

THOMAS CARLYLE
AS A SOCIAL REFORMER

by
Helen Wilma Reith

THOMAS CARLYLE
AS A SOCIAL REFORMER

by

Helen Wilma Reith

An Essay submitted for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1927

C O N T E N T S

Chap.	Page
I Introduction	1
II Political Reform	25
III Social Reform	59
IV Education	98
V Modern Criticism of Carlyle	114
Bibliography	1

THOMAS CARLYLE
AS A SOCIAL REFORMER

I

INTRODUCTION

Thomas Carlyle was one of the first and most outstanding social reformers among the literary men of the 19th Century. His most noteworthy characteristic as such was his sympathy with the working classes. They were his own people, to whom he wished to bring justice and true happiness more than to any other class. Carlyle was the thinker whose arguments, ethical, political, and social, got nearer to the heart of England's social woes than those of any of his predecessors. He was attached to no party, and hence was free to set forth his own theories without thought for any side in politics or in economic thought. He was absolutely original and unpartisan in an age which was decidedly prejudiced in all its thought.

To understand fully the place which Carlyle holds in the thought of the world, whether it be in politics or in literature, we must first know something of his place in relation to the history both of the past and of his own time. He was born in 1795 at the end of that 18th Century which was in England, and indeed in all Europe, the Age of Rationalism. The 18th Century, especially the latter half of it, was also a period of great colonial expansion and economic change.

The conquest of Canada from the French in 1760, and the appropriation of India at about the same time marked the imperial progress of the nation. The long war with France was concluded by the Treaty of Paris in 1763. This was followed shortly by the loss of the American Colonies 1775-1777, while the last decade of the century was taken up by the French Revolution beginning in 1789, which involved England in a long exhaustive war with France, both during the Revolution, and under the regime of Napoleon.

During the latter half of this century of colonial expansion and almost continual foreign war, there had been practically no attempt made at any political or social reform within the country. Men were as yet content to let such matters rest on the basis established at the end of the previous century. Religious toleration, personal liberty, and sacredness of property rights were the bases of political belief at this time. Each man held himself independent of his fellows, and felt very little responsibility for the well-being of society as a whole.

In matters of commerce, industry, and conditions of living, however, great changes had appeared. Modern science had come into existence, which made the Industrial Revolution possible by the new researches in chemistry, physics, and other branches of science connected with industry. The luxuries of living had been increased, but at the same time the conditions of the workmen had been changed by the introduction of machinery, and of the Factory System in labour.

England was no longer an agricultural country, where each industrial labourer was an independent individual on his own plot of land, as it had been for centuries. Great social problems were rising out of the new labour conditions in the factory areas. The wealth of the nation had shifted from the nobles and land-owners to the manufacturing classes, and ultimately to the workmen themselves. For these reasons the need of a readjustment of political status was beginning to be felt in order that the new classes of national importance might have a voice in the government. Such were the social and political problems which faced England at the end of the 18th Century.

Along with this commercializing of the Nation we find the spirit and thought of the whole age to be that of Rationalism. Reason was the god of the 18th Century in England as well as in France. The literature of the age was rationalistic and didactic rather than emotional. Pope's Essay on Man, Swift's satires, the periodical essays of Addison and Steele, and the cold sparkling brilliance of the social drama of the time, show this tendency very strongly. In philosophy Hume's scepticism strikes the characteristic note of the age, while in religion the tendency was to Deism and Rationalism. It was not until towards the end of the century that a more sincerely emotional and human element began to creep in, with such writers as Gray, Burns, and Goldsmith in literature; and John Wesley and George Whitfield in theology who introduced Methodism and the Evangelical Movement into religion. Rationalism, independence in individual rights, and conservatism

in property rights, in all matters outside of industry, were the characteristics of the 18th Century, while the admixture of industrial progress caused the many problems which were left to be solved by the following century.

At the end of the 18th Century, so imbued with rationalism and selfish commercialism, its problems of life and politics as yet quite unsolved, Thomas Carlyle came into the world. In order to understand the peculiarities of his doctrines, it is necessary to know something of his life in relation to its social surroundings, and what influence such circumstances had on his beliefs.

He was born on December 4, 1795 at Ecclefechan, in the district of Annandale, Dumfriesshire, Scotland, of hard-working thrifty parents from the better class of Scotch peasants. His father, James Carlyle, was a mason by trade, and a stern Calvinistic Presbyterian in matters of religion. His mother was of much the same type, but with a deeper and more complete capacity for religious emotion. Her influence over Carlyle's life was of the greatest. By her and by his father, an intense love of truth was instilled into his nature.

In this simple Scottish home, with its stern religious teaching and frugal living, Carlyle lived during his early years and became imbued with the Calvinistic religious principles and Spartan way of living which was to remain with him all his life. He received his education, first at the village school, then at the Annan Grammar School, and finally from 1809 to 1814 at the University of Edinburgh. In these

schools he received a fair grounding in the classics and was especially interested in mathematics. Poverty and an extremely sensitive nature made much of his school life a misery. He was destined for the ministry by his parents' wish, and in 1814, after completing his university course, he was elected to a tutorship at the Annan school, where he taught and worked as a rural divinity student. He disliked the idea of the ministry as a profession, for religious doubts had begun to trouble him. These were deepened while teaching, when he had been reading Voltaire's essays and the works of other Encyclopaedists; Hume's philosophy and political economy, and Gibbon's History.¹ His former religious faith was disturbed by these readings, and in 1818, he decided to study law. He now gave up school teaching and went to Edinburgh. Here he seriously began his literary life by writing articles for Brewster's Encyclopedia. There is also evidence that the social and industrial evils of the country were making an impression on him, for he visited Glasgow about this time and saw manufacturing conditions at first hand as they were in the post war period. The Napoleonic Wars had ended with the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and this event was followed by a period of extreme trade depression, in which wages were low, while food prices were high because of the Corn Laws of 1815. Thus, the lot of the workers was made much harder than it had been even under the changes wrought by the Industrial

1 Froude, Life of Carlyle 1705-1835; 1882, vol. 1, p. 54.

Revolution, since at this time there was little market for the industrial products. Carlyle was forcibly impressed by these facts that something was organically wrong with English society.

There now came in Carlyle's life a period of great mental and spiritual trouble. Physically he was weakened by dyspepsia, which never left him to the end of his life. Mentally and spiritually he was tormented by religious doubts and financial difficulties. His religious doubts were partially terminated in 1821, as expressed in the chapter "The Everlasting No" in Sartor Resartus. He gave up law and sought a living through the sale of his translations of German literature, which he had commenced in 1820. His studies of these works produced the one external literary influence on his thought. Towards the end of his school teaching period he studied German literature intensely; Schiller, Goethe, and the philosophers Fichte and Kant having the deepest influence on him. The works of these German thinkers, especially those of Goethe, were the constructive force in Carlyle's spiritual development at this time. His love of truth and fact made him turn more to the practical thought found in Goethe's novels, rather than to his poetry, but it was chiefly in Goethe that Carlyle found an active formulation of a theory of life to take the place of his religious doubts and denials. His belief in duty, in self-renunciation, and in the "worship of sorrow", come chiefly from Goethe. Some points in his faith, however, such as the theory that

the laws of science are a revelation of God's control of the Universe, come from Fichte. Many of his political doctrines were also taken from Fichte. Of these "Hero-Worship" and "1
"Might is Right" are the most important. Goethe, Fichte and Kant were the constructive forces in Carlyle's philosophy of life, just as Voltaire, Gibbon, and Hume had previously been the destructive forces in his spiritual creed.

Until 1824 he was unsettled in his choice of a profession. A tutorship with the Bullers in 1822 gave him pecuniary relief, and on the termination of this engagement in 1824 he published a translation of Goethe's Wilhelm Meister which brought him a moderate sum. A Life of Schiller followed which brought praise from Goethe himself. For a long time Carlyle had been leaning to literature as a career, partly because it seemed to be his natural bent; but also because he began to feel that he had a spiritual message to deliver to mankind. Goethe's praise, therefore, finally turned the balance in favor of literature. In order to carry on his career comfortably, he terminated his romance with Jane Baillie Welsh by marrying her on October 17, 1826, and settled at Comely Bank, Edinburgh; later removing to Craigenputtock in 1828. The interval between his marriage in 1826 and his first literary success with The French Revolution in 1837 is filled with the struggle against poverty, ill health, and misunderstanding on the part of the public, for

1 C. E. Vaughan, Carlyle and His German Masters.

recognition in his chosen field.

A visit to England in 1824 with the Bullers, and six months' residence there in 1832 marked his further acquaintance with England and her political and social conditions. The writing of his essay Characteristics, was the result of his contact with the riots which broke out in England following the defeat of the Reform Bill in that year. Following this event he took up permanent residence in London in 1834. By this time theories of political and social reform had become the centre of his message to the world. His own spiritual doubts had been finally laid at rest, and a new positive program of spiritual ideas had been conceived to take their place, as has been already pointed out. In this program, theories for the improvement of the social conditions of his fellow men bulked largely. Such ideas in fact made up the core of all his writings, whether historical, as in Oliver Cromwell and the Life of Frederick the Great, or in the professedly political documents such as Past and Present and Latter Day Pamphlets. There were already signs of his doctrines of social reform in Sartor Resartus and in Characteristics as they appeared later in all his original writings.

After the publication of the French Revolution in 1837, his life is the story of his success as an author, and of his efforts as such to aid in some way the reform of social conditions of his country. Money anxieties had now ceased for all time, and he could turn all his energies to the exercise of his literary talents, and to the furthering of

his social theories. The political agitation for reform between 1830 and 1840 caused him to write Chartism in 1839, a short treatise on the rights and needs of man. In the following year, due to the fame of his lectures on Heroes and Hero Worship, he was offered a professorship in the University of Edinburgh. Such a prospect, however, was no longer necessary or acceptable to him since the sale of his works now provided him with sufficient income, and he preferred to be free from the restraints of any particular party or institution.

From 1840 to 1843 he busied himself gathering material for his new book Oliver Cromwell, and at the same time watched the political and social movements in England. He was deeply touched by the poverty and suffering of the labouring class, as caused by the Industrial Revolution, the mercenary selfishness of the employers, and the utter indifference of the aristocracy to existing conditions. The Corn Laws were not yet abrogated, and besides the misery arising from those laws, there was in his opinion, a fundamental error in social relationships in England, which took the form of a spiritual want causing all her miseries. With these facts in mind, he wrote Past and Present in 1843, in which he dealt with the political and social evils of the country as he saw them, together with such suggestions for their amelioration as he could offer.

Oliver Cromwell was finished in 1845, and was favorably received by the public. Carlyle was always a Radical in his

sympathies with the poor. Because of this tendency, he welcomed the Catholic Emancipation Bill in 1829, and the Reform Bill of 1832, but he was greatly disappointed in the extent of their results. In studying Cromwell he came to the conclusion that there must be other methods of procuring the right governors and the right government than through balloting, which at that time seemed to have failed in its purpose of finding true leaders. The majority apparently had failed in choosing the right governors. Hence, to him, only the right, whether of majority or minority, had any just claim to rule.

The following years of public unrest drove him still further from accepted ideas of social reform. In keeping with his radical sympathies he had been thinking for some time of the social troubles of Ireland. The Poor Law of England had been thrust upon that country in 1838, while the fundamental evils of land ownership and church grievance between Catholics and Protestants had been left untouched, and in 1845 a potato blight struck Ireland with its accompanying famine. Under these circumstances Carlyle visited Ireland in the autumn of 1846 to gain first hand knowledge of conditions there, and was deeply impressed by the misery of the Irish peasants. Furthermore in 1848 the Third French Revolution broke out, and Europe was swept by revolutionary outbreaks. The English Chartists presented another petition in April of that year, at the same time threatening violence, while insurrections also occurred in Ireland. Carlyle fore-

told disaster to England unless she became more sincere and just in her treatment of her workmen. He thought of writing a book on Democracy at this time, pointing out its defects, and the necessity of government of the weak by the strong, but did not see his way clear to this.¹ He saw that democracy was coming, but fought against it as having too many evils, such as absence of hero worship, for its good points to compensate. In this attitude he stood alone in his time. The complete reaction against this democratic movement later on in the year, however, startled and disappointed him. All evidences of the Revolution disappeared. Chartist and Irish leaders were goaled and England returned to her belief in the current political economy to which Carlyle was so bitterly opposed. In 1849 he went to Ireland again, but never wrote a separate book on conditions there, probably because he felt that Ireland's problems were so closely connected with those of England that they needed no separate treatment. The important outcome of these years of political turmoil was the Latter Day Pamphlets in 1850. This book had its source in the pamphlet of 1849 on The Nigger Question in which he shows his sympathy with the miseries of the English labourers when compared with the comparative luxury enjoyed by the emancipated negroes. Latter Day Pamphlets was also the outcome of his reflections on the revolutions of 1848. In it he stated that democracy was a failure, and should be replaced by a

1 Froude, Life of Carlyle 1834-1881; 1884, vol. i, p. 429.

government in the hands of an aristocracy of talent who should not be interfered with by the ignorant. His suggestions in this book for social and political reform were disapproved of at the time, but later many of them were adopted, especially those dealing with industrial problems.

