from such a dignified source—from one of wealth and education—Ruskin's message naturally received from the cultured classes a very wide reading. Thus the "germs of wholesome ferment" began their working in the upper as well as the lower strata of society. The real signification to the whole social movement, of thus having its cry voiced by a prophet of such commanding position and ability, has by no means been fully appreciated.

In carrying forward the agitation begun by Mr. Ruskin and his contemporaries, the Fabian Society has rendered conspicuous service. This society was founded in 1884. It has remained non-political, not allying itself with any particular party. Yet it has largely inspired the "Independent Labor" movement in politics. Lectures and tracts are its favorite methods of propaganda. Unquestionably it has been the inspirer of most of those now prominent in English social reform movements.

The recent social legislation by the British parliament will be the better understood if seen in the light of the political changes
which made this legislation possible. In 1906 the Tory Government, which largely had stood for the old regime, was decisively defeated. Such remarkable "Labor" strength was shown in the struggle that the Liberal party coming to power fused with the moderate socialists. Previous to that time the members of parliament, save the cabinet ministers, received no pay. This had made practically impossible the election of any who were not financially independent. However, trades unions, by collections among their members, assured the support of those not independent who might be elected. Randolph Churchill, who had served in the Boer war, was made Chancellor of the Exchequer. He presented a budget which greatly displeased the "Lords", as it aimed at the overthrow of certain special privileges concerning which that body was particularly sensitive. The budget was rejected, but to their own hurt, for the ensuing election returned the liberals, pledged to greatly reduce the powers and prerogatives of the Lords, which pledge was faithfully kept. A bill was introduced providing a living salary for all members of parliament. To provide for this increased expenditure, the income tax was readjusted as was the tariff on tea, tobacco, wines, and other luxuries. In 1908, Lloyd George, a genuine radical, was made chancellor. He received conspicuous help from John Burns, the great labor leader, who had risen from a common dock laborer to a seat in the cabinet—an unparalleled thing in English history. Together they worked out the extraordinary social legislation which was passed in 1911.
Having thus hastily observed this reform movement from the political side of its development, it is now in order to study some of the more prominent features of its program of legislation.

Before 1850, England had endeavored by legislation to impose some restrictions upon the hours and the conditions of labor in her mines and factories. The decades between 1850 and 1870 saw a steady enlargement of the scope of these laws. However, public opinion had not yet come to the support of any very radical position. In 1873, the "Factory and Workshop Consolidation Act" was passed which substituted for all former laws a comprehensive code for the regulation of all industrial establishments. This code gave increased attention to the welfare of all toilers; but especially to the welfare of women and children. Subsequent acts were passed in the interest of labor, until Great Britain probably now has a more elaborate code of factory laws than any nation of the world.

In 1897, the "Workmen's Compensation Act" was passed. This act provided "that in case of accident to a workman causing death, or incapacitating him for a period of more than two weeks, compensation in proportion to the wages he formerly earned should be paid by the employer as a matter of course, unless 'serious and wilful misconduct' on the part of the workman could be shown to have existed." This act was somewhat changed in 1906, but the change was in the interests of the laborer, awarding compensation for all injuries.

In 1908, a "Children's Act" was passed providing for an
effective official supervision of all institutions wherein children were confined. It aimed chiefly to prevent cruelty. Provisions were made for a juvenile court, and for regulating the sale of tobacco to children, while any child under fourteen was prohibited from entering a saloon.

The most radical and far-reaching social legislation, however, was that passed December 6, 1911, known as "Lloyd George's Insurance Bill." This so fully incorporated some of the tenets of Ruskin's social creed, that, had he been alive, he might well have been suspected of being its real author. It consisted of three parts, the first of which was a scheme of compulsory insurance against sickness and break-down. About fourteen millions people come within its scope. It affects all who have received less than eight hundred dollars per year.

The second part of the bill consisted of a scheme of compulsory insurance against unemployment, and affects about two and one-half millions. Here, as with the insurance against sickness, the funds are to be provided by contributions from the employer, from the individual, and from the state.

The third part of the bill set aside seven and one-half millions dollars with which to wage war against tuberculosis, one of the chief enemies of the laboring population.

That the wave of social reform will here be stayed is impossible. Agitation will go on. Other evils will be corrected. The profound interest being taken in the infant science of
cugenics is hing that civilization is awakening to the vital import of Ruskin's message about the pre-natal as well as the post-natal education of children. The rapidly growing protest against the disfiguring of natural scenery by either the thriftless owner or the vulgar advertiser, is indication that Ruskin's words about beauty as a minister to human life have not altogether lost. And the almost universal interest in the twin problems of the living wage, and the proper housing of the poor, is proof that his pleadings have not wholly fallen upon heavy ears.