Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris: Work Across the 'River of Fire'

Rob Knowles*

> for between us and that which is to be, if art is not to perish utterly, there is something alive and devouring; something as it were a river of fire that will put all that tries to swim across to a hard proof indeed... (cited in Thompson 1977, 244).

This imagery is from William Morris (1834-1896) writer, poet, artist, artisan, and socialist calling for courage in confronting the daunting work of transforming industrial capitalist society to a better socialist future; a transformation from 'old art' to 'new art'. The reference to 'art' here is a reflection of Morris's developed view of art as a holistic manifestation of the condition of human society and of its deep connection with 'work' or labour (Morris [1884] 1969, 94-5). The intransigent and deeply embedded barrier which Morris saw before him in his mission to contribute to transforming society was the Political Economy of his time.[1] It was a similarly daunting 'river of fire' which had earlier confronted the prophetic 'man of letters', historian and social critic Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) and the equally prophetic and incisive social critic and art critic John Ruskin (1819-1900).

Although the view of a politics of transformation or reform and the politics of a future society was distinctly different between these men, it was not nearly as different as many superficial readings of their work has suggested (Williams [1958] 1983, 146-9; Rosenberg 1974, chapter IX). And while their comparative politics is a subject which begs for a new history, it cannot be explored here. Further, the far-reaching breadth and interconnection of ethical, economic and political thought which each of these men enunciated makes it impossible here even to summarise, let alone analyse, their 'constructive work' in total. For each of them, however, the concept of 'work' was central to their prescriptions for a future society and their writings on 'work' or 'labour' (these expressions were used interchangeably by these writers) was perhaps the most resilient and overt positive intellectual relationship between them.

The purpose of this essay is to demonstrate, through focusing on the concept of 'work' as a central factor in economic thought and in social reality, that Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris profoundly shared a view of the future of work.[2] Connecting these three politically disparate thinkers through their understandings of work is unique within histories of economic thought. It also seems that mention of their shared ideas with respect to work has not appeared in any economic writings since the social reformer J.A. Hobson linked 'Emerson, Carlyle, Zola, Ibsen, William Morris, and Tolstoy' as of common mind with Ruskin regarding his 'gospel of good work' (Hobson 1904, 305).[3] Most often the ideas of Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris are considered separately from each other or they are grouped in pairs in writings on economic thought, if they are mentioned at all. It is common to find Carlyle associated with Ruskin, or Ruskin associated with Morris, but all three men are never linked with respect to their constructive economic ideas in histories of economic thought.[4]

The three writers are however often linked in literary or aesthetic discourses, and typically they are grouped within a 'tradition' of ideas or a literary genre. Discussion of their economic ideas often appears in a general way within such discourses but this has clouded the way their economic thought has been perceived. It will therefore be necessary in this essay first to cut a path through the literary, aesthetic, and political rhetoric which has surrounded their ideas since much of their work was written. Only then will it be possible to see more clearly the economic ideas of the actual persons who stood on the banks of the 'river of fire' and how they stood in relation to each other.

The critiques expounded by Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris of the economic dimensions of the society which they confronted will not be dwelt upon here because they are relatively well known or at least readily accessible (see, e.g. Carlyle 1949; Carlyle 1972; Ruskin 1905c; Zabel 1993). Each of these men was a forceful critic of the capitalist and industrialising society he saw and experienced, but they each individually held, and to some extent also shared, positive visions of the way life could be.[5] To see Carlyle or Ruskin or Morris as a mere critic of society is to understand only part, and perhaps only a minor part, of the whole man and his thought.

It is as much an historian's perspective as that of an economist which will be evidenced in this essay.[6] The questions each of these men were asking and seeking to answer with respect to 'work' were different to those which were asked by most economists of their time. As is abundantly evident in their critiques of contemporary society, neither Carlyle nor Ruskin nor Morris had a commitment to the orthodox economic theory of their respective days (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 176-181; Ruskin 1905c, Essay 1; Morris, 'Art, Wealth, and Riches', in Zabel 1993, 74-6). The 'methodological' base from which they each launched their ideas was not that of economics as a science but that of political economy as not only social inquiry but an economic and indeed ethical prescription for future society. It follows that, as Fain noted with respect to the ideas of Ruskin,

> in treating Ruskin as a political economist it is inadvisable to exclude on scientific grounds subject matter which Ruskin includes in his political economy. Even if such exclusions were based on present-day opinions on the scope of economic science, one should still have to choose from among a dozen species of economists, each with different ideas on scope (Fain 1956, 14).

Fain's astute advice half a century ago was applicable to Carlyle and Morris no less than to Ruskin and it should be equally heeded with respect to the political economy of each of these men today.[7] Specifically, work, or labour, was not treated as a commodity by any one of them. This was obviously a fundamental problematic for any economic theory which insisted on treating labour as a commodity which is subject to the laws of supply and demand. In order to understand the concept of work for Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris, that 'mechanical' interpretative framework would have to be cast aside (see e.g. Anthony 1983, 159-160).

A Path Through the Rhetoric

Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris are usually seen to be part of a British radical tradition of thought which has been variously called 'the Romantic tradition' in contradistinction to a 'Marxist tradition' (Stanley Pierson, cited in Thompson 1977,

774); 'the Romantic critique of Utilitarianism' (Thompson 1977, 769); the 'romantic critique of industrialism' (Williams [1958] 1983, xi); or 'realized romance', which is described as 'a particular tradition with roots in the work of Thomas Carlyle and branches in that of William Morris' (Spear 1984, xii,7). The difficulty with most of these labels is the overarching implication of a nostalgia, a dreaming, a 'romance', or a 'utopian' outlook which does not uncritically or unconditionally manifest in the work of each of these thinkers. Further, an accusation of suffering from the blight of 'nostalgic medievalism' has been applied in one respect or another to the works of Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris (Thompson 1977, 234, 239; Chandler 1971, esp. chapter 6). It is indeed apparent that each of these men looked back to pre-industrial society for insights into the way they could perceive the future, but it certainly does not necessarily follow that their ideas for the future were simplistically nostalgic, neither does the expression 'medievalism' carry meaning on its own.[8]

Morris especially has often been labelled a 'utopian' thinker primarily because of the vision of a future society which he set out in his 'utopian' novel *News from Nowhere*, which he perhaps unfortunately sub-titled a 'utopian romance' (see e.g. Meier 1978, xi, 275). Substantial difficulties arise when Morris's prose work is viewed as part of a literary genre of 'utopian' writings and at the same time as part of his politics. The fantasy is too seriously treated as a representation of reality by those who attempt to understand his thought.[9] The importance of writings by Morris beyond his fictional work was noted by Raymond Williams in his important work *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. Williams stated that

> For my own part, I would willingly lose *The Dream of John Ball* and the romantic socialist songs and even *News from Nowhere*...if to do so were the price of retaining and getting people to read such smaller things as *How We Live*, *and How We might Live*, *The Aims of Art*, *Useful Work versus Useful Toil*, and *A Factory as it might be*. The change of emphasis would involve a change in Morris's status as a writer, but such a change is critically inevitable. There is more life in the lectures, where one feels that the whole man is engaged in the writing, than in any of the prose and verse romances. (Williams [1958] 1983, 155)