For the actual politics and politicians of his day Carlyle cared very little at any time.¹ He met a few politicians such as Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, but was too greatly prejudiced against contemporary politics to realize their true worth. So when Peel died in 1850 he lost what little friendly interest he had in such matters. He had hoped for more results from the Latter Day Pamphlets, perhaps² in the way of carrying out personally his proposed reforms. But this hope failed and so helped to dampen his enthusiasm for politics, although his inherent sympathy with the miseries of the workers remained until the end of his career. The more sympathetic tone of the later reviews of the Pamphlets soothed him slightly, and early in 1851 he wrote the Life of Sterling. The next year he began to collect material for his Life of Frederick the Great. Frederick was to Carlyle, a solid sincere man, though not particularly religious, who built up a kingdom which would withstand revolutions such as had ravaged Europe for so long a time. Unconsciously having the truth of his great political doctrines in mind, he determined on Frederick of Prussia as the subject of his next book.

² Edinburgh Life of Carlyle 1834-1881; 1884, vol.ii, pp.46-9.

In his usual way, he studied minutely and at first hand the scenes and material which he was to use. A good half of 1852 he spent travelling in Germany, visiting scenes associated with the events of Frederick's life. It is to be noticed that for all his work Carlyle sought to get first hand impressions of his subject. For Latter Day Pamphlets and his social writings, he visited English manufacturing districts and Ireland itself. For Cromwell he visited and studied the Cromwell country. In all cases he studied deeply and as far as possible gave his own unbiased opinions on such a background.

In 1853 his mother died, thus ending the source of one of the permanent influences on his life. The next year the Crimean War broke out. With it he had very little sympathy, first because he disliked Turkey and the ideas which she represented, and secondly because of the misery of the English soldiers and people during the war. The American Civil War came in 1861, but to this Carlyle paid very little attention. In his own words, it was to him "a smoky chimney which had taken fire,"¹ the outcome of negro emancipation. Frederick the Great was finished in January 1865, the last and greatest of Carlyle's large works, and a real addition to English historical literature. Later in the year his worth was publicly recognized in Scotland, and he was appointed Rector of the University of Edinburgh.

1 Froude, Life of Carlyle 1834-1881; 1884, vol. ii, p. 246.

In 1866 Mrs. Carlyle died suddenly while Carlyle was absent at Edinburgh University, and from this time on he seemed unable to interest himself in any regular work. Political and social conditions alone roused him to action. In 1866 Governor Eyre of Jamaica put down a negro revolt in that island with great harshness, for which he was recalled and threatened with imprisonment. Carlyle, as a member of the Eyre Committee, fought hard to save him from disgrace and finally managed to have him reestablished in England. Politics at that time were constantly going contrary to Carlyle's own conception of autocratic government. The Conservatives under Disraeli and Lord Derby had carried through the 1867 Reform Bill, enlarging English franchise still further, and making English government still more democratic. In protest to this movement he wrote Shooting Niagara in 1867, against useless political reform and the money making tendencies of the age when so much social reform was needed.¹ This is his last public protest against the ^{democratic} tendencies of English politics. He never ceased to be interested, however, in Ireland or the grievances of labour and the poor, to whom he was always most charitable. But his mind at this time was taken up chiefly with the atheistic trend of his age caused by the progress of science, especially as illustrated by Darwin's Origin of Species. To Carlyle, disbelief in God was the greatest evil which could befall a nation. Therefore this

1 Froude, Life of Carlyle 1834-1881; 1884, vol.ii, p.350.

tendency of his time greatly disturbed him. France was more or less the centre of this atheistical movement, and hence the Franco-Prussian War in 1870 seemed to him a just retribution for her impiety. Prussia, a state governed in part according to Carlyle's "Hero" theories, was to him in the right, and accordingly the outcome of the war was but according to his political prophecies in such matters. To prevent war between England and Germany, however, he wrote a long letter to the Times explaining the real relation between Germany and France. Thus ended his active work in the politics and society, in both of which he had always been so vitally interested.

In 1869-70 his right hand became paralysed and henceforth he was unable to write. He could not compose by dictation so his literary production finally ceased. His last years were saddened by the death of friends and relatives. Recognition as a great man, also came in his old age, although he cared very little for it at this time. The Prussian Order of Merit was conferred on him in 1873 and an offer of the Grand Cross of Bath was made in England. He still remained interested in politics being deeply disappointed both in Gladstone's Irish policy of Home Rule, and in Disraeli's foreign policy, especially with regard to the Russo-Turkish War. Finally, worn out with old age and his strenuous life work, he passed away at his Chelsea home in London, on Feb. 5, 1881, at the age of eighty-five; one of the greatest and certainly the most sincere man of the 19th Century.

Such in brief, is Carlyle's life in relation to the political and social movements of his time. Such in outline is the attitude, which he took from time to time to the various events in his country. Such are his works and the purposes for which they were written.

In order to realize fully his position among English social writers, it is not only necessary to understand Carlyle's attitude to the politics and history of his age but also his relation to contemporary authors. His early life was spent in Scotland where few literary geniuses were then living. Sir Walter Scott, the only noted Scotch writer of that time, he never saw, nor did he have a very high opinion of the latter's works. Going to London from his narrow surroundings and an unappreciative Scotch public he had had great expectations of meeting men of kindred tastes and sympathies, whom he could reverence and respect. In this hope he was bitterly disappointed, and he continued to be so in such matters to the end of his life. It is often true that our expectations exceed the reality, and this was especially true in Carlyle's case. Wordsworth he found old, trivial, and prosaic, without the dash of genius he had expected. Coleridge, Lamb, and De Quincey had sparks of ~~this~~ genius but were weak characters in Carlyle's sight. These men he met ~~an~~ and conversed with, but on close observation they lost most of their noble qualities. Moreover, they were not of Carlyle's type, nor were they interested in such an intense way

as he was in such subjects as political economy and social reform.

It is not until the later period of his life, when he made his permanent home in London, the centre of British thought, that he made more agreeable friendships among his own class. Mill, Ruskin, Tennyson, and Clough are notable in these later years. At one time, Mill was under the influence of Carlyle to a certain extent, and in spite of differences of opinion as to theories of liberty they remained close friends for the greater part of Mill's life. Tennyson he admired and loved, feeling that the poet was giving expression in his poetry, to the same search for truth, that he himself was seeking to give in prose. Arthur Clough he also loved and respected for much the same qualities of truth and bravery in his convictions. Ruskin, however, was the most closely connected with him in literary work; yet Carlyle did not feel so much personal friendship for him as for some of the others. He loved him rather as his disciple and as the teacher of his social and political theories. Ruskin was nearest to Carlyle in life purpose and style. He seemed to be taking up the task of conservative reform where Carlyle was forced to leave it off through old age. For this reason he held Carlyle's deepest regard and interest.

Besides these purely literary figures, he met a great number of the influential men of his time in both political and religious circles. Dr. Chalmers, the Dean of Winchester, and Thomas Erskine were the most important in the religious

world. For most of these men he had a sincere regard, his respect for their opinions depending largely on their sincerity in speech and action. In politics, he met the most prominent leaders of the Whig and Tory parties, Gladstone and Disraeli; but, while he felt a certain friendship for Disraeli, he was of the opinion that they were both insincere "Copper Captains," and were not the true leaders of England. In other countries too, he had several noted friends such as Emerson from America, who was his friend and disciple, and Mazzini of Sicily, besides Goethe of Germany of whose influence on him I have already spoken. However, among all these noted men, with the exception of Goethe, there was not one who had any influence over his thought or writings. His friendship for them in whatever degree it might have existed, while of a sincere and often admiring nature, had frequently a touch of patronage in it. His friendship was for them as men. They seldom had anything in common with his own thought except sincerity, unless they were his disciples. Thus he stood apart intellectually from his equals and contemporaries, ^{and} ^{fought} always ~~fighting~~ his own battles.

Still more important to a study of Carlyle's social writings and the spiritual teachings which permeates them, is a knowledge of the religious principles which governed his thought and actions. It is necessary to know his conception of God the All-wise, All powerful Ruler of this world, as the essential basis of all human life and action; and thence of

all society. It is the capacity for such faith in spiritual things which differentiates man from other gregarious animals for him. This belief is at the back of his repudiation of Darwin and the progress of science, which so marked his later years.

Carlyle was brought up a Presbyterian of the stern Covenanter type. As a child and youth he was imbued with all the essential Calvinistic doctrines of that religion, of which predestination, and a sense of a stern and just God as the controller and author of this universe remained with him throughout life. Even after his period of religious denial he was of the puritanical school in fundamentals, even though he seemed to give these ideas other expression than the conventional one. There are, however, various points in which he takes a more mystical outlook on the world than his fellow Presbyterians, for he ceased to follow any religious sect at length, and finally formulated his own religious beliefs to suit his needs.

Partly because of the influence of the then prevalent religious scepticism which was increased by fresh discoveries in science at this time, but chiefly because his own intense feeling for truth was against rigid church dogma, he fell a victim, about the time he finished college, to profound religious doubts as to the existence of God, or to the beneficence of His nature in relation to human affairs. Doubts such as these had been formulating themselves in his student days, and when he read the works of Gibbon, Voltaire, and the

French Encyclopaedistes a little later, they became more acute, threatening for some time to overthrow his entire religious and moral faith. After years of struggle, and with the aid of the German mystics, as already mentioned, he finally laid aside these doubts. He tells of the end of this struggle in Chapter VII Book II of Sartor Resartus, where he shows how he asserted his own individuality as a spiritual being, who could be superior to earthly evils. From this position he proceeded to a definite belief of his own in the existence of God and an ultimate purpose in human life, (as described in the "Everlasting Yea" of Sartor Resartus); although his position in such matters was somewhat different from the orthodox beliefs of his parents' faith.

In the first place Carlyle believes that man is essentially spiritual in nature. His true life is in spirit and not in matter. "So that this solid world after all is but an air image; our me is the only reality, and all is Godlike or God"¹ he says in one of his letters. At another time he points out "First that Man is Spirit, and bound by invisible bonds to all men."² This belief in the all-pervading spirituality of man's life is in accordance with all religions, but to Carlyle it was extraordinarily real, so much so, that in the first quotation we have his tendency to mysticism. Such beliefs were not merely casually accepted church creeds to him. They were vital facts of actual life. Furthermore ,

1 Froude, Life of Carlyle 1795- 1835; 1882, vol. 11, p. 84.

2 Sartor Resartus (Everyman Series); ^{Bk. I, ch. ix.} p. 45.

everything except this spiritual life was a symbol, unsubstantial and unreal, a semblance of that spiritual life which it portrayed. "This Dreaming, this Somnambulism is what we on Earth call Life; wherein the most indeed undoubtedly wander as if they knew right hand from left, yet they are only wise, who know that they know nothing."¹ Man's earthly life itself he believed to be an unreality. Therefore in the same strain we find "Prose, Decay, Contemptibility; there is in each sort Poetry also, and a reverend Worth. For matter were it never so despicable is Spirit, the manifestation of the Spirit"² and "All visible things are emblems."³ Thus to Carlyle, nature, man's earthly life, and all we know as actuality in this world are but temporary manifestations of the spiritual life which is eternal. It is this aspect of his belief that shows the spirit of mysticism which is characteristic of his inmost religious thought. In connection with the above beliefs is found his theory that miracles are merely the working of those laws of nature which are beyond our understanding. This is what he terms Natural Supernaturalism, in which miracles and the supernatural are but a working of the higher laws of Nature, or of God through Nature. Such is Carlyle's belief in the all powerful spiritual life in this world, which explains his insistence that God and the spiritual are necessarily the centre of man's life and of all human activity and relationship. To Carlyle, man's religion

Bk. I, ch. viii.
1 Sartor Resartus (Everyman Series); p. 40.

2 *ibid.*^{ch. x} p. 49.

3 *ibid.*^{ch. x} p. 54.

and his relation to God was the foundation of society; since, as has been said before, "man is bound by invisible bonds to all men," these bonds being spiritual. Without being in right relation to God, man cannot hope to recognise these spiritual bonds or to be able to live with his fellows in social harmony. If we sin against God, retribution will surely overtake us.¹ This for him was a fundamental law for society.

Carlyle was intensely sincere in all things. Hypocrisy, cant, and all untruth were worse to him than any other form of evil. They were, in fact, direct manifestations of the Devil. Naturally, then, any hypocrisy in religion, which is the outward manifestation of man's relation to God, would be especially intolerable to him. This hatred of insincerity is at the back of all Carlyle's social tirades. It was also what he believed to be at the basis of all the social evils and atheism of the mid-19th Century in England. Darwin's theories of the origin of man together with the general progress of natural science which was then being made, had upset the previous stability of men's religious creeds. The unrest caused by this upheaval in matters of faith gave Carlyle a feeling that man's belief in spiritual life was disappearing. This feeling gave rise to his outbursts against scientific progress. It was not science in which he necessarily disbelieved. It was the fatal influence which he felt that the

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets, Collected Works 1898, vol. 20, p. 288.
~~p. 288.~~

newly discovered scientific theories would have on man's religious belief, which troubled him; and it must be remembered that such beliefs in his opinion were necessary for the maintenance of healthy society.

He believed that in England, and likewise in Europe, religion had become hypocritical. He did not care about existing creeds. What mattered to him was that the individual man should believe whole heartedly in his own personal beliefs and act upon them sincerely.¹ This, he thought, Englishmen no longer did. Hence, from insincerity in religion came their insincerity in actions and because of this evil, man's social relationships were poisoned, whence the social evils of the time had their source. Thus to him both lack of religion, and insincere religion, were at the heart of England's social troubles, far more than was the Industrial Revolution, even as a man's lack of spiritual life influences his outward actions. If England would mend her social problems, she must first improve her spiritual life. She must put herself into right relations with God; she must find out His laws and follow them.

Carlyle was the spiritual prophet in an age of materialism. He came at the end of the 18th Century, the age of Scepticism and Reason, and was at the height of his powers when the evil effects of the Industrial Revolution were being felt most in English labour circles. Into this age of

Let. i,

1 Heroes and Hero-Worship (Everyman Series); p. 240.

materialism, unreformed, and weary of its accumulated social grievances, he brought his doctrine of spiritual healing; spiritual in the awakening of man's better nature, which he believed would produce a better understanding, man with man. In this great purpose he stood alone in his age as the pioneer, and free of outside influences. As such he preached his gospels of truth and sincerity, and of reverence for the basic spirituality of man's being. With these facts in mind, concerning his life and religion as related to his works on social reform, it is hoped that the study of his political, social, and educational doctrines will be more intelligible.

II

P O L I T I C A L R E F O R M

In 1831 Carlyle gives his definition of society as "the vital articulation of many individuals into a new collective individual."¹ Later in Past and Present he states what to him is the threefold need of any society, particularly of the society of his own time. First there is the need of a king, then the need of a system of order and government, and finally but most important of all, the need of God in industrial society, as in all society.² Government, a fulfillment of these three needs of society, is the relation between men which makes for order in the world, and such, by his program of political reform, he sought to make it.

Political Economy as he knew it was false and harmful. The Utilitarian school was most important in politics at this time. Its followers were materialists whose tendency was to destroy the life giving belief in God, which to him was the living essence of society. Benthamism, with its belief in the greatest happiness principle, was leaving out the stern spiritual laws of God which Carlyle said that man must follow whether they brought happiness or not. Bentham, the head of the Utilitarian school,

1 "Characteristics", *Scottish and Other Miscellanies* (Everyman ed.); p. 195.

2 *Past and Present*; Everyman ed., reprint 1915, Bk. iv, ch. 1, pp. 240-1.

believed that all men were born with plastic unimpressed minds. All had equal chances, and environment after birth was what made the differences between individuals. The senses only are born with men; hence pleasure and pain are the the criterions of morality, and the greatest happiness to the greatest number is the law which should govern relationships in politics and in society. John Stuart Mill, the other great political economist of this time, also accepted these principles, at the same time stressing the liberty of the individual to develop his own gifts, not for the good of society, or in order to be its leader, but simply for himself as an individual.

Utilitarianism as set forth by these two philosophers was the dominant guide in the political economy of the day. To Carlyle, however, they were ignoring the spiritual worth of the individual, and were tending to make politics mechanical by leaving out the belief in man's innate differences in capability, and regarding him merely as a machine to be moulded by material laws. Because of these tendencies he believed them to be false economists, for, at one time he says "Political philosophy should be a scientific revelation of the whole secret mechanism whereby men cohere together in society."¹ For him the secret mechanism was the workings of man's spiritual nature with God, and among his fellows. It will be seen from this, that his theories of political and

1 Froude, Life of Carlyle 1795-1835; 1882, vol.ii, p.78.

social reform are based primarily on the spiritual needs of man.

Government, then, must be built on a thorough understanding of man's higher sensibilities; those feelings which distinguish him from the beasts and make him human. "For man is not the creature and product of mechanism; but in a far truer sense its creator and producer: it is the noble People that makes the noble Government rather than conversely."¹ Carlyle believed that without considering this human and spiritual side of man, the government becomes mechanical and brutish; and when the unconsidered elements seek expression, that Government comes to grief. Over all man's practical actions, his soul has final predominance. This must be taken into account and allowed its proper function if the government is to be successful.

The greatest aids in recognizing this side of man and in understanding the laws of God and nature are absolute truthfulness and acknowledgment of fact. To recognize the importance of the spiritual we must ourselves be truthful to ourselves and to others, in all things. Unless we are so, we cannot understand or perceive the highest and best which should govern our relationship to others. We cannot see God's laws clearly and we will fail in everything of importance. Cant and hypocrisy are fatal diseases of all human relationships. In political relationships they show them-

¹"Signs of the Times," Scottish and Other Miscellanies; Everyman ed., p. 236.

selves in injustice which is merely a form of untruth. As such it is particularly disastrous.

At this point it is necessary to see what he believed to be the true relationship between man and man. He lived in an age when the rights of man and social laws were much talked of. As has been seen already, Bentham and Mill were the authors of the most popular theories of the period. Carlyle took quite the opposite view from theirs. They believed that all men were born equal. Carlyle believed that men are not equal in mental, spiritual, or physical qualities; and this for him was one of the laws of God. "Slave or free is settled in Heaven for man: acts of parliament attempting to settle it on earth for him, sometimes make sad work of it."¹ Therefore, since one man has greater mental and spiritual gifts,--greater wisdom, in other words,--it is natural that he should have the greatest right to govern. Wisdom, intellect, and spiritual insight are what enable a man to discern the laws of God, and therefore those laws which should operate in government. Having that greater wisdom its possessor must expend it to guide his less fortunate brother, who, under the decree of heaven, lacks the superior amount of wisdom necessary for divining the best way of life. This constitutes Carlyle's chief political doctrine,--that of government of the ignorant by the wise. In connection with this it must always be remembered that by "wise" he means not so much those who have been educated in book learning, but more

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works, 1898, vol. xx, p 248.

especially those who possess native intellect, and spiritual insight. By ignorant, he means those who lack this intelligence and insight.

All these ideas form the basis of his Hero worship, from which comes the second law of political relationship. This was that the man of lesser wisdom should recognize the other's superior wisdom, and render the latter reverence (Hero-worship) for those qualities. Thus by so doing he would acknowledge his superior's right to govern. Carlyle's own words show this clearly, "Surely of all the 'rights of men' this right of the ignorant men to be guided by the wiser, to be gently or forcibly held in the true course by him, is the indisputablest."¹

In this too lies man's true liberty. Mill states that the liberty of man consists in his free development without the restraining influence of social law and custom. Liberty, in the language of the political parties of the time, is personal liberty, especially as in sacredness of property rights. For Carlyle, however, it is not a state which comes from lack of external restraint, but is rather the conditions under which man can perform his life function most fully, and can work to the best advantage; under which he can develop to the fullest the best that is in him. He may have the wisdom to do this by himself, or he may be one of the ignorant who require guidance from without by those wiser than himself. In¹

¹ "Chartism," Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, vol iv; collected works 1899, vol xxix, p. 157.

his own words we find "The true liberty of a man you would say, consisted in his finding out or being forced to find out the right path, and walk thereon. To learn or to be taught, what work he actually was able for; and then by permission, persuasion, and even compulsion to set about doing same."¹ Liberty to Carlyle was freedom from the tyranny of his own ignorance of, and inability to choose what was best for himself.

These are two laws of God which, to Carlyle form the basis of his theory of Government. This theory is that it is the duty of the wise to take the reins of government, and of the ignorant to obey such government. "Intellect has to govern in this world; and will do it; if not in alliance with the so called 'Governments' of red tape and routine, then in divine hostility to such,"² and again in speaking of slavery, but really referring to all government he says, "Well except by Mastership and Servantship, there is no conceivable deliverance from Tyranny and slavery. Cosmos is not Chaos, simply by this one quality, that it is governed."³ This is the basis of all government for Carlyle. The superior in spiritual and intellectual things must govern in some way as by a law of God; this being the only way in which society can exist.

1 Past and Present; Everyman ed., reprint 1915, Bk. iii, ch. xiii, p. 204.

2 Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p. 130.

3 "The Nigger Question" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, vol. iv; collected works, 1899, vol. xxix, p. 362.

But if such is the law of God to mankind, there is one thing within human power which can disturb it, and that is injustice. He who is the Governor, the superior in wisdom should exercise his powers justly, otherwise that same law of God's, which insists on truth and justice is defied, and the scheme of social relationship will be destroyed. Sooner or later the man seeking guidance will realize the falsity of his superior, and at the same time the latter's lack of superior wisdom. Then in Carlyle's own phraseology, there will be Chaos instead of Cosmos, and government, the badge of human society as opposed to that of the beasts, will be nought.

Such are the principles upon which Carlyle based his scheme of political reform. First, by the law of God, men are not equal, and the inequalities are because of differences in mental and spiritual worth combined. Secondly, the ignorant, have the right to be governed by the intellectual superiors. Last of all, but most important to Carlyle, while it is the duty of the ignorant to obey his superior, it is likewise the duty of that superior to govern wisely and justly, or his claims for the title of governor cease to be valid. These to Carlyle are the unchangeable laws by which the government of man as a social animal and a human being must be carried out, and according to such principles he criticized the government of his time, and suggested such reforms as he believed would lessen the political evils of his day.

According to such theories, he suggests government by an

Aristocracy of Talent as the one remedy in politics.¹ But to appreciate his meaning in this, it is necessary to discuss more fully the character of the man of superior wisdom, who is to be the ideal Governor. We must see what, according to Carlyle, was his place in the consummation of political reform. Carlyle's Governor is the Hero of which he speaks so much. He is the King, in old English kenning, or "the one who knows," as Carlyle falsely takes the etymology of the word king to be. For him the hero is the ablest man, of the highest God-given endowments. Such a hero may show his heroic qualities in many ways according to his environment, and to his place in the progress of the human race. He may be regarded as a god as in Norse pagan times; or he may be a prophet as was Mahomet; a priest, as was Luther; a poet as was Dante or Shakespeare; or a man of letters; but the highest of all forms of the Hero is the King who is the commander over men.² The ability to lead men is the greatest of all gifts, for he who possesses it must possess the qualities which other forms of Heroism show. He must be priest, prophet, and poet, as well as commander of men. At least he must have the insight which these types of heroes possess.

This brings up the question of the definite qualities of Carlyle's Hero. First of all he must be sincere. He must look on all conditions of men and affairs fairly, and act

¹ Heroes and Hero Worship; Everyman ed., reprint 1921, ^{Lect. vi,} p. 453.

² Heroes and Hero Worship, Everyman ed., ^{Lect. vi,} p. 453.

towards them sincerely. He must be sincere in his attitude towards God, sincere to himself and sincere to his fellow-men. In relation to this first quality he says, "If he have not the justice to put down his own selfishness at every turn, and courage to stand by the dangerous true at every turn; how shall he know? His virtues all of them, will be recorded in his knowledge. Nature with her truth remains to the bad, to the selfish and the pusillanimous forever a sealed book."¹ Secondly he must have the God-given insight to read aright the meaning of all conditions about him, and to judge correctly in all matters of importance. Thus he says of his Hero, "Fearful and wonderful, real as life, real as death is this Universe to him. Though all men should forget its truth, and walk in vain show, he cannot. At all moments the Flame image glares in upon him, undeniably there, there! I wish you to take this as my primary definition of a great man."² The Hero is essentially the divinely inspired man who is able to discern the will of God, so as to walk by His laws, and lead others in them. This is Carlyle's ideal governor, who expresses clearly his conception of the "divine right of kings," but not in the accepted way as hereditary kingship.³ He is rather the man of talent and of worth wherever he may be found.

If the king is to be the greatest hero, chosen because

Lect. iii,

1 Heroes and Hero Worship; Everyman ed., 1921, p. 339.

2 Ibid. ^{Lect. iv,} p. 280.

3 Ibid. ^{Lect. iv,} p. 422.

he possesses the highest ability and the greatest insight, his counsellors in Government are likewise to be chosen for their heroic qualities. The King or Governor is to be helped by an "Aristocracy of Talent," or as Carlyle calls it at other times "a Corporation of the Best and Bravest." They must be men possessed of like qualities with their leader, in order to be able to sympathise with and advise him. They are to be the pick of the nation, to be the best according to the definitions of Heroism. Of such an aristocracy Carlyle says, "Whatsoever Aristocracy is still a corporation of the Best, is safe from all peril, and the land it rules is a safe and blessed land."¹ Such for Carlyle is the ideal governing body of any country, and such he would wish for England.

Actual conditions in England, to Carlyle's mind, were very far from such an ideal state. Government by the "Ablest" had ceased to be. The aristocracy of the land had become for Carlyle a "Phantasm" for two reasons. First because the aristocracy no longer possessed the high qualities of an Aristocracy of Talent. It was "no longer able to do its work, not in the least conscious that it has any work longer to do."² It had become an imaginary aristocracy of title without those powers which command the respect and reverence of the common people, whom it is God's law that the aristocracy should guide and govern. For this reason, we have our second

¹ "Chartism" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, vol. iv: collected works 1899, vol. xxix, p. 160.

² Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iii, ch. i, p. 135.

cause of the failure of the Aristocracy, for the people had ~~ceased~~ ceased to fulfill their function of reverencing their aristocracy or in fact any sort of wisdom whatever. Such wisdom had ceased to exist among men, and they had turned to something which did exist, that is to the material things of life, such as accumulating money and property. They were disregarding their higher nature so that hero-worship had changed to a soul killing worship of wealth (mammon-worship) which, if left, would destroy the heart of the nation.

This is a fairly true criticism of the conditions of the time. The aristocracy of England was hereditary, and a large proportion of the generation of that day no longer possessed the genuine qualities of leadership for which their forefathers had been knighted. The Industrial Revolution had changed the social conditions of the country. Money was more plentiful, and it was possible for those of the lower classes to accumulate ^{such as} large fortunes, had hitherto only been possible for the aristocracy. The aristocracy had lost much of its prestige in this way, and had become indifferent, indolent, or supercilious in their attitude to their duties as the governing body of the country. They refused to see the needs of the lower classes. The commons on the other hand had begun to realize that they could rise to a higher station in life through commercial enterprise. They were no longer dependent on the aristocracy, and hence no longer gave them the respect and loyalty which had been common before the Industrial Revolution. Wealth as the product of commerce was

the mark of the new aristocracy. Each class was striving against the other for the possession of such wealth, and the old interdependence and friendly relations between the different ranks of society was gone. For these reasons Carlyle's attacks on the absence of hero-worship and the existence of mammon worship in its stead were just, for these rivalries for wealth and position were being taken into political relationships in government, causing the various parties to lose sight of the true interests of the country.

Democracy had taken the place of the more aristocratic government of the Middle Ages, when some sort of hero-worship had existed. Carlyle attacks this condition of society bitterly. To him democracy means "despair of finding any Heroes to govern you, and contented putting-up with the want of them."¹ This lack of heroes is the cause of anarchy and revolution. Carlyle firmly believed that with the coming of democracy, a greater evil has been brought into man's life, for the reason that he has ceased to reverence his superior in government, thus abandoning a worship akin to religious worship, the symbol of a healthy state of soul. Thus lack of a true aristocracy affects man's spiritual life, and since the source is poisoned, all the activities and enterprises springing from that must be evil; hence the misery of the people and the failure of the government to bring about any

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed. 1915, Bk. iii, ch. xiii, p. 208.

better state of affairs. A law of God had been broken, and Carlyle says that "If we sin against God, it is most certain God's judgments will overtake us; and whether we recognize them as God's message like men, or merely rage and writhe under them like dogs; it is certain they will continue upon us, till we either cease 'sinning' or are all torn to pieces and annihilated."¹

England had not always been in this state of debased ~~so~~ government. In Past and Present, he gives us what, to him, is perhaps the ideal state of government, as it existed in the days of feudalism. The election of Samson as Abbot of St. Edmonds is for him an example of choosing the true governor in the proper fashion. Samson was chosen for his worth and ability. In choosing him, his fellows put aside any personal considerations or selfish motives. Because they were true men themselves, they chose him as the best man to be their leader. They chose him solemnly, seeking God's guidance in the matter, not lightly with election campaigns and bribery as was done in Carlyle's time. Then too, in early times, the nobles of England were chosen by the king because of their meritorious service to the state or to himself; and not for selfish mercenary or political reasons as now. This was the nearest approach to true government, in Carlyle's opinion, that England has ever had.

Government reform must come, then, first of all, by

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works, 1898, vol.xx, p. 298.

reforming the spiritual basis of government. The power of hero-worship, of honesty, and of sincerity must be reawakened in the people, so that they may be fit to distinguish clearly who is the best man to be their governor. In the second place the ablest man must exist and then must be chosen, no matter in what rank of society he is in. As to how this is to be done, Carlyle does not give us very clear directions. Certainly it is not to be by democratic vote of the majority. The most significant point which he makes in this respect is that every man should seek to bring himself into right relationship with God and His laws with proper sincerity. To Carlyle it is only the wise and the sincere who can discern the hero; and for this reason it is only these who should have the right to choose the Governor. The one practical hint which he gives in this respect, is that the leaders shall be chosen for ability discovered through education as is done in China, but this point will be discussed later in a chapter on education. Above all Carlyle believes the great need of England to be that there should be a true king and a genuine aristocracy rediscovered among her people. Of this he says "It is tragically evident to me, our first want, which includes all wants, is that of a new real Aristocracy of fact, instead of the extinct imaginary one of title which the anarchic world is everywhere rebelling¹ against." And again in the same tone he prophesies "That there will again be a King in Israel; a system of order and

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx p.263.

Government, and every man shall in some measure see himself constrained to do that which is right in the King's eyes."¹

Such is Carlyle's ideal program of government which he hoped in vain to see accomplished. He realized himself that such a program was impossible in the England of his time and under existing conditions. He believed that England would require a long painful period of time to return to any degree of spiritual life from the degrading conditions of selfish and material politics such as existed then. However, along with much violent criticism of existing political conditions, Carlyle sought to instil a certain amount of this spiritual reform. He endeavored to make the politicians feel that some step towards this must be made, and that the cause of discontent lay deeper than superficial reform might reach. To see how far he carried his program of reform into the practical needs of the country is the next step in outlining his program of political reform.

Parliament is one of the oldest institutions in the government of England. Great changes had been made in that body since the dawn of English parliamentary history. Carlyle naturally turned most of his attention to this outstanding institution of British politics in his endeavors to bring about a reform of vital institutions.

The history of the growth of parliament is briefly as follows. The original function of parliament was to advise

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed. 1915, Bk. iv, ch. i, pp. 240-1.

the king. The old Anglo-Saxon witenagemot was a body of noble men brought together for this purpose. Such too was parliament as instituted by Edward I in 1295. It was essentially aristocratic, and its powers were entirely subordinate to those of the king in position and authority. It continued thus through the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries. During the 17th Century, the Puritan Revolution took place under Cromwell, but this affected the position of parliament very little. It was not until the 18th Century, under weaker kings and nobles, that the people began to seek greater authority in matters of government through parliament. Lord Chatham, the elder Pitt, and William Pitt the younger, in the latter half of the 18th Century, were outstanding in the agitation for a more complete representation of the people. Finally in Carlyle's own day parliamentary reform and modern enfranchisement began to have being. The Reform Bill of 1832 redistributed the representation and enlarged the number of voters through the £10 franchise, thus increasing the power of the middle classes. Further Political Reforms in 1867 and 1884 gave the franchise to every householder, and changed the representation still more, so that the middle and lower classes had the controlling voice in Parliament. These later reforms do not come under Carlyle's writings on parliamentary conditions but he saw the tendency in 1832 and resented it fiercely.

Parliament for Anglo-Saxon and Medieval England had been entirely in the hands of the aristocracy who were completely

subservient to the king. This was to Carlyle an aristocracy of worth. As portrayed in Book II of Past and Present this parliament shows the ideal relationship between king and aristocracy. In his own time, on the other hand, the voice of authority had changed position entirely. Parliament as the instrument of democracy had usurped the authority of the king and aristocracy. It is true that he did not see much evidence of an aristocracy of worth existing in his own time, but the chief problem to him was that the function of parliament has shifted from that of advisor to the king and his authority, to taking the place of that authority itself; and he does not believe that the British parliament fulfills, or is capable of fulfilling this new function.¹

The true function of parliament as an advisory board to the King or chief Governor is to express its opinion. It is the talking apparatus of the nation. Parliament's fulfillment of this function Carlyle believes to be indispensable to good government.² It must not, however, talk for the sake of talking alone. It must have an opinion worth giving, and it is primarily on this point that he criticised the British parliament of his day. Speech as speech without meaning or sincerity, has become the curse of parliament as of all organizations of the country. The volubility of the press, and the power of a glib tongue in a politician rule in all departments of thought, and hinder judgment of the opinion

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p. 224.

² *ibid.* p. 194.

given. The "Unfettered Press", which he calls the "Fourth Estate of Parliament", plays a great role in political judgments, chiefly for the worse in Carlyle's opinion. Then too, the absence of any Hero king as leader gives parliament and the perpetrators of the above foolishness scope for their activities. Furthermore, those who pretend to be the leaders in government are insincere and ruled by the love of money. Not only the politicians, but all men have become insincere. In Latter Day Pamphlets he says "What we have to complain of, is that all men are become Jesuits. That no man speaks truth to you or to himself,"¹ and later in the same book "But as to Parliament, again and its eligibility, if attainable, there is yet no question anywhere; the ingenuous soul, if possessed of money capital enough is predestined by the parental and all manner of monitors to that career of talk."² Politicians have lost the first attribute of a true man, namely, sincerity; and moreover they are chosen not for their inherent worth but because of wealth and hereditary position. It is the existence of bribery and insincerity so rife in English politics, both among the politicians themselves and in the press, that Carlyle feels to be the greatest curse of parliament whatever its function.

As opposed to this state of affairs Carlyle would have the reformed parliament composed of members chosen from all ranks of society for their wisdom and sincerity, rather than

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p. 309.

² *ibid.* p. 189.

from a limited aristocratic class, who do not now necessarily possess the worthiness of their forefathers. Neither were they to be chosen because of their financial position, as was becoming the case at this time. They were to be men of true worth no matter in what class of society they were to be found, or how little wealth they possessed. This doctrine was entirely contrary to the then prevalent ideas of class distinction and of class government. It was neither flattering to the titled aristocracy of the land, nor to the new class of capitalists and factory owners who were beginning to feel an equal right with the aristocracy to the control of the government. It shows, however, the one point of Carlyle's radical sympathy with the lower classes in his program of government reform. It is especially in keeping with his desire to reform the soul of all English manhood, as foundation for political reform. Without the existence of men who are sincere and wise who may be chosen, and sincere men to do the choosing, no amount of balloting and enlarged franchise will choose the right members of parliament. "In the long run," he says, "every Government is the exact symbol of its People with their wisdom and unwisdom; we have to say like People, like Government."¹ The failure of the English parliament at that time to satisfy the people and to carry out the necessary reforms for the people's welfare, shows the unwisdom of that Parliament and also the unwisdom of the people through

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed. 1915, Bk. iv, ch. iv, p. 259.

their choice of governors. Only by renewed sincerity and the cultivation of true wisdom and spiritual insight would such conditions be amended, and a true parliament of King's advisors be chosen.

Carlyle takes great exception to the prevalent mode of choosing such men by ballot. The supposed purpose of enlarging the number of voters was to increase the chances of choosing the best and most representative leader. The political tendency of the period was to have universal suffrage as the best method of finding the ablest man. The reform agitation between the years 1828-1832, which ended in the Reform Bill of 1832, was all in this direction. Originally the franchise had been granted only to a limited circle of the aristocracy and more or less influential land owners and churchmen. This custom had not been changed to any great degree since medieval times. The Industrial Revolution, however, had altered the centres of population, so that the representation was no longer according to the population of the districts, as it had been relatively before that time. The redistribution of members and enlarged franchise granted in the Reform of 1832 was a long step towards democracy such as has been realized in later years.

To Carlyle, however, this extension of franchise would not be conducive to a choice of better leader. Rather the opposite would be the case, since in accordance with his views on the inherent inequalities of men, some men are wise while others are unwise, and only the wise have the insight

to choose the true leaders. Of this he says "Are not two men stronger than one; must not two voters carry it over one? I answer no, nor two thousand, nor two million--Many men vote, but in the end, you will infallibly find, none counts except the few who were in the right."¹; and again "No people or populace, with never such ballot boxes, can select such a man for you. Only the man of worth can recognize worth in men."² Most men do not possess the proper amount of wisdom. Hence by enlarging the franchise so as to include the masses, the proportion of unwise or useless votes is made to largely exceed the number of wise ones.

The true voter is the man who is spiritually free, who is wise and also obedient to the laws of the Universe. From this idea of the wise and free, comes Carlyle's belief in the rights of the minority being superior to the rights of the majority, because the minority with their God-given wisdom have the insight to choose aught, while the majority, being without such wisdom would choose wrongly. "The free man is he who is loyal to the Laws of this Universe, who in his heart sees and knows across all contradictions that injustice cannot befall him here. The first symptom of such a man is not that he resists and rebels, but that he obeys."³ As has been said before, freedom to Carlyle means obedience to the laws of God in this Universe, and hence to the will of the

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p. 245.

² *ibid.* p. 141.

³ *ibid.* p. 237.

just and wise ruler. It is only when the ruler is unjust and unwise, that the common man has any right to revolt. Voting and enfranchisement mean very little to Carlyle, since once the Heroic Governor is found, man's one rule in politics is obedience to him as to a superior.

The only purpose of value which Carlyle sees in elections in the form which they take in modern democracy, is to give the Governor an insight into the state of public opinion on various political questions. In his own words we find him saying, "Beyond a doubt it will be useful, will be indispensable, for the King or Governor to know what the mass of men think upon public questions, legislative and administrative, what they will assent to willingly, what unwillingly; what they will resist with superficial discontents and remonstrances, what with obstinate determination, with riot, perhaps with armed rebellion, . . . To which end, Parliaments, Free Presses, and such like are excellent; they keep the Governor fully aware of what the People wisely or foolishly think."¹ This does not imply that the Governor is to follow the voice of the people in all decisions. If to his superior wisdom their decision is foolish, Carlyle's statement indicates that it is the Governor's duty to act contrary to the popular decision. This is the autocratic side of Carlyle's theory of Government. In his belief in the right of the wise, of every class to rule he is democratic, but in the method by which the wise shall rule he is entirely autocratic.

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p. 240.

One may ask how far this has come to pass since Carlyle wrote the Latter Day Pamphlets in 1850. Certainly as far as administrative matters are concerned, it is only the broad and simplified issues which are put before the people at an election.¹ The technical details and actual working out of such matters are left in the hands of the Government leaders and experts. Then too, once those leaders are elected to office, they do not necessarily follow the voice of elections in every detail, if the people's² wishes go contrary to what appears to be the best policy as they see it with their technical experience and more intimate knowledge of conditions. This disregard of popular vote now appears to be an abuse in government at times, but in these two points Carlyle's plan has been tacitly accepted with regard to the extent of the control exercised by elections. Our leaders are still elected by the masses, but the wisdom of this is sometimes questioned, when oratory and personal prejudice are seen to sway the populace against their better judgment if taken as individuals.

Then too, in Carlyle's time, the masses of English working men were utterly ignorant according to the common meaning of that word. Compulsory education for all had not yet been enforced or so much as thought advisable. The first definite step in this direction was the Education Act of 1870, twenty years after Carlyle wrote concerning the lack of wisdom displayed by the masses. Even then very little had been done.

¹ MacCunn, *Six Radical Thinkers*; 1910, p. 153.

It is little wonder then, that he does not see the possibility of the whole population being able to take an intelligent stand in politics. He does believe, however, in the efficacy of education in such matters, although he does not see all its possibilities in the way of increasing popular wisdom. It is nevertheless, almost the sole practical suggestion which he offers in matters of political reform.

In spite of all our education of the masses, he does speak for the evils of this generation as well as for those of his own, when he attacks the failings of politicians. Their insincerity, their selfishness, their love of meaningless oratory, and their liability to bribery in office, are unfortunate traits which have not yet been entirely uprooted. What is really worth while, in his program of political reform is his proclamation of the need of a change in the hearts of all men, and especially in the case of the leaders, whereby they might be turned to truth, sincerity, wisdom in God's universal laws, and to a sense of the seriousness of their position among their fellows. Carlyle says in speaking of government, "Who's to decide it? . . . why thou and I, and each man into whose living soul the Almighty has breathed a gleam of understanding, . . . and woe will befall us, each and all, if we don't decide it aright according as the Almighty has already decided it."

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works, 1898, vol. xx, p. 234.

Such is the important note in Carlyle's plan of reform in England's Government. It is now necessary to see what changes he proposed to make in that Government's Foreign and Colonial Policy,--that institution which deals with those relations which the country has with the world outside its own insular borders. Interest in colonies was very low at this time, while an aggressive foreign policy was the main purpose of the Government. People in England thought the Colonies were a great expense and worry, rather than an asset to the country, and accordingly rather neglected colonial needs. In 1837 the people of Canada rose in rebellion because of lack of just self-government and threatened to join United States. England as a whole was very indifferent as to what happened to the Colony. On the other hand they felt that they must maintain their position of supremacy among the nations of Europe, especially after the recent Napoleonic struggle. This foreign rivalry may have had a certain effect on the colonial policy, by inducing the mother country to keep the colonies for pride's sake, when otherwise they would have let them go as useless possessions. This indifference towards the colonies was fairly marked from 1820 to 1860 especially. Under Disraeli a policy of strong imperialism in foreign relationships was inaugurated. During these years Carlyle was the exponent of the opposite theory. To him the Colonies were much more important than an aggressive foreign policy in Europe, and as a social reformer he was intensely interested in their welfare and in keeping them loyal to the crown.

With the hope of changing this policy he attacked the

Government at Downing Street where are situated the Foreign and Colonial Offices. Sloth and misdirected effort are the two evils most apparent to him in these offices as is shown in the following passage "that the work, such as it may be, is ill-done in these establishments - delayed, neglected, slurred over, committed to hands that cannot do it well . . . Or second what is still fataler, the work done there may itself be quite the wrong kind of work." ¹ Here again he implies the value of his doctrine, that the man of worth should be in charge, since the present occupants of Downing Street are neither capable of doing the work before them, nor have they the insight to see what work should really be done.

This statement was especially true of the Colonial Office which, in Carlyle's opinion, dealt with questions which were not in its field, and which should have been left to the Colonies themselves. Here he perhaps has in mind the cause of the American Revolution and also the Canadian situation as it then stood. Colonies to Carlyle were a divine gift, and as such should be respected. He connects our right to the Colonies with his doctrine of 'might is right.' His views on this subject frequently seem to be conflicting, but if one looks deep enough he will see that they are connected closely with his feeling for God's divine guidance in all affairs of this world. 'Might is right' he often says, but just as frequently he points out that "right is might", in the sense

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p.95.

that might which is able to persist for a long time must be the will of God, and hence the right, as in the case of the Norman Conquest. Thus at one time he says "that all goes by wager-of-battle in this world; that strength well understood is the measure of all worth. Give a thing time, if it can succeed, it is the right thing."¹ Tyranny does not appeal to Carlyle's freedom-loving soul any more than to any one else, but to him "might is right" is God's law proved by survival. Tyranny and the temporary survival of "mights" prove their wrongness by their short life. Carlyle fails, however, to take into account the injustice and terrible cost to humanity which is usually involved in proving whether the "might" is right or wrong. Moreover, since the "might" is frequently wrong, the cost of proving it so according to Carlyle's method usually proves a great menace to society, as in the case of the late war. That the "mights" of this world are usually tested thus by survival is, on the whole, true, in spite of the injustice involved, and in this Carlyle proves his insight into human nature.

In connection with the colonies "might is right," regarding their possession, to that extent which our forefathers through their valour have been able to conquer the new lands and make them of more value. This is the law which gives any man rights of possession to land. If he has the might to conquer that land and make it more valuable in the

1 Heroes and Hero-worship; Everyman ed. 1921, p. 373.

light of society's need, then he has proved his right to hold that land by might if necessary, so long as he is making the best use of it. With this idea in mind it follows that we should be unworthy of the heritage of our ancestors, if we did not keep the colonies and make the best use of them. "If any Governor contrive to cut off the Colonies, or any real right the big British Empire has in colonies, both he and the British Empire will bitterly repent it one day . . . Tasks colonial and domestic, which are of an eternally divine nature . . . have been assigned to this nation."¹ Such is Carlyle's opinion of the worth of the Colonies, and the duty of Britain to retain them.

Of existing affairs in colonial administration he picks out two points as of special significance. First the Colonial Office in London decides upon questions which should be decided in the Colonies themselves as has already been noticed. Secondly, following the Durham Report of 1838 on Canada, this colony was given, in 1838, one of the hated democratic constitutions, a bait to maintain peace for the time, but which did not touch the root of the matter. Following this act the Government indemnified the rebels, which was a piece of gross injustice to Carlyle's way of thinking. To remedy these evils, Carlyle would have, first of all, a permanent Governor of the Hero type, who would be qualified to carry out the administration of colonial affairs without

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1896, vol. xx, p. 152.

constantly referring to the office in England. Such a governor with a reformed parliamentary council as already suggested for England herself would constitute the Government of any colony, though in this case it was applied especially to Canada. Permanence in the governor's position, and true insight in the man who holds it would do much, he believed, to remove the misunderstandings which then existed, and would thus control too great a tendency to democracy, while it would also obviate unnecessary interference from the Colonial Office.

At the same time Carlyle saw into the future conditions of the Colonies with rare insight. He foresaw the mixed population which was to come to Canada. He agrees with the suggestion for high money and property qualifications for voters in order to eliminate from the ballot list the floating population of foreign extraction whose loyalty to British Government is as yet questionable; but he questions whether this will not exclude some possible wisdom from the poorer people. He also recommended a transcontinental railway as a link between the different parts of the Colony, thirty-five years¹ before such a railway was built.

Many of these things have been accomplished in Canada since Carlyle's time, in a way which he would possibly approve. Not one but three transcontinental railways have been built. Our foreign population must wait until they have been

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol. xx, p. 156.

educated in our customs, and have gained sufficient loyalty to their adopted country before they are allowed to vote, though it is not by money qualifications that they are kept from this privilege. Universal suffrage, while contrary to Carlyle's scheme of government, has been adopted and any possible waste of wisdom among voters has thus been eliminated. It is true that we have not a permanent governor, nor has our governor the authority which Carlyle would have wished to see him have, but responsible government has been introduced, though again contrary to Carlyle's autocratic theories of government, by which the Colony's problems are decided by the Colony, so that petty interference from the Colonial Office is obviated. For the most part he saw clearly the needs of the colonies at that time, and helped by his sympathy and fearless recommendations to bring about a better understanding with regard to the strained relations between the colonies and the mother country at the same time, ^{by} stirring England to a sense of their value.

He believed that the foreign policy of the kingdom was no less at fault than the colonial policy. The Foreign Office should exist to look after the protection of the country against foreign interference with its rights, and to regulate its interests with those of other countries. Such are the accepted duties of the Foreign Office. Carlyle attacked the manner in which these duties were carried out. He maintained that the Foreign Office was instigating too many foreign wars, merely to feed the national pride. To him no war since Oliver Cromwell's Puritan War against Catholic Spain has been truly

necessary.¹ War against the French Revolution was useless, as being against the will of God. The French were justified in ridding themselves of a sham aristocracy. Protection is the only just cause of war, especially protection of trade and of colonies. The latter he believes to be ours by the will of God; therefore it is just that we should fight for them. This appears contradictory to his statement that war should be only for protection, but here again comes his idea of might being in the end right. After all the colonies are a part of Britain and as such must be protected. He also means, however, that new colonies are to be acquired, by fighting if necessary. In speaking of war in general he says "I care little for the sword. I will allow a thing to struggle for itself in this world, with any sword or tongue or implement it has or can lay hold of . . . very sure that it will in the long run conquer nothing which does not deserve to be conquered."² We may justly fight for our rights in colonies for self-protection and for trade. If we are right we will succeed, but to deliberately interfere in the rights of other nations for the sake of forcing our political beliefs on them, as in the case of the war with France during the French Revolution, is not the function of the Foreign Office.

Besides this, too much money is spent on armaments and defense in peace time. The army and navy are maintained in

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works 1898, vol.xx, p.145.

² Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed. 1915, ^{Lect. II} p.296

idleness as an expense to the workers of the country. This is the great evil which is due to the policy of the Foreign Office. To reform this, he suggested that every man should be trained as a soldier in order that he might defend his country when the need arose, but that in peace time all soldiers should be turned to industrial and agricultural work to produce, rather than to consume what others provide. The navy, instead of remaining as an idle show, is to be engaged in commercial traffic over all the world. Idleness in any man or any body of men is evil to Carlyle, hence his hatred of idle soldiery in peacetime.

He forgets, however, that there is a necessity for vigilance on the part of any country. He presupposes that between wars the nations shall make no attempts to get the better of one another or to gain one another's possessions. He allows for no armaments or soldiery to guard the nation's commerce and possessions during peace time. He forgets that protection, or at least visible evidence of power to protect, is necessary before commerce can exist. The nations are to be in an ideal state of peace and such an ideal condition in national affairs has not yet become possible in this world. Justly, however, he condemns the maintenance of a large standing army in idleness. Only those actually required for protection should be kept in arms. The others, except for training, should be allowed to work.

Carlyle's program of political reform made little impression on the proceedings of government at the time of

writing. Democracy continued to grow and is still growing. His greatest mistake was that he did not appreciate the strength of the growing power of democracy. He did not realize that the time was coming when all men would be educated sufficiently to have a right to a voice in matters of government. He fails to see that his hero, if found, would have so much superior wisdom that he would fail to tolerate the newly awakened lesser wisdoms of the masses, and thus would appear to the people as a tyrant rather than as a hero. He believed that all men will find their satisfaction in life by developing in the same manner and in accordance to the will of one man. He did not allow for any differences in mode of action between one man and another. They must all acquiesce to the one man's will. This is where his conception of a Hero as governor fails under the new system of universal education and scientific enlightenment.

His argument that universal suffrage involves the question of lower intelligence;--that in spite of education the masses will choose "^{Jabesh} ~~Jehiel~~ Windbag" instead of the man of worth--has some real value. The problem today is still how to avoid this popular weakness in elections, nor has the answer yet been found. Science and democracy have full sway and are likely to have for some time. The fact that only the larger and simpler questions are now put before the public mitigates this evil to a certain extent. Carlyle's suggestion as to the scope of such questions has become an actuality,

and certain prophecies concerning the government of colonies have also come true. The greatest point, however, in his outline of political reform is his insistence upon truth, sincerity, and justice as essentials in the realm of political activity. He insists on the existence of these qualities in the individual's life, in the relationship between individual's life, in the relationship between individuals, and above all in that body which is to control the destiny of the nation. This is the doctrine by which Carlyle will do most good in politics at all times if only heeded. Like Plato, he desires "a return to purer manners, nobler laws, with the best men in the state to regulate them."¹ His real value as a reformer lies in his stressing of the ideal elements, rather than in his practical reforms.

¹ Nichol - "Carlyle"; English Men of Letters Series, 1881, p.229.

III

S O C I A L R E F O R M

If Carlyle is extremely vague and ideal in his program of political reform, he is not less ideal in his social reform, though not so vague in specific instances. Just as he detested the Political Economy of his day, so he hated the social and industrial economics then in vogue. Bentham, Mill, Ricardo, and Malthus were his contemporaries in economic thought, and these were all contrary to Carlyle's more spiritual ideals of reform. Bentham claimed that "the greatest happiness principle" was the basis of men's code of ethics. The sum of the greatest number of happinesses was the greatest good to be accomplished in society. Men therefore were primarily selfish in their actions, since pleasure (happiness) and pain were their guides in conduct. Thus he was leaving out the idea of God as the controlling force in human conduct, which to Carlyle was most important. Mill also accepted Bentham's theories, at the same time insisted that man can attain his highest development only through leisure,¹ work being an activity of a lower form. This was in direct opposition to Carlyle's belief in work as the highest and only God-given function of man in this world. Malthus and Ricardo, equally odious in Carlyle's sight as "professors of the Dismal Science," were more practical in their suggestions. Both

1 Neff - Carlyle and Mill; 1924, p. 35.

upheld the happiness principle of Bentham's philosophy. In addition to this principle Malthus proposed to improve conditions by birth control and a system of high tariffs against foreign food stuffs. Ricardo maintained that the interests of the landlord were opposed to those of any other class and that participation in rights of property, wealth, and government, should belong exclusively to the labouring classes. These principles are again contrary to Carlyle's belief in the spiritual inheritance of man, and the right of the aristocratic hero to govern the lower classes. For to Carlyle the interests of the aristocracy and those of the labouring classes must be united rather than remain permanently opposed, and he also advocates the abolition of high food tariffs such as the Corn Laws. In these points he was entirely opposed to the practical principles of his fellow economists.

All the social economists of the time believed men to be born equal, with minds like a blank page. To them, man was an animal who could be moulded by education and trained by social law. They left out the spiritual inheritance of man entirely, which to Carlyle was the basis of man's nature in the varying degrees in which it was inherited, as a gift from God, the Maker. He did not deny that social conditions were evil; that the division of wealth was unjust; or that the aristocracy of the land was idle and useless, but he sought to reform these conditions from a different standpoint from that taken by the economists. Reform was not to be accomplished by curtailing the birth rate or doing away with the

aristocracy, but rather by a reawakening of the better nature in every class and in every man. This would enable the different classes to come into right relations with each other, and so to cooperate in doing the world's work.

As has already been pointed out in the previous chapter, Carlyle believed that the laws of human relationship were based upon a proper cooperation between the more highly gifted men as leaders, and the less gifted ones as the workers and followers; through loyal obedience to and worship of these superiors on the part of the less gifted. The above mentioned economists insisted, on the other hand, on the equality of all men, and hence on the institution of government in the form of democracy with recognition of equal social status of all classes. On the other hand it is Carlyle's belief that social economy should deal with the laws which hold men together in society, of which the theory of equality is not one, since it cuts asunder those interdependencies and relationships which bind man to man, by making him believe himself the equal of his fellow men and therefore independent. Man is admittedly a gregarious animal who cannot live in isolation, hence Carlyle says, "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."¹ Society for him is an organic whole, which must have a head as well as feet and

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed. 1915, Bk. iv, ch. vi, p. 275.

and hands, and whose happiness depends on a harmonious working together of the different members, each according to its proper function.

Man's social liberty, he believes, does not come from being independent of his fellow-beings, but through the proper functioning of the feelings of obedience to and worship of his superiors. The desire of man at this time was to be emancipated from the control of his fellows, such as the Aristocracy, the Capitalists, and Mill Owners; but such liberty would not obviate the fact that he was still the slave of his own ignorance and uncontrolled passions, for, says Carlyle to the common man, "Thou art the thrall, not of Cedric the Saxon, but of thy own brutal appetites and this scoured dish of liquor."¹ Society is based on this interrelation of degrees of respect between men and between classes of men. "He that is the inferior of nothing, can be the superior of nothing, the equal of nothing"² says Carlyle in speaking of the doctrine of equality. At another time he states, "Society is founded on Hero Worship. All dignities of rank, on which association rests are what we may call a Hero-archy . . . Society everywhere is some representation, not insupportably inaccurate of the graduated Worship of Heroes;- reverence and obedience done to men really great and wise."³ This is correct, in spite of

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk.iii, ch.xiii, p.210.

² Sartor Resartus; Everyman ed., 1921, Bk.iii, ch.vii, p.188.

³ Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed., 1921, Lect.1, p.249.

the existence of so called democracy, and theories of liberty and equality of Carlyle's day, and since; for even in democracy, do we not nominate a man for office more or less because we respect him for certain qualities which we believe him to possess more than we? Such, then, is the only basis on which crumbling society can rebuild itself in Carlyle's eyes; and in order that such feelings of obedience and worship should operate properly, he believes that the spiritual side of man must be active. It must not be deadened by lust for wealth and by pride of social position, but must be cultivated and allowed to discriminate as to what are the best things in life, regardless of the dictates of caste. In this Carlyle is again stressing the necessity of the inward spiritual reform of man for the sake of better social relationships as well as for reform in politics.

If the soul or spiritual life of man is the mainspring of ^{his} life, work must be the outward manifestation of that life. This is Carlyle's belief, known as the "Gospel of Work" which he offers as a basic principle in social and industrial reform. Accomplished work is the end and reward of man, since work well done is the greatest and most useful memorial which he can leave behind him. This alone proves the worth of the man. ² Work too is a remedy which will help man to rid himself of his difficulties and ennui. An idle man is prone to all kinds of folly and mistakes in life. The man without

¹ Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed., 1921, Lect. 1, p. 252.

² Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iii, ch. v, p. 152

work,--both he who must starve without it, and the rich man who is bored without it,--is in the worst position possible, both for himself and for society. "The most unhappy of all men is the man who cannot tell what he is going to do, who has got no work cut out for him in the world, and does not go into it. For work is the grand cure of all the maladies and miseries that ever beset mankind,--honest work, which you intend getting done."¹

Since man is unhappy without some definite work to do, Carlyle preached his gospel of work as a panacea for the social unrest and unhappiness of his time. He saw that the poor man without work was unhappy, because in his case lack of work meant doing without his daily bread. The rich man and the aristocrat without work were unhappy because they had nothing worth-while to take up their attention and were bored in consequence. It was a still greater evil that the men of neither class were fulfilling their life function. The poor man was not producing anything either for himself or for the world's benefit. The idle rich and idle aristocracy were worse, for they were not only failing to fulfill their function in the serious work of leadership but they were unwilling to do so. The poor man was at least willing to work if he was allowed. Both classes were taking from the world without giving in return, which condition is absolutely against the laws of Heaven. The ideal remedy for such a state of unhappy

¹ "Inaugural Address" Scottish and Other Miscellanies: Everyman ed.,¹⁹²³ p. 148.

idleness, would be that every man should know what his work is in life, and to do it according to Carlyle.¹ But, since man is not able to know exactly what his life work is in most cases, Carlyle says that the best thing to do is to work at whatever is immediately at hand, with all our intellectual and physical energy, in hopes that by so doing we shall see more clearly into what shall be our ultimate life duty.

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might."²

"Do the Duty which lies nearest thee, which thou knowest to be a Duty! Thy second Duty will already have become clearer . . . Up, up! Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might. Work while it is called Today: for the Night cometh, wherein no man can work!"³ This is Carlyle's chief doctrine in his "Gospel of Work." By doing the work that is nearest to us to the best of our ability, our next step in life will be made clearer. If each one, whether rich or poor, does all his work in this spirit, the rich man will not be bored, and the poor man will not suffer from want or be forced to do without work in consequence of the rich man's idleness.

Society can only be reformed by a recognition of the innate spiritual qualities which differentiate man from the beasts, and the sincerity of those recognized qualities must be proved in practice by honest work on the part of each individual whether rich or poor. These two principles are the

¹ "Characteristics" Scottish and Other Miscellanies; Everyman ed.,¹⁹²³ p. 198.

² *ibid.* p. 222.

³ Sartor Resartus; Everyman ed., 1921, Bk. 11, ch. ix, p. 148.

are the bases of Carlyle's suggestions for Social Reform.

Carlyle was more interested in the lives of the middle class and of the peasants, than he was in those of the aristocracy. The peasant class was the class with which he was familiar,--the one from which he himself had sprung. He understood their weaknesses and their needs much more clearly than those of the higher classes, for he had lived among them. For this reason he failed to understand the position of the aristocracy as well as that of his own class, nor was he so fair to them in his criticism of political and social conditions. His sympathies were with the workmen and the poor. The injustice which they met with from those in a higher station in life, and the miseries of their lot aroused his indignation to its highest pitch. His whole program of social reform is formulated with a view to bettering the conditions of the lower classes, who, he believed, were the foundation of the Empire. Because of this inherited sympathy he was almost entirely democratic in his social reform, and certainly quite radical for his day.

It is now necessary to look into those conditions leading up to Carlyle's Reform. Before 1750, England was largely an agricultural country with much the same social conditions as had existed in the Age of Elizabeth. The majority of the people lived on the land, as small farmers or as tenants on the farms of the large landowners. They tilled their small plots of ground and wove or spun in their spare time. The two occupations combined gave them their living. Neither did

the distribution of the population change; since the same families remained in one place from generation to generation. There was very little change in the comforts of life, or progress in methods of industry or agriculture. All spinning, weaving, and industrial work was done by hand in the homes of the peasants.

With the invention of the flying shuttle by Kay in 1733, and still more so with that of Hargreave's spinning jenny (1764), of Arkwright's water-frame (1769), and of Crompton's mule in 1779, the textile industry was entirely revolutionized. James Watt's invention of the steam engine in 1769 enlarged the scope and speed of production in all industry, by making the use of power possible instead of hand labour as formerly had been the case. Cotton, woollen, and iron industries, were the most affected.

With the coming of this Industrial Revolution in the latter half of the 18th Century the conditions of the lives of the workers were greatly affected, and the effects of the change were becoming most apparent in the first part of the 19th Century, when Carlyle was rising to the height of his powers as an author. The hand weavers were no longer able to compete with the new power looms, and, as a result of this change the peasants, who had formerly worked on their own small farms, were now forced to give up their homes, and to migrate to the larger towns for employment in the new factories. The repeal of the Cottages Act in 1775, and the Acts for Enclosure during the last half of the century, forced

this migration from country to town still further so that by 1790, the class of yeoman farmers and industrial peasants who, at the beginning of the Century had formed one quarter of the rural population, had disappeared from the country.

The output of the industries was largely increased while the production of food stuffs decreased. During the War with France between 1793 and 1815 there was a lively demand for the industrial output, except during the period of Napoleon's Continental System. At the end of the Napoleonic War in 1815, however, the market failed, and a general state of post-war depression existed, aggravated by the enactment of the Corn Laws. Machine breaking and riots showed the discontent and misery of the people and the government did nothing to alleviate these conditions. They believed in a policy of laissez-faire, by which the factory owners and landlords were allowed to fix wages and prices to suit their own convenience without thinking of the welfare of the workers. The government believed that these things would adjust themselves in time without interference. They preferred to institute a system of Poor Laws for the unfortunate workman, which, far from improving conditions, only tended to degrade those for whom it was made.

The factory owners were allowed to do as they pleased with regard to such matters as wages and workmen's living conditions, and consequently they became selfish, and thought only of accumulation wealth. This is the first of the ills of England which Carlyle attacked. He maintained that the

mill owners had lost their sense of humanity and worshipped mammonism entirely. They strove for greater production and greater profits and did not seek to make sure of a just distribution of their products. This caused the evil of over-production, which is the second evil of the industrial world to which Carlyle turns his attention. Moreover the industrial employers did not seek to look after the welfare of their employees in such a way that the conditions of employment might be mutually helpful. The workers were employed from day to day and their only recompense was a small cash wage. Nomadism and cash payment were the two evils which Carlyle saw in the employment system of his time. The lower classes were working under great injustices in these respects and this feeling of injustice on their part was at the basis of all their discontent.¹ Carlyle saw that they were regarded as so many beasts of burden rather than human beings while the aristocracy and government, who should have had their people's welfare at heart did nothing to alleviate matters, but followed their own pleasure. Here, as always, Carlyle saw that what was really needed was the recognition of the spiritual side of humanity, and a reform of mankind in that respect in all classes. Justice and spiritual development are the basis of all social and industrial reform. The Captain of Industry must turn from his mammonism and realize his human responsibilities for his fellows, and the workmen must cease to regard them-

¹ "Chartism" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 1899, vol. iv; collected works, vol. xxix, p. 144.

selves as beasts, and act towards their employers as responsible men and honest workers. Until this inner realization of responsibility is somehow accomplished in each man, very little of real value can be done in practice. "The first beginning of a remedy is that some one believe a remedy possible; believe that if he cannot live by truth, then he can die by it. Dost thou believe it? Then is the new era begun."¹ Man must first realize his human responsibilities and believe in the possibility of true reform, before anything of value can be accomplished.

By way of practical reform, until such a state of ideal conditions can be reached, Carlyle first suggests that through a proper organization of labour much may be done in the way of reform. The lack of such genuine reform was showing itself plainly in many ways. "Parliamentary Radicalism, the claim of the Free Workingman to be raised to a level, we may say, with the working Slave; his anger and cureless discontent till that be done. Food, shelter, due guidance, in return for his labour: candidly Chartism and all such isms mean that."² Such were the demands which the English working class were making in all their Six Point Charters and Riots which preceded the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1848. According to Carlyle, they were the just demands, and true need, of every working man; whether hidden under the wording of Six Point Charters, or only spoken in actions, as in riots.

1 Froude - Life of Carlyle 1795-1835; 1882, vol.ii, p.206

2 "Chartism," Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, 1899, vol.ii; collected works, vol.xxix, p.186.

and "Manchester Insurrections."

These needs in any age can only be filled through the existence of "Captains of Industry," who will honestly see to the "food, shelter and due guidance" of the working men. These Captains of Industry must be men of the genuine aristocracy of talent which we have discussed before. They must be Heroes, just as Carlyle's Governors are to be Heroes, with all the qualities of justice and mental and spiritual nobility which every hero must possess.

Such industrial leaders are to organize all the labourers in the kingdom into Industrial regiments to do the world's work. There is room for everyone to work in the world, Carlyle believed, especially when he saw the vast amount of land and stores of natural wealth which were lying unused. All such resources have been given mankind that they might improve them and better themselves through its improvement. For the purpose of so improving the land, all the labourers must be organized by the Captains of Industry; if not willingly, then by force. The leaders must not do this for their own gain, but for the betterment of humanity, and it is the duty of the workmen to obey those leaders loyally and without question; remembering their leaders' superior wisdom. Especially is this true for the idle and the poor. In Carlyle's opinion it is as much their own fault as it is that of their employers that they find themselves in difficult circumstances. They must bestir themselves to honest work and thrift when work is offered them under reasonable conditions, or take the consequences. "He that will not work according

to his faculty, let him starve according to his faculty, let him starve according to his necessity." ¹ But work under just conditions and with due guidance, must be within his reach before Carlyle would have us apply the above rule in the case of idleness and poverty. A just and honest leader, organizing all the unemployed into industrial regiments, for compulsory work if need be, is Carlyle's idea of the organization of labour. Beyond this he did not go in describing his plan for labour reform, except that such industrial regiments should be similar to military regiments but with a more intense and more permanent interest in their work as members of their regiment and of society. They should be justly ruled, and kept faithfully to their work.

He also believed it to be the Government's duty to enforce such an organization in the industrial world. He recognized the change of conditions which the Industrial Revolution had brought about; that the place of importance in the nation's population had shifted from the aristocracy to the industrial classes, and that in future, the maintenance of a happy relation between labour and employers would be the chief problem for the government. In this connection Carlyle says "What Government can do? This that they call 'Organizing of Labour' is, if well understood, the Problem of the whole Future, for all who will in future pretend to govern men." ² Government then, must interfere if the mill owners or

1 "Chartism" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, 1899, vol. iv; collected works, vol. xxix, p. 132.

men."¹ Government then, must interfere if the mill owners or supposed industrial captains will not cease pursuing their own ends to the exclusion of all others. Government must find the true Industrial Captains² and must see that they are taught by "noble example" and "noble precept."³ As to the question of how he is to be found, Carlyle, as usual, leaves us without a definite answer. Teaching and education again are the only method at which he hints. These industrial captains are to be the link between government government authority and labour under the new conditions. The paupers and unemployed are to be enrolled in State industrial regiments; and under just captains and conditions, are to be forced to work. The unjust private capitalist would then be forced to provide just conditions for his workmen in order to keep them from joining the State regiments. Carlyle, in so advocating Government Labour Organization points the way to Government Ownership and Labour employment such as is now the custom in some parts of our Empire, especially in New Zealand.

Last of all, if the Government is not able to organize labour on a new basis it must at least legislate to improve actual factory conditions as Carlyle saw them in his time. Sanitary Regulations should be enforced to make wholesome living conditions possible for those who do work. In partic-

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iv, ch. iii, p. 248.

² Latter Day Pamphlets, 1898; collected works, vol. xx, lect. 1, p. 44.

³ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iii, ch. xii, p. 201.

ular he says, "The Legislature, even as it now is, could order all dingy Manufacturing Towns to cease from their soot and darkness, to let in the blessed sunlight, the blue of Heaven, and become clear and clean, to burn their coal smoke, namely, and make flame of it. Baths, free air, a wholesome temperature, ceilings twenty feet high, might be ordained, by Act of Parliament, in all establishments licensed as Mills." ¹ These, with an immediate abrogation of the Corn Laws, were what he recommended for immediate incorporation as laws. Some of these industrial problems, such as the smoke nuisance, are still under discussion at the present time. The others for the most part have been changed according to Carlyle's suggestions.

Next to Government supervision in industrial matters, Carlyle recommends permanence in employment, and a friendly relation between workmen and their employers. He argues justly that a workman cannot render his best service when his interests are not more or less permanently allied with those with those of his employer. Day labour and such forms of employment tend to increase inefficiency and thriftlessness among the employees, since they live only day by day, from hand to mouth, with no settled prospect before them. "Happy is he who has found a master;--and now, farther I will say, having found, let him well keep him. In all human relations permanency is what I advocate; nomadism, continual change, is

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iv, ch. iii, pp. 254-5.

what I perceive to be prohibitory of any good whatsoever."¹
 Nomadism is against the interests of both the workman, and the employer. Neither should money wages form the only relationship between employer and employed. Just money payment for a fair day's work there certainly must be, in order that a man may live, but Carlyle does not think that this can form a satisfactory permanent bond. There must be justice and a friendly feeling for the labourer on the part of the employer, and loyalty with an interest in the employer's industry, on the part of the workman. These are the only conditions under which the workman will be happy and do his best, and under which the employer will derive true happiness and prosperity; for, Carlyle would say, men are not machines but human beings who receive inspiration for their work from their relationships with one another as much as by material comforts. "Your gallant battle-hosts and work-hosts as the others did, will need to be made loyally yours; they must and will be regulated, methodically secured in their just share of conquest under you,--joined with you in veritable brotherhood, sonhood, by quite other and deeper ties than those of temporary day's wages."²

Finally he suggests in connection with this theory of permanence, that there should be cooperative ownership between men and employers, a suggestion which we now believe to

¹ "The Nigger Question" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 1899, vol. iv; collected works, vol. xxix, p. 367.

² Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iv, ch. iv, p. 263.

be quite modern, and the value of which has not yet been fully proved. He says of this doctrine, "Whether, in some ulterior, perhaps some not far-distant state of this 'Chivalry of Labour' your Master-worker may not find it possible and needful, to grant his workers permanent interest in his enterprise and theirs? So that it become in practical result . . . a joint enterprise; all men, from the Chief Master down to the lowest Overseer and Operative, economically as well as loyally concerned for it." ¹ This would be for Carlyle, the consummation of the right relationship in the Industrial world, since it would include not only the spiritual relationship but the practical relationship as well. Compulsory Organization of Labour, under Hero Captains and under Government Control in Carlyle's plan of reform in Industrial society. Permanence, just payment, and cooperative ownership are the means by which individual relations are to be bettered. Carlyle not only touches the main practical problems which faced the industrial world of his day, but he also brings in the philosophical and humanitarian aspects of the situation, thus striving to give industrial society a sound basis. Harmonious cooperation among the workers of the nation will give untold strength to the nation, while dissension will only spread weakness. "Twenty men united in love can accomplish much that to two thousand isolated men were impossible." ²

Past and Present; Longman ed., 1915,

1 ~~Ibid.~~, Bk. iv, ch. iii, p. 271.

2 Froude - Life of Carlyle 1795-1835; 1882, vol. ii, p. 82

Carlyle ranks the land situation as having equal importance with the industrial problems of his day. He recognized that the land, connected as it was with food production and agricultural pursuits, was the foundation of society. Without the possession of land, and the production, through it, of food, the nation could not exist. Land is the greatest gift of God to mankind.

Important changes had been wrought in the land situation, previous to and contemporary with Carlyle. As has been seen before, the Industrial Revolution had greatly affected the agricultural population of England, by driving to the city the peasants who earned their living partly by weaving and spinning and partly by agricultural pursuits. Secondly the Acts of Enclosure at the end of the 18th Century by which common lands, and holdings without official deed, were enclosed by the large land-owners, forced out most of the yeoman farmers which formed a large part of the English rural people. In Ireland, especially, the land situation was unendurable. There the tenant was at the mercy of his landlord under a short lease system. Moreover, in neither country were the landlords making the best use of the land thus acquired. The owners of estates were often absent, and left the land in the care of overseers. These frequently cheated and persecuted the tenants for their own profit, or else neglected the lands entirely. Again, this statement was especially applicable to Ireland. Famine in Ireland and the Corn Laws in England so reduced the food supply for the poor in both countries that the people were on the point of rebellion at

times. Even after the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1848 conditions remained much the same, for the land question in Ireland was not remedied until 1870.

Carlyle saw the agricultural population crowding to the industrial centres which were already overcrowded. He saw them unemployed and in dire misery while those who clung to the land were in an equally bad plight. At the same time the titled aristocracy, who were in most cases the possessors of the land, seemed entirely without a sense of responsibility either for their remaining tenants or for the government of the masses of industrial workers whom they had forced into the cities. He attacks this condition bitterly; pouring out his wrath on the idle aristocracy and dilettante governors who will not accept their responsibilities.

In the first place, land is the gift of God to man, Carlyle says. It belongs first and foremost to its Maker and not to the aristocracy as they seem to believe. Secondly, man cannot make land, he can only improve it. Hence, the right to possession of the land should go to those who can best improve it. For example, Carlyle says that the rights of property to the West Indies go to him "who can best educe from them whatever of noble produce they were created fit for yielding. He, I compute, is the real Viceregent of the Maker."¹ The owner of land must never forget that he is only the "Viceregent" of that land and not the absolute owner who is, rather, God its Maker. Here as always Carlyle seeks to

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk.iii, ch.viii, p.169.

impress upon men the ever present influence of God in the life and affairs of men.

At the same time, he believes in the sacred mission of the aristocracy of England as the true rulers of the land. Like his heroes, the aristocracy of the land must come into being "by the Grace of God". They cannot be made, or thrust into that position with the expectation that they will fulfill their trust properly. "You cannot hire men to govern Land;" he says, "it is by a mission not contracted for in the Stock-Exchange, but felt in their own hearts as coming out of Heaven, that men can govern a Land. The mission of a Land Aristocracy is a sacred one, in both the senses of that old word."¹ Therefore, since the post is such a sacred one, Carlyle reasons justly that they should take it in all seriousness, and fulfill its functions to the best of their ability. They must not, as he saw them doing, leave the country to a policy of laissez-faire while they sought their own pleasure in idleness. Theirs is the post of responsibility and death if need be. They, as the owners of the land, should be the Governors of the country. They were remaining idle, while their work in reality is the greatest and most difficult of any in the country. Carlyle attacked their idleness and uselessness very bitterly, especially when he saw the misery of the Irish peasant, caused largely by their lack of diligence in attending to their duties, both in Government and as

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915. Bk. iv, ch. i. p. 236.

owners of the land. For, he announces in one of his tirades against this class, "I say, you did not make the Land of England; and, by the possession of it, you are bound to furnish guidance and governance to England! . . . True government and guidance; not no-government and Laissez-faire; how much less misgovernment and Corn Law."¹ This for him is the function of the Aristocracy of the land, but, in the same way as in his program of political reform, he does not give any definite suggestion whereby the existing condition of things may be remedied. His chief purpose, in criticising the idleness of the aristocracy of England at that time, was to point out their uselessness, and to try to arouse them to a sense of their responsibilities. What really happened was that, as the result of Carlyle's preaching and that of others of the same opinion, the people of England gradually forced the aristocracy out of their central position in government replacing them by popularly elected members, and at the same time forcing a reform of the chief land evils. A reform of the land question was brought about, again not in the way Carlyle sought to have it. What Carlyle really wished to see, however, was the land in possession of those who would make the greatest use of it, and this was accomplished.

Many of Carlyle's suggested reforms in industrial and labour matters have become fact. His influence, however, was general rather than practical in the bringing about of these

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915, Bk. iii, ch. viii, p. 170.

reforms. We cannot trace the origin of any ~~of any~~ of them directly to him, nor say that his writings forced their consummation either at the time he wrote or later. His chief accomplishment in this respect seems to be that he pointed out clearly in his pungent and striking manner, the evils of the time and offered useful suggestions which more practical reformers took up and made actualities. His influence was to force others to act in matters of reform, rather than to act directly for himself. He is the prophet of many reforms which were to come rather than their actual formulator. The chief reforms whose advent he prophesied are cooperative ownership of factories, as is now practiced to a certain extent both in England and America; improved conditions for workmen under government supervision; more permanent employment; and a certain amount of reorganization of land ownership. From the beginning of the Factory Legislations for Child Labour in 1833 until the present time, conditions of living and labour have been steadily improving under government supervision and legislation. Employment is now more permanent if the workmen give satisfaction, though day labour is still common. The problem of land ownership has worked itself out to a satisfactory ending by degrees in England and Ireland; the Irish tenant farmers being permitted gradually to acquire their own farms under the Land Acts of 1870; 1891; and 1903. On the whole Carlyle, by his sympathy with the lower classes, and stern denunciation of the social injustice of the time, did much to bring the people of England to a realization of the necessity of social and industrial reform.

Besides the larger field of reform in Industry and Land ownership, Carlyle was attracted to three particular points which he felt must be changed in the social structure of his country namely, Prison Reform, Slavery, and Emigration. The chief of these three is his denunciation of Prison conditions and the existing Poor Laws. Previous to 1800 the prisons had been dismal, unhealthy places, into which men were cast for the slightest offences. Conditions of living in these institutions were extremely bad, and on the whole causes for imprisonment were unjust and the punishment too severe. In the latter half of the 18th Century, however, John Howard began agitating for prison reform as, for example, in his tract on prison conditions of the late 18th Century. This work of attempted reform was carried on still further in the early part of the 19th Century by Elizabeth Fry. These philanthropists and prison reformers apparently produced very little immediate result, but by 1835 the evils of such institutions had become so flagrant, that the suggestions of Howard and Mrs. Fry were at last heeded, and prison reform was commenced. Model prisons were built in which kindness and instruction were tried as methods of reforming the prisoners rather than the cruelty and neglect of former times. Popular sentiment now went to the opposite extreme in advocating lenient punishment and sympathy for all criminals no matter what might be their nature or the seriousness of their crime; whereas formerly the public had insisted on the severest punishment for all offences. This sentimental attitude on the part of the

public towards misfortune and crime was also carried into matters of charity which the government took up as a means of relieving poverty in industrial centres. In the latter case they preferred to support work houses and poor houses rather than exert themselves in bringing about just conditions of labour.

It was this excess of philanthropy in matters of prison punishment and in charity, that revolted Carlyle's stern justice-loving soul. It was not that he wished to see the squalor and harshness of the old prisons remain; for this was cruel, and contrary to conditions of healthy human life; but he did wish to see justice done. The accepted purpose of punishment as embodied in the existence of prisons, was to protect the property of society, and society itself, from the degradations of its unruly members. This was the chief purpose accepted prior to the 19th Century. Secondly punishment was to improve and reform the criminal but this was quite a secondary purpose during most of England's prison history. That it should prevent the criminal from repeating his offence was the first consideration while little thought was taken as to how this was to be accomplished. In the 19th Century, however, the emphasis was shifted from the first purpose to the second in popular opinion. The chief end of punishment was now to improve the criminal; and the means by which this was to be done was not just punishment according to the merits of the crime, but so called sympathetic treatment illustrated by comparative luxury in living and moral instruction. Faith in the last named methods was increased because the belief in

the psychological and biological causes of crime was beginning to take firm hold on the people. Hence they believed that the criminal could best be cured by kindness and education rather than by actual punishment.

It is to this latter belief that Carlyle objected. He maintained that this method in prison reform tended by its luxury to increase criminals, and not to cure them for criminals would now remain criminals in order that they might be put in prison. The comforts and comparatively easy life of the prison, as compared to the strife of honest life in the world, would induce laziness and crime. Carlyle did not believe that a criminal could be cured of his criminal tendencies. What he was, was under the decree of God and could not be changed by man, and if that man in his weakness chose to serve the Devil, teaching and kindness in prisons could not change his nature. Such efforts were a waste of energy which should have been bestowed on those who had not sunk quite so low. "To feed you in palaces, to hire captains and schoolmasters and the choicest spiritual and material artificers to expend their industries on you--No by the Eternal! I have quite other work for that class of artists; Seven and Twenty Millions of neglected mortals who have not yet quite declared for the Devil."¹ says Carlyle of the new efforts at improving criminals.

Carlyle believed that God's law is entirely against all

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets, 1898; collected works, vol. xx, lect.ii, p. 59.

criminals. To become a criminal one must have broken some of the divine commandments which it is our special duty to perceive and follow in this life. Hence, in the name of justice which is one of God's attributes, severe punishment must be meted out to the wrongdoer. Justice and not love, should be the method in treating such men. "To guide scoundrels by 'love'; that is a false woof. I take it, a method that will not hold together, hardly for the flower of men will love alone do; and for the sediment, what chance!"¹ And again he states, "I take the liberty of asserting that there is one valid reason, and only one, for either punishing a man or rewarding him in this world; one reason, which ancient piety could well define: That you may do the will of God with regard to him; that you do justice to him."² Justice and the will of God according to the stern meaning given in the Old Testament were to be the basis of punishment according to Carlyle. He did not take the Christian attitude which teaches love and pity to the wrongdoer, nor did he accept newer medical and psychological discoveries which show that through inherited tendencies or stress of special circumstances, the criminal is not responsible for his actions, and because of this should be given another chance. Carlyle, on this point, was a stern Calvinist of the old school, who makes no allowances for the weakness of human nature.

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets, 1898; collected works, vol. xx, lect. 11, p. 56.

² *ibid.* p. 75.

What Carlyle believed to be true prison reform was that all criminals should be taken out of prisons and set to work under stern and just captains of industry in some place where work needs to be done. As conditions were then, the prisoners were kept in idleness or at some task which did not benefit society to any great extent. This was directly opposed to the ideas expressed in the Gospel of Work, in which every man must make the best possible use of his talents in aid of mankind. Criminals should be separated from the rest of mankind so that they will not harm or contaminate them, but they should not be kept in idleness. They must do their share of the world's work, and since they will not do it willingly, they must be forced to do it. Carlyle suggested that they should be sent to some of the colonies and there under stern discipline, be set to clear and improve the lands. Idleness and coddling are the last conditions in prisons which will lessen crime, or improve the criminal. He says to such men that he "will sweep you rapidly into some Norfolk Island, into some special Convict Colony, . . . under hard drill sergeants, just as Rhadamanthus . . . there leave you to reap what you have sown."¹ This statement points to a similar institution to that which gave rise to the convict colonies of the 18th and early 19th Centuries. Criminals now are usually regarded as the unfortunates of society. Carlyle maintained that of their own will they had fallen from grace; and

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets, 1898; collected works, vol. xx, lect. ii, p. 59.

as such, they must be forced to take their punishment and bear their share of the world's burden.

Poor houses, work houses, and such institutions, he believed likewise to have no good effect. They too only weakened the manhood of the unemployed and destitute which they were supposed to benefit. Those helped by them depended upon such help instead of making the most of their own resources. The maintenance of justice in labour conditions comes before charity. Then if the worker will not make sufficient effort to maintain himself when working conditions are favorable, he should be left "to starve according to his necessity." Carlyle believed firmly in the old proverb which says "Heaven helps those who help themselves." Charities and philanthropic societies were to him hindrances to the welfare of the working man, as were the mammonism