Further, the self-effacing revised opinion of Morris as Marxist and the associated literature review which E.P. Thompson undertook in the 'Postscript: 1976' to his biography *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary* highlights the problems associated with the label 'utopian', most definitely in a Marxist context, but also more generally (Thompson 1977, 792, 797). Thompson, after acknowledging that he among many others had been unreasonably dismissive of 'Utopianism' as a consequence of 'a fright given to us by Engels in 1880', concluded that in order to 'define Morris's position as a Socialist it has proved necessary to submit Marxism itself to self-criticism: and in particular to call in question the scientific/utopian antinomy'. Thompson had initially argued hard for Marxism's claim to Morris but almost in exasperation he admitted with hindsight in 1976 that 'Morris, by 1955, had claimed me' (Thompson 1977, 792, 797, 810).[10]

When notions of 'romance' or 'utopian' thought are mixed with social criticism, the crucible can hold strange brews. Paul Meier has, for example, referred to Morris as 'The Marxist Dreamer' (Meier 1978), a label which explicitly locates the politics of Morris as Marxist then paradoxically, given the rejection of 'Utopian' ideas by classical 'scientific' Marxism, tags his thought with a character

of unreality. As another example, Jeffrey Spear has cited a definition of 'romance' as expressing a 'nostalgia for a social order in the process of being undermined or destroyed by nascent capitalism...' which according to Spear 'goes to the heart of Carlyle's and Ruskin's efforts to "realize" a social romance' (Spear 1984, 203). The concept of a 'social romance' is inherently problematic outside of literary discourse.

Marilyn Butler, as an outcome of her analysis which 'seriously questions the very existence of a "romantic movement" other than as an intellectual artefact"' has concluded that '"Romanticism" is inchoate...' (cited in Anthony 1983, 199). One has only to read through Raymond Williams's discussions of 'Romanticism', the possibility of 'pseudo-categories', and the idea of 'romanticism' as 'spilt religion' to understand how the mixing of literary categories of analysis and social ideas can be confusing or distorting (Williams [1958] 1983, chapter 11, 190-5; Williams 1988, 274-6). The mixture contributes very little, if anything, to a discussion of the economic ideas of actual people in actual and specific social circumstances.

The claim for William Morris as a Marxist requires attention here. It has been noted by Anthony that until recently 'Morris was often regarded as a good designer whose political theory was, to put it at its kindest, unsound. Now Morris is regarded as unique among British critics of capitalism' (Anthony 1983, 2). This reputation has arisen basically as a result of Marxist efforts to claim a heritage of Marxist social theory in Morris's thought. One of the most explicit of such claims is Meier's *William Morris: The Marxist Dreamer*, but the British Marxist historian E.P. Thompson subsequently produced such a strong and plausible critique of Meier's work that its thesis must be heavily shrouded by doubt. Thompson's highlighting of insights which were written by Morris in 1880, before Morris had heard of Marx, and based on Ruskin's work, is a telling factor against any exclusivist claims for Morris by Marxism (Thompson 1977, 780-3; see also Anthony 1983, 196). Morris's words are close to expressions by Marx; however they also follow the ideas expressed by other and earlier socialists and anarchists (Marx and Engels 1980; see also e.g. Proudhon [1851] 1989, 130). Perhaps, as Thompson hinted, Morris was simply a 'Morrisist' (Thompson 1977, 773).[11]

Ruskin's holistic view of political economy, expressed in his distinctive writing style,[12] has led to many confused and confusing accounts of his thought. Relatively recent books which focus on his economic ideas include Austin (1991), Spear (1984), Anthony (1983) and Sherburne (1972). James Sherburne positively engages with Ruskin's economic thought in *John Ruskin or the Ambiguities of Abundance*, however, through his insistence on locating Ruskin within a tradition of 'Romanticism', Sherburne fails to be able to perceive Ruskin's ideas within a wider intellectual and social context.[13] Ultimately, Sherburne resorts to a psychological interpretation of history in his attempt to explain his perception of Ruskin's personal 'ambiguities', asserting that Ruskin's 'vision of the new man is achieved at the cost of his sanity' (Sherburne 1972, xi, 285, 290-1, 297).[14] In contrast, Jeffrey Spear suggests that references to Ruskin's insanity 'relieve Ruskin of responsibility for his words only to deny him credit for his thoughts. It is not, as his first biographer feared, 'the reproach of insanity' that has cast its shadow back over Ruskin's work, but the excuse of insanity' (Spear 1984, 2). While it is certain that Ruskin suffered some form of mental illness late in his life, it would be simplistic to uncritically adopt nineteenth century perceptions of his 'insanity'.

The historiography of Sherburne's and Spear's works envelope Ruskin's economic ideas in either a psychoanalytic or an aesthetic fog. This is not to deny that their work has merit in enhancing an understanding of Ruskin's thought. It is however suggesting that a cautious reading is necessary, as economic ideas are easily distorted or obscured through the specific and non-economic interpretative lens of the analyst. Linda Austin's book, *The Practical Ruskin: Economics and Audience in the Late Work*, focuses on the later period of Ruskin's life. While her efforts to explain Ruskin's 'economics' are admirable, her concentration on aligning Ruskin's ideas with Marxist categories of economic analysis, such as the labour theory of value, and literary theory lacks meaning in the context of Ruskin's *Weltanschauung*. Amongst the relatively recent work, it is in P.D. Anthony's *John Ruskin's Labour* that the fog has substantially lifted and the ideas on which it focuses can be seen with more clarity.

Ruskin's primary focus was on the principles which he believed should underpin political economy as he perceived it, and it was inevitable that at those times when he directly engaged with orthodox economic theory he would find himself and the economists speaking different 'languages'. The type of problem which can result from different discourses speaking different 'languages' can be seen in G.C.G. Moore's review of Willie Henderson's recent book *John Ruskin's Political Economy* (Moore 2000). Moore's critical response to Henderson's work with 'literary theory' is indicative of the impossibility of a literary analysis of Ruskin's work yielding sufficiently convincing evidence to satisfy a reviewer who is viewing it through the interpretative framework of 'scientific' economics. Reconciliation between Moore's and Henderson's perspectives is only likely to be found through an interpretation of Ruskin's economic ideas based on thorough historical inquiry and associated contextualisation which is not anachronistic to the works of the historical actor. Ruskin's approach to economic theory and its proponents was often cavalier such that clashes and confusion were inevitable (see e.g. Sherburne 1972, 94-100).

Apart from his doctrinal differences with economists, Ruskin was vilified in the press of his day when he first began to write on matters of political economy whilst holding the highest reputation in England as an art critic. For the press and many casual observers of his apparent changed orientation to society, Ruskin was seen to have created 'eruptions of windy hysterics', 'absolute nonsense', 'intolerable twaddle', and so on. Such opinions, perhaps less brutal, were steeped on him also by his peers (Maas 1999, 89, 116). Ruskin proceeded with his work, largely unsubdued, although disturbed by the lack of appreciation of his economic ideas.

Recent analyses of his work have been less dismissive than Ruskin's contemporaries. Both Sherburne and Spear, for example, find a 'formal wholeness' and 'underlying consistency' in Ruskin's writings (Sherburne 1972, 1; Spear 1984, 8). Spear instructively alludes to Ruskin's need, in the 1860s and 1870s, to apply fresh literary and activist 'tactics' in pursuing his personal 'crusade', due to his 'articles being driven from the journals', the ridicule of his books by the press and their neglect by the public, and because his lectures were 'treated as entertainments' (Spear 1984, 8, 158-167). For Ruskin, as for Carlyle and for Morris, specific actions or words in print often could be tactical as readily as they could be their 'truth'. Inconsistencies or exaggerations could be deliberate as easily as they could be 'errors'. Only Carlyle could express the shared tactical imperatives of the three crusaders as he did in a letter to Ruskin:

> Many, many are the Phoebus Apollo celestial arrows you still have to shoot into the foul Pythons and poisonous Megatheriums and Plesiosaurians that go staggering about, large as cathedrals in our sunk epoch. (cited in Spear 1984, 158).

Carlyle's personal interaction with Ruskin was frequent and prolonged. They gave to each other freely of their time and their ideas (Roe [1921] 1970, chapter IV). Morris was explicit in expressing his intellectual debt not only to Ruskin but to Carlyle as well.[15] In terms of political economy, they each confronted a similar 'river of fire' and each of them sought a way to cross it. The 'hard proof' which that required was evident in the relentless way in which they pursued their goals. Perhaps the most central of those goals was the retrieval of human dignity and pleasure in work. From here there arises the most visible connecting thread of beliefs and ideas between them.

Work Across the 'River of Fire'

Thomas Carlyle described Political Economy as 'the dismal science' and famously expressed the 'cash nexus' perception of nineteenth century capitalism: 'Cash Payment the sole nexus; and there are so many things which cash will not pay!' (Carlyle [1840] 1972, 199). His underpinning beliefs were deeply and unambiguously Christian, but not in respect of allegiance to a particular Church. His beliefs were more Tolstoyan, more generically Christian. In combination with his Christian beliefs and ethics, he had an extensive involvement with German literature and philosophy early in his adult years (Roe [1921] 1970, 91-3; Harrold 1978, 5-18, 25-30).[16] Carlyle preached loudly against the 'Gospel of Mammonism': 'We call it a Society; and go about professing openly the totalest separation, isolation. Our life is not a mutual helpfulness; but rather, cloaked under due laws-of-war, named "fair competition" and so forth, it is a mutual hostility' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 141). It was the 'the unembodied Justice [which] is of Heaven; a Spirit, and Divinity of Heaven...' which inspired his observation of the profoundly personal nature of the social problems he saw around him: 'It is not to die, or even to die of hunger, that makes a man wretched...But it is to live miserable we know not why; to work sore and yet gain nothing; to be heart-worn, weary, yet isolated, unrelated, girt-in with a cold universal Laissez-faire...'. Carlyle sought, as the essence of the renewal of society, the return of 'nobility' to labour: 'All work...is noble; work is alone noble...a life of ease is not for any man, nor for any god' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 13, 147, 203). It is in Carlyle's expansion of the concept of work that its holistic nature becomes apparent.

For Carlyle, work extended into the depths of human existence itself:

> Labour is Life: from the inmost heart of the Worker rises his god-given [sic] Force, the sacred celestial Life-essence breathed into him by Almighty God; from his inmost heart awakens him to all nobleness,- to all knowledge, 'self-knowledge' and much else, as soon as Work fitly begins. (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 190)

He was insistent on the individual's right to the ownership of his or her own labour. In an interesting extension of the prevalent belief that society 'exists for the protection of property', he noted that 'the poor man also has property, namely, his "labour"'. It should be protected through enforcement of the 'Eighth Commandment... *Thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not be stolen from*...Give every man what is his, the accurate price of what he has done and been, no man shall any

more complain, neither shall the earth suffer any more'. Exploitation of labour under the Gospel of Mammon would then cease. As an incisive observer and critic of English society under conditions of *laissez-faire* ideology, Carlyle was acutely aware of the impending class conflict which was arising from the miserable condition of the working class, in Europe and 'more painfully and notably in England than elsewhere...' (Carlyle [1840] 1972, 169-70, 203). He was also aware of the impact of industrial machinery on the nature of work, although his allusions to it were often fleeting. He clung to his belief in the essential nobility and religious character of work: 'The inventive genius of England is not a Beaver's, or a Spinner's or Spider's genius: it is a *Man's* genius, I hope, with a God over him!' Factory work was, for him, anathema and painful to observe: 'Industrial work, still under bondage to Mammon, the rational soul of it not yet awakened, is a tragic spectacle. Men in the rapidest motion and self-motion; restless, with convulsive energy, as if driven by Galvanism, as if possessed by the Devil...' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 178, 199). It was not however a condition without hope.

In a reference to the factories of 'Sooty Manchester', Carlyle assured the worker that God was within, despite the working conditions: 'Brother, thou art a Man, I think; thou art not a mere building Beaver, or two-legged Cotton-Spider; thou hast verily a Soul in thee, asphyxied or otherwise!' Labour, owned by and unassailable as the property of human beings, possessed a nobility and verve which was intrinsic: 'Labour is not a devil, even while encased in Mammonism; Labour is ever an imprisoned god, writhing unconsciously or consciously to escape out of Mammonism!' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 199, 220). Carlyle often inflated his concept of labour to become the 'Chivalry of Labour', an expression which reflected his belief that 'Work is of a religious nature:-work is of a *brave* nature...'. In a synthesis of this chivalrous character of labour and his beliefs that 'Labour is Life' and the property of all human beings, he preached: 'Thou wilt never sell thy Life, or any of thy Life, in a satisfactory manner. Give it, like a royal heart; let the price be Nothing: thou *hast* then, in a certain sense, got All for it!...[this belief] is an element which should, and must, enter deeply into all settlements of wages here below. They will never be "satisfactory" otherwise...'. For Carlyle, work must be accompanied by a 'Fair day's-wages for a fair day's-work' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 192, 196, 197, 285). Fairness however could not be achieved by a simple process of calculation. Work was always a more profound notion than the one-dimensional idea of its being an input to production or a human resource.

Carlyle observed that 'Wages, it would appear, are no index of well-being to the working man: without proper wages there can be no well-being; but with them also there may be none'. Referring to the capricious nature of employment, he noted that even if wages were high, workers were forced to live 'like gamblers, now in luxurious superfluity, now in starvation' (Carlyle [1840] 1972, 186-7). He called on the 'Captains of Industry' to play their part in joining with the worker 'in veritable brotherhood, sonhood, by quite other and deeper ties than those of temporary day's wages!' It was a call for solidarity which applied equally to the aristocracy: 'Men cannot live isolated: we *are* all bound together, for mutual good or else for mutual misery, as living nerves in the same body. No highest man can disunite himself from any lowest' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 263, 275). Despite, or perhaps because of, the generic socialist tenets apparent in these ideas, Carlyle did not eject the positive aspects of 'Mammon' through his sweeping critique. There were benefits which could accrue to society but not until the return of a 'Soul'.[17] He was clinging to Mammon but it was a deeply contingent grasp.

For John Ruskin, Carlyle became both mentor and guide. He was Ruskin's 'second papa' in his personal life and by 1855 'Ruskin had already publicly declared that he owed more to Carlyle than to any living writer...Carlyle became one of the few contemporaries whose work Ruskin read and reread...' (Spear 1984, 86). An indication of Ruskin's intellectual debt and deep respect for Carlyle can be seen in this fragment from one of Ruskin's letters to a working-man:

> Read your Carlyle, then, with all your heart, and with the best of brain you can give; and you will learn from him first, the eternity of good law, and the need of obedience to it: then, concerning your own immediate business, you will learn farther this, that the beginning of all good law, and nearly the end of it, is in these two ordinances, - That every man shall do good work for his bread: and secondly, that every man shall have good bread for his work. (Ruskin, cited in Spear 1984, 85).

Especially after 1860 the influence of Carlyle 'was both continuous and powerful...The similarities in the two men at this period are more striking than the differences' (Roe [1921] 1970, 146). In brief summary, the similarities between the two men were identified by Roe as having a common imperative to seek out the '*fact*' within life:

> They sought to pierce through the shows and shams to the solid ground of eternal veracity beneath; and to show that it was in this soil alone, in the deep heart of our common humanity, that beauty and truth and goodness must have their roots if they were to live and flourish...Both believed in reverence, reverence for the fundamental facts of life as well as for superior men; and Ruskin was as truly a hero-worshiper as Carlyle. Both stood staunchly for a gospel of work and held that the foundation of all religion is 'in resolving to do our work well'...Ruskin, like Carlyle, reduced everything that he taught to the simple proposition that man has within him 'that singular force anciently called a soul'. (Roe [1921] 1970, 146-7)

There were of course other similarities and many differences between them; however this summary is sufficient to indicate the depth of their relationship. Interestingly, although Ruskin leant heavily on Carlyle's thought, there has been little attempt to explore or understand the intellectual connections between them.[18]

Ruskin's own thinking on the nature of political economy had its genesis in some of his earliest work. From 1843 with the publication of the first volume of his monumental work *Modern Painters* Ruskin drew deep connections between art and nature and human life. As Anthony has noted, Ruskin began studying 'the laws of the organization of the earth' through the art of painting at this time. Ruskin's Calvinist upbringing and his clinging to fundamental Christian beliefs and ethics throughout his writings gave a deep and holistic meaning to the concept of work. As Anthony has explained this background, 'Everything that Ruskin did was a deduction from first, Christian principles. God and moral order informed all of nature and all of human affairs' (Anthony 1983, 11-12). This ethical perspective contributed greatly towards bringing his ideas into close alignment with those of Carlyle.

Despite contemporary and later appreciations of aspects of his economic ideas by respected social reformers and academics working with political economy,[19] it is important to realise that Ruskin did not contemplate his ideas within the tenets of Political Economy as it then existed in theoretical writings. He

was as dismissive of 'the dismal science' as was Carlyle (Ruskin 1905c, 25-6). He summarised his own belief in the fundamentals of political economy as being 'neither an art nor a science; but a system of conduct and legislature, founded on the sciences, directing the arts, and impossible, except under certain conditions of moral culture'. This was contrasted with the 'Political Economy' which he saw in action in England as being 'in reality nothing more than the investigation of some accidental phenomena of modern commercial operations...' (Ruskin 1905b, 147). His focus was consistently first on 'moral culture', in the absence of which only base and individual accumulation of wealth would prevail, through the wielding of power over the labour of others (Ruskin 1905c, 44-5). When Hobson linked Emerson, Carlyle, Zola, Ibsen, William Morris, and Tolstoy with Ruskin regarding his 'gospel of good work', he noted that, for these men, it was 'no mere moral platitude, but a definite protest against the severance of work and life, process and result, producer and consumer, which the excessive specialisation of industry has forced upon the modern life' (Hobson 1904, 305). It is instructive to note here also that, as William Morris pointed out, Ruskin's constructive ideas were absorbed not only by 'superfine audiences', but also by the working class.[20]

As Ruskin expressed in more practical terms his own perspective of political economy: '(the economy of a State, or of citizens) consists simply in the production, preservation, and distribution, at fittest time and place, of useful or pleasurable things' (Ruskin 1905c, 44). It followed that 'the question for the nation is not how much labour it employs but how much life it produces. For as consumption is the end and aim of production, so life is the end and aim of consumption'. He compressed these beliefs into the rubric: 'There is no Wealth but Life'. More expansively then, 'That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings...'. (Ruskin 1905c, 105). The notions 'moral culture', 'useful or pleasurable', 'nourishing', 'noble', and 'happy' were profoundly parts of the religiously human way Ruskin viewed political economy. He drew upon his belief in God to assert that all human action must be guided by 'balances of justice' and 'meaning, in the term justice, to include affection, - such affection as one man *owes* to another'. It was 'justice' with its intrinsic implications of human 'veritable brotherhood' (as Carlyle expressed the same notion) which must dictate 'All right relations between master and operative, and all their best interests...' (Ruskin 1905c, 28). Here was the moral basis of labour relations and of work.

Ruskin defined labour in terms of a 'loss' with respect to human life, stating that 'It is usually confused with effort itself, or the application of power (opera); but there is much effort which is merely a mode of recreation, or of pleasure'. He therefore concluded that labour cannot be bought or sold: 'Everything else is bought or sold for Labour, but Labour itself cannot be bought nor sold for anything, being priceless. The idea that it is a commodity to be bought or sold, is the alpha and omega of Politico-Economic fallacy' (Ruskin 1905b, 183). Ruskin is so close to Carlyle here, with the idea of labour being the property of the worker, accompanied by the conclusion that labour cannot be sold. Carlyle had said 'Labour is Life' and this is the same conceptual base from which Ruskin developed his perception of labour as a 'loss'. For Ruskin, 'True labour, or spending of life, is either of the body, in fatigue or pain; of the temper or heart...or of the intellect' (Ruskin 1905b, 184). The worker is giving of his life when he works and this is not to be trifled with as a mere commodity.

The question of wages was confronted by Ruskin within the context of a 'moral culture'. Given his understanding of the nature of labour, it is obvious that he could not accept that wages would be determined solely by supply and demand in unrestrained market conditions of commerce. Returning to his deep commitment to justice he looked to the idea of 'just wages' as the basis for payment: 'The abstract idea, then, of just or due wages, as respects the labourer, is that they will consist in a sum of money which will at any time procure for him at least as much labour as he has given, rather more than less' (Ruskin 1905c, 66). Ruskin pointed out that this rate of payment was to bear no relationship whatsoever to the availability of equivalent labour. For an employer to force equivalent workers to bid in competition with each other for a job was an unjust action by the employer. There was a 'just' wage for work and that full amount should be paid to the worker.

Ruskin was especially concerned at seeing the use of machinery substituted for human labour. Carlyle had earlier expressed similar concerns: 'On every hand, the living artisan is driven from his workshop, to make room for a speedier, inanimate one. The shuttle drops from the fingers of the weaver, and falls into iron fingers that ply it faster' (Carlyle, cited in Lutchmansingh 1990, 11). For Ruskin, machinery had a role, but it should be subsidiary to the need to protect and enhance the personal and social benefits of labour. In the simplest terms, he believed that 'The value of instruments consists, first, in their power of shortening labour, or otherwise accomplishing what human strength unaided could not' (Ruskin 1905b, 156). In a pamphlet published in 1868 he identified a hierarchy of the use of labour and machinery. He believed that there were 'three great classes of mechanical powers' available for use, and they were 'vital muscular power', 'natural mechanical power of wind, water, and electricity', and 'artificially produced mechanical power', such as the steam-engine. It was quite clear to him that 'the first principle of economy [is] to use all vital power first, then the inexpensive natural forces, and only at last to have recourse to artificial power'. His reasoning was simple, and related directly to his perception of labour as life: 'it is always better for a man to work with his own hands to feed and clothe himself, than to stand idle while a machine works for him...'. For Ruskin it was a social waste and degrading of humanity to have the worker producing useless goods when there was useful work which could be done, work which could contribute directly to the worker's own subsistence (Ruskin 1905a, 541, 543-5). Further, as Anthony has pointed out, Ruskin believed that 'the means of production should never become so complex that they cannot be controlled (or even understood) by the labourers'. As will be seen shortly, this belief was very close to William Morris's view of the role of machinery in society (Anthony 1983, 101).

Ruskin had perceived in manufacturing industry the potential for manual work to be separated from intellectual work, to the great detriment of the welfare of the worker.[21] Purely manual work in those circumstances was miserable and it was 'a violation of divine law and "a sign of some kind of folly or sin in their way of life"'. For Ruskin, there were three characteristics of work which were essential for people to be happy engaged in it. First they must be suited to it, secondly the amount of work must not be excessive, and thirdly they must feel as if they have been successful in some way in carrying it out (Anthony 1983, 60). The use of people solely for manual or intellectual work was the result of two aspects of mistaken thinking, which Ruskin expressed as: 'the first, that one man's thoughts can be, or ought to be, executed by another man's hands; the second, that manual labour is a degradation, when it is governed by intellect' (Ruskin, cited in Anthony

1983, 59). It was not only the welfare of the worker in manufacturing industry which brought him to this conclusion. He had early in his life developed a particular perception of the hands of manual labour within his studies of art and architecture.

The ideas on manual labour and intellectual work expressed by Ruskin had their beginnings in his studies of Gothic architecture and art work more generally. He believed that art 'must never exist alone, never for itself, it exists only when it is the means of knowledge or the grace of agency for life' (Ruskin, cited in Anthony 1983, 13). The deep conceptual relationship between art and life, in parallel with his perceived relationship between labour and life, is apparent. It was a theme which was also embraced by William Morris, who explained to a lecture audience in 1884:

> by art, I do not mean *only* pictures and sculpture, nor only these and architecture...these are only a portion of art, which comprises as I understand it a great deal more; beauty produced by the labour of man both mental and bodily, the expression of the interest man takes in the life of man upon the earth with all its surroundings, in other words the human pleasure of life is what I mean by art. (Morris [1884] 1969, 94).

For Morris, as for Ruskin, art was not solely the output of an artist alone and it was not connected with a judgment of aesthetic or financial value. Art was the manifestation of life, art was the embodiment of 'the human pleasure of life', art was the outcome of human work, and work itself was therefore life.

The nexus which Morris identified most clearly between the ideas of Ruskin and those which he adopted himself was Morris's eulogising of the chapter titled 'the Nature of Gothic' from Ruskin's work *The Stones of Venice*, which was published in three volumes between 1851 and 1853. Carlyle was also impressed with this work: 'A strange, unexpected, and, I believe, most true and excellent *Sermon in Stones*...from which I hope to learn in a great many ways' (Carlyle, cited in Harrison 1907, 69). The connections between Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris converged in many ways and this was one of the primary sites of reference. The convergence is well illustrated by these blunt assertions in *The Stones of Venice*:

> You must either make a tool of the creature or a man of him. You cannot make both. Men were not intended to work with the accuracy of tools...If you will have that precision out of them...you must unhumanize them...On the other hand, if you will make a man of the working creature, you cannot make a tool. Let him but begin to imagine, to think, to try to do anything worth doing; and the engine-turned precision is lost at once. (Ruskin, in Morris 1977, 17-18)

Here is work as life, the denial of humanity to a person who is forced to work in a machine-like manner. Only in pleasurable work which comes from the individual's own initiative can human dignity be found in work. William Morris agreed. The single chapter 'The Nature of Gothic' was extracted by Morris as a stand-alone work in 1892 and he highlighted the significance of Ruskin's work in his own 'Preface' to the book. Morris thought that it was 'one of the most important things written by the author...[and that] in future days [it] will be considered as one of the very few necessary and inevitable utterances of the century' (Morris 1977, i). The significance which Morris gave Ruskin's ideas is illustrated in Morris's explanation of Ruskin's message:

> For the lesson which Ruskin here teaches us is that art is the expression of man's pleasure in labour; that it is possible for man to rejoice in his work, for, strange as it may seem to us to-day, there have been times when he did rejoice in it; and lastly, that unless man's work once again

> becomes a pleasure to him, the token of which change will be that beauty is once again a natural and necessary accompaniment of productive labour, all but the worthless must toil in pain, and therefore live in pain. (Morris 1977, i-ii)

At least in public Morris was more secular in terms of the underpinnings of his beliefs than was either Carlyle or Ruskin, although it is significant to recall that Carlyle, despite his evangelising rhetoric, was more generically Christian than a follower of any specific theological doctrine. Ruskin also, especially in his later years, became disillusioned with Christian dogma (Harrison 1907, 205-6). Morris had a Christian upbringing, and although he spoke little about religion there is some evidence to suggest that he never released his hold on the fundamental ethics of Christianity; it would be '*absorbed in Socialism*' (William Morris, cited in Morris 1966, 301-2). In an 1893 lecture, Morris neatly summarised his thoughts in relation to the society of his time:

> Now the chief accusation I have to bring against the modern state of society is that it is founded on the art-lacking or unhappy labour of the greater part of men; and all that external degradation of the face of the country...is hateful to me not only because it is a cause of unhappiness to some few of us who still love art, but also and chiefly because it is a token of the unhappy life forced on the great mass of the population by the system of competitive commerce. (Morris, 'Art under Plutocracy', in Zabel [1883] 1993, 27)

Morris, like Carlyle and Ruskin, was a scathing critic of the social effects of the economic activity which he saw around him. In following them closely with respect to the nature of work at times he came quite close to reiterating the Christian ethics of his mentors: 'The pleasure which ought to go with the making of every piece of handicraft has for its basis the keen interest which every healthy man takes in healthy life, and is compounded, it seems to me, of three elements; variety, hope of creation, and the self-respect which comes of a sense of usefulness; to which must be added that mysterious bodily pleasure which goes with the deft exercise of the bodily powers' (Morris, 'Art under Plutocracy', in Zabel [1883] 1993, 27). Morris was almost, if not completely, equating labour with life.

The extent of the importance of work in human society was expressed by Morris in unequivocal terms. He stated that 'I have looked at this claim by the light of history and my own conscience, and it seems to me so looked at to be a most just claim, and that resistance to it means nothing short of a denial of the hope of civilization. This then is the claim: *It is right and necessary that all men should have work to do which shall be worth doing, and be of itself pleasant to do; and which should be done under such conditions as would make it neither over-wearisome nor over-anxious*'. He was first expressing the need to avoid the waste of human labour associated with the production of 'useless things'. Labour should only be applied to the making of things which are of direct usefulness to human society, and not to luxury goods which do not contribute to the 'commonwealth'. It was the waste of human labour as well as the exploitation of that labour for no useful purpose which led Morris to advocate 'the putting away of luxury, to the stripping yourselves of useless encumbrances, to the simplification of life...' (Morris, 'Art and Socialism', in Zabel [1884] 1993, 83-7).

Morris has been famously slandered as having possessed a hatred of machinery and seeking a nostalgic return to hand-crafts for all (Williams [1958] 1983, 155). His resistance against the massive intrusion of machinery into the realm

of human labour was driven not only by his ethics of work but also by the displacement of human labour by machinery. If he had seen machinery undertaking the most degrading forms of labour and contributing to economising of labour time, rather than the loss of work altogether for many people, he would have seen machinery in a different light. As it was, however, for Morris machinery was most definitely not 'invented with the aim of saving the pain of labour. The phrase labour-saving machinery is elliptical, and means machinery which saves the cost of labour, not the labour itself, which will be expended when saved on tending other machines' (Morris, 'Art under Plutocracy', in Zabel [1883] 1993, 32). The increasing use of machinery in production he foresaw as an ever-worsening path to the degradation of work for all. He also believed that 'production by machinery necessarily results in utilitarian ugliness...' and that this was 'a serious evil and a degradation of human life'. It did not follow, however, as Morris was at pains to point out on many occasions, that he was against the use of machinery in production. As he summarised his view, 'As a condition of life, production by machinery is altogether an evil; as an instrument for forcing on us better conditions of life it has been, and for some time yet will be, indispensable' (Morris, 'The Revival of Handicraft', in Zabel [1888] 1993, 131).

It was certain that Morris did seek a return of handicrafts, which would accompany the simplification of life and which would also return human dignity, invention, and pleasure to work: 'We are right to long for intelligent handicraft to come back to the world which it once made tolerable...' (Morris, 'The Revival of Handicraft', in Zabel [1888] 1993, 134). By way of comparison with Morris, here are Ruskin's 'three broad and simple rules' which he believed must be applied to all manufactures: 1. NEVER encourage the manufacture of any article not absolutely necessary, in the production of which Invention has no share. 2. NEVER demand an exact finish for its own sake, but only for some practical and noble end. 3. NEVER encourage imitation or copying of any kind, except for the sake of preserving records of great works' (Ruskin, in Morris 1977, 24). These rules are set down in 'The Nature of Gothic' and it requires no effort of inference to perceive the profound relationship between Ruskin and Morris with respect to these ideas.

It is only possible here to provide a brief sketch of the vision Morris had for work in a possible future. With explicit reference to the characteristics of work in medieval times (but not, note, any advocacy of a return to the feudal system) he observed that working hours were shorter then but still 'far too long' and there were more holidays.[22] Further, 'They worked deliberately and thoughtfully as all artists do; they worked in their own homes and had plenty of elbow room; the unspoiled country came up to their very doors...Finally, all their work depended on their own skill of hand and invention, and never showed signs of that in its beauty and fitness...'. He concluded that it was 'the development of the commercial system crowned by the revolution of the great machine industries' which had taken away from work its 'attractiveness' (Morris, 'Unattractive Labour', in Salmon [1885] 1994, 90). Morris envisaged a transformation of the nature of work from the 'unattractiveness' of his own time to conditions in which it was first possible 'for a man to choose the work which he could do best...This choice of work would not be difficult...[because] People's innate capacities are pretty much as various as their faces are...'. He foresaw that 'in a reasonable community' these capacities would be discerned and cultivated, through education especially in the 'visual arts' and the teaching of more than one craft to each individual: 'many, or most, men would be

carrying on more than one occupation from day to day' (Morris, 'Attractive Labour', in Salmon [1885] 1994, 94).

The approach Morris advocated here, of 'fitting people's work to their capacities and not, as now, their capacities to their work...', would involve a 'complete reversal' of labour under the system of competitive commerce. He added two further essential elements to the 'new' work: 'leisure and pleasantness of external surroundings'. The first would come about through a reduction of the working day; the second would require a reversal of the tendency he saw of 'crowding up of factories into huge towns', or 'workshops being heaped together in the mass of disorder and misery which we call a big town'. He concluded that 'Work so done, with variety and intelligently, not intensified to the bursting point of the human machine, and yet with real workmanlike, or rather artistic eagerness, would not be a burden, but an interest added to life quite apart from its necessity...' (Morris, 'Attractive Labour', in Salmon [1885] 1994, 95-6). Distinct from the more obscure literary colouration employed by Ruskin when advocating the same approach to work, Morris sounds much more the pragmatist, closer to engaging with the realities of commercial and industrial life surrounding him. This is not surprising, given the fact that he was throughout the period of his writings and lecturing also operating his own handicrafts business as a commercial venture (May Morris, 'Introductory', in Morris 1966, 10-12).

There is much more which could be drawn out with respect to the relationships between Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris. This has been nothing more than a sketch, yet sufficient evidence has been presented to demonstrate the depth of the connections between these men in terms of the idea of work and its central place within their world-view and within society as it might be. In a lecture in 1883, Morris espoused his vision of 'nature beautiful around us again...with science set free from the huckster's fetters...' and the end of 'the insatiable compulsion of commerce on us to make an extra profit from labour we know not for what or for whom'. He asked the crucial question: 'Is it a dream?' In answering, it is not drawing too long a bow to assert that he was also answering for Carlyle and Ruskin:

> It is not a dream but a cause; men and women have died for it, not in the ancient days but in our own time: they lie in prison for it, work in mines, are exiled, are ruined for it: believe me when such things are suffered for dreams, the dreams come true at last. (Morris, 'Art and the People', in Morris 1966, 403)

To dismiss as purely utopian or nostalgic or romantic the notions of work which these men collectively and individually developed would have been to them, in their time, the height of ignorance, insult and hypocrisy. The profound intellectual debts they acknowledged between each other is sufficient reason to avoid analysis of the economic ideas of either one of them without at least implicit awareness of the ultimate direction in which perhaps the most central of those ideas travelled through time.

---

* Research Student, Department of History, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Queensland, Australia 4072. Email: Heathcoach99@hotmail.com. I would like to thank Rob Leeson and Paul Flatau for their editorial suggestions, and the anonymous referee for constructive and helpful advice. I especially want to express

my respect for and appreciation of Ray Petridis for his generous advice and assistance during an earlier stage of my research work.

Notes

1 Note that E.P. Thompson used the expression 'the river of fire' as the title for a chapter of his book. However he interpreted Morris's meaning as 'class conflict' in Marxist terms, whereas it has been interpreted here, it is believed more accurately, as a reference to the prevailing Political Economy of Morris's time (see Thompson 1977, Chapter VII, 271).

2 The expressions 'economy' and 'economic thought' are used here in a generic or Polanyian 'substantive' sense (Polanyi 1977, 20).

3 E.P. Thompson identified the common ideas regarding work between Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris, but it was a fleeting mention buried within his biography of Morris (and therefore not an economic writing), which itself was an explicit attempt to 'claim' Morris for Marxism (Thompson 1977, 32-9).

4 See for example Roe ([1921] 1970) and Harvey and Press (1995). An indication of current uneven perceptions of their work can be seen in *The New Palgrave*, where Carlyle has an entry, as a critic of economics and 'the originator of the epithet "the dismal science"'; Ruskin's entry acknowledges both his criticism and his constructive work, as well as noting the influence on him of Carlyle and his own influence on William Morris, while Morris does not have an entry of his own. Morris is mentioned in passing under the general heading of 'socialism': 'There were also socialist alternatives to Marx, during and since his lifetime. William Morris combined some ideas derived from Marx with ethical socialism and devotion to arts and crafts'. There is no entry to explain 'ethical socialism' (Eatwell *et al*., 1987 Vol.I, 371, Vol.4, 228-9, 402). A contemporary example is H.S. Foxwell's broad account of the state of economic thought in England in 1887, which exhibited similar uneven treatment. Ruskin and Morris were given respectful mentions, but Carlyle was absent. The communitarian anarchist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and the socialist Karl Marx were included (see Foxwell 1887, 86-7,100).

5 Hobson expressed clearly the too-frequently overlooked fact that criticism and positive ideas are intrinsically interrelated: '[social] criticism will always be a special function of reformers; but it is only a short-sighted and partial view of their work of criticism which will regard it as negative and destructive merely: all criticism in the hands of such men will be reformatory in purpose, the distinctively critical work only serving as the foundation of constructive work, which will proceed continuously from it' (Hobson 1904, 90).

6 Historiographical insights utilised here are essentially those of the social historian. Ideas are not seen as being autonomous; they emanate from human beings in specific social contexts. See, for example, (Samuel 1992; Kramer 1986). Of particular relevance is the political philosopher John Dunn's observation 'that thinking is an effortful activity on the part of human beings, not simply a unitary performance; that incompleteness, incoherence, instability and the effort to overcome these are its persistent characteristics; that it is...an activity which is conducted more or less incompetently for most of their waking life by a substantial portion of the human race, which generates conflict and which is used to resolve these, which is directed towards problem-solving and not towards the construction of closed formal games...' (Dunn 1980, 16).

7 The term 'political economy' is used here, following Fain, in the broad sense which pre-dated the separation of 'modern economics', political science, and sociology

(Fain 1956, 14.). If this approach seems anachronistic towards the end of the nineteenth century, one has only to look closely at the way in which Alfred Marshall at that same time was still struggling with the differences between an ethically-informed economics and economics as a more abstract science (Marshall 1922, Book 1, Chapter 1, p.1; Groenewegen 1995, 761). Although there is no stable definition of 'political economy', Schumpeter's later definition of 'a system of political economy' will suffice for this essay: 'an exposition of a comprehensive set of economic policies that its author advocates on the strength of certain unifying (normative) principles such as...of economic liberalism, of socialism, and so on' (Schumpeter 1972, 38).

8 Philip Rosenberg's analysis of Carlyle's work, for example, concluded that a return to the past 'played little role' in Carlyle's thinking, and he astutely noted that 'It is precisely [this] myth-generating potential of the past that led socialists like Engels to study the primitive communism of the Iroquois nation and anarchists like Proudhon and Kropotkin to study the Middle Ages. In all of these cases the models are used to provide historically validated nuclei around which to organize thought and action' (Rosenberg 1974, 151). Thompson has amply illustrated that this was the perspective of Morris as well (Thompson 1977, 239).

9 See Thompson's acidic critique of Meier's work ('Postscript: 1976', in Thompson 1977, 780-3). An example of the confusion which can arise from insufficiently comprehensive or selective readings of Morris's work is Ruth Kinna's conclusion that the Marxist assertion that Morris was not an anarchist should be accepted. Part of the reason for Kinna's conclusion lies in her variable and selective use of parts of Morris's *News from Nowhere* as evidence of his vision for a future society. As Thompson has shown, however, Morris 'had no intention whatsoever to make cut-and-dried prophecies, but rather to make hints and suggestions...' which were not always consistent with each other, yet Kinna adopts an opinion that the novel represented 'a perfectly practical utopia'. Kinna eventually locates Morris in a negative half-world of 'anti-parliamentarism' from 1884-90, which is a partial analysis at best (Thompson 1977, 685-6, 696, 790; Kinna 1994, 594, 612). *News from Nowhere* is best left aside and treated as fiction and not as a purposeful preview of a future society.

10 Thompson's mention of the 'fright' by Engels in 1880 is a reference to Engels's pamphlet *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* which was dismissive of the practical value of socialisms which pre-dated the 'scientific' theories of Marx and Engels. The pamphlet was an extract from (Engels [1878] 1975).

11 See also G.D.H. Cole's reference to Morris's thought as 'Morrisite Socialism' (Cole 1964, 419). Ruth Kinna provides an example of the consequences of 'pedigree-plotting' ideas without a sufficiently comprehensive historical perspective. Following her conclusion that Morris owed a substantial intellectual debt to Marx, and Morris's acknowledgment of his reading of Fourier, her analysis of his ideas on art and labour lead her to find substantial contradictions and paradoxes in Morris's thought. Yet if she had followed Morris's own acknowledgments of the way in which his ideas leant upon the work of Ruskin and Carlyle as shown here, rather than so much on Marx and Fourier, Morris's thought would be seen to be coherent and consistent (see Kinna 2000, especially 509-12).

12 For especially insightful descriptions of Ruskin's writing style and the potential for misinterpretation by his readers, see for example (Fain 1956, 18-19, 82-3).

13 See Knowles (2000) for a broader view. Note also Anthony's suggestion that 'there is more than a hint of populism, even anarchism, in his [Ruskin's] later opinions' (Anthony 1983, 173).

14 For critiques of Sherburne's approach, see Anthony (1983 93, 95, 160-3, 187, 199). For an alternative view to that of Sherburne regarding Ruskin's 'insanity' see

Ruskin's own description of his falling 'ill in a frantic manner' (cited in Stimson 1888, 443).

15 As one simple example, in 1894, the year before he died, Morris noted his broad intellectual debt to both Carlyle and Ruskin: 'Lastly, there were a few who were in open rebellion against the said Whiggery - a few, say two, Carlyle and Ruskin. The latter, before my days of practical socialism, was my master towards the ideal aforesaid...' (Morris, cited in Thompson 1977, 33).

16 This is not to imply that Carlyle absorbed German thought uncritically. As Harrold has pointed out, 'In his handling of German ideas Carlyle touched nothing that he did not alter. From first to last, he was the born Calvinist, seeking to reconstruct, largely from German thought, a belief in the transcendent sovereignty of Right and in a world of immanent divine law' (Harrold 1978, 235).

17 For Carlyle, 'When Mammon-worshippers here and there begin to be God-worshippers, and bipeds-of-prey become men, and there is a Soul felt once more in the huge-pulsing elephantine mechanic Animalism of this Earth, it will be again a blessed Earth' (Carlyle [1843] 1949, 283).

18 George Cate has noted that there was only one work (Roe [1921] 1970) before the late 1950s which 'made any extended attempt to deal with the Carlyle-Ruskin relationship' (see Clubbe 1976, 227). For more recent work, see Cate (1982).

19 See Hobson (1904) and Smart (1880). See also E.T. Cook's mention of Smart's 'exposition of [Ruskin's] doctrine' in Smart's *A Disciple of Plato* and the positive comments by J.K. Ingram, Patrick Geddes, and the list of other 'professors and teachers of Political Economy' who signed an 1885 Address to Ruskin which expressed their positive opinions of the 'value' of his work (Cook 1905, lxxxiii, ciii, civ, cvi-cvii).

20 In a lecture delivered in 1884, Morris noted: 'I have been surprised to find...such a hearty feeling toward John Ruskin among working-class audiences: they can see the prophet in him rather than the fantastic rhetorician, as more superfine audiences do. That is a good omen, I think, for the education of the times to come' (William Morris, 'Art and Socialism', in Zabel 1993, 89).

21 These perceptions were neither unique to nor original to Ruskin. They were expressed across the whole spectrum of society, from the Russian anarchist-communist Peter Kropotkin to the British economist Alfred Marshall (see Knowles 2000, 42). As will be seen shortly, they were also expressed by William Morris. Morris further noted the early British socialist Robert Owen and the equally early French socialist Charles Fourier as precursors of Ruskin and especially suggested that 'Fourier and Ruskin were touched by the same instinct...' ('Preface', in Morris 1977, iv).

22 For an instructive historical review of time and work since medieval times, see (Thompson 1967).

References

Anthony, P.D. (1983) *John Ruskin's Labour: A Study of Ruskin's social theory,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Austin, L.M. (1991) *The Practical Ruskin: Economics and Audience in the Late Work,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Carlyle, T. [1843] (1949) *Past and Present,* London: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Carlyle, T. [1840] (1972) 'Chartism'. In *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Essays*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Cate, G.A. (ed.) (1982) *The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin,* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chandler, A. (1971) *A Dream of Order: The Medieval Idea in Nineteenth-Century English Literature,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Clubbe, J. (ed.) (1976) *Carlyle and His Contemporaries: Essays in Honor of Charles Richard Sanders,* Durham: Duke University Press.
Cole, G.D.H. (1964) *A History of Socialist Thought,*Vol. II, London: Macmillan.
Cook, E.T. (1905) 'Introduction'. In Cook, E.T. and A. Wedderburn (eds) *The Works of John Ruskin*, Vol. XVII, London: George Allen.
Dunn, J. (1980) 'The identity of the history of ideas'. In *Political Obligation in its Historical Context: Essays in Political Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eatwell, J., M. Milgate and P. Newman (eds) (1987) *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics,* London: Macmillan.
Engels, F. [1878] (1975) *Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science,* London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Fain, J.T. (1956) *Ruskin and the Economists,* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
Foxwell, H.S. (1887) 'The economic movement in England', *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* October, 2, 1, 84-103.
Groenewegen, P. (1995) *A Soaring Eagle: Alfred Marshall 1842-1924,* Aldershot: Elgar.
Harrison, F. (1907) *John Ruskin,* London: Macmillan.
Harrold, C.F. (1978) *Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834,* New York: A.M.S. Press.
Harvey, C. and J. Press (1995) 'John Ruskin and the ethical foundations of Morris & Company, 1861-96', *Journal of Business Ethics,* 14, 181-194.
Hobson, J.A. (1904) *John Ruskin Social Reformer,* London: James Nisbet & Co.
Kinna, R. (2000) 'William Morris: art, work, and leisure', *Journal of the History of Ideas,* July, 61, 3.
Kinna, R. (1994) 'William Morris and Anti-Parliamentarism', *History of Political Thought,* Winter, XV, 4.
Knowles, R. (2000) 'Political economy from below: communitarian anarchism as a neglected discourse in histories of economic thought', *History of Economics Review,* Winter, 31.
Kramer, L.S. (1986) 'Intellectual history and reality: the search for connections', *Historical Reflections,* Vol. 13, Nos. 2 & 3.
Lutchmansingh, L.D. (1990) 'Archaeological socialism: utopia and art in William Morris'. In Boos, F.S. and C.G. Silver (eds), *Socialism and the Literary Artistry of William Morris*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Maas, H. (1999) 'Pacifying the workman: Ruskin and Jevons on labor and popular culture', *History of Political Economy,* Annual Supplement to Volume 31, 85-120.
Marshall, A. (1922) *Principles of Economics: An Introductory Volume,* 8th edn, London: Macmillan.
Marx, K. and F. Engels [1848] (1980) *The Communist Manifesto,* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Meier, P. (1978) *William Morris: The Marxist Dreamer,* New Jersey: Harvester.
Moore, G.C.G. (2000) 'Ruskin on political economy, or "being preached to death by a mad governess"', *History of Economics Review,* 31, Winter.

Morris, M. (1966) *William Morris: Artist, Writer, Socialist,* Vol. 2, New York: Russell & Russell.
Morris, W. [1884] (1969) 'Art and labour'. In Le Mire, E. (ed.) *Unpublished Lectures of William Morris*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
Morris, W. (ed.) (1977) *The Nature of Gothic: A Chapter of the Stones of Venice,* New York: Garland Publishing.
Polanyi, K. (1977) *The Livelihood of Man,* New York: Academic Press.
Proudhon, P.-J. [1851] (1989) *General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century,* London: Pluto Press.
Roe, F.W. [1921] (1970) *The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin,* New York: Gordian Press.
Rosenberg, P. (1974) *The Seventh Hero: Thomas Carlyle and the Theory of Radical Activism,* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Ruskin, J. (1905a) 'Appendix VIII: employment for the destitute poor and criminal classes (1868)'. In Cook, E.T. and A. Wedderburn (eds) *The Works of John Ruskin*, Vol. XVII, London: George Allen.
Ruskin, J. (1905b) 'Munera pulveris'. In Cook, E.T. and A. Wedderburn (eds) *The Works of John Ruskin*, Vol. XVII, London: George Allen.
Ruskin, J. (1905c) 'Unto this last'. In Cook, E.T. and A. Wedderburn (eds) *The Works of John Ruskin*, Vol. XVII, London: George Allen.
Salmon, N. (ed.) (1994) *Political Writings: Contributions to Justice and Commonweal 1883-1890 William Morris,* Bristol: Thoemmes Press.
Samuel, R. (1992) 'Reading the signs ll: fact-grubbers and mind-readers', *History Workshop Journal,* No. 33.
Schumpeter, J.A. (1972) *History of Economic Analysis,* London: George Allen & Unwin.
Sherburne, J.C. (1972) *John Ruskin or the Ambiguities of Abundance: A Study in Social and Economic Criticism,* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Smart, W. (1880) *John Ruskin: His Life and Work,* Manchester: Abel Heywood & Son.
Spear, J.L. (1984) *Dreams of an English Eden: Ruskin and His Tradition in Social Criticism,* New York: Columbia University Press.
Stimson, F.J. (1888) 'Ruskin as a political economist', *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* July, 2, 4, 414-445.
Thompson, E.P. (1967) 'Time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism', *Past & Present,* 38, 59-67.
Thompson, E.P. (1977) *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary,* London: Merlin Press.
Williams, R. [1958] (1983) *Culture and Society: 1780-1950,* New York: Columbia University Press.
Williams, R. (1988) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society,* London: Fontana Press.
Zabel, G. (ed.) (1993) *Art and Society: Lectures and Essays by William Morris*, Boston: George's Hill Publications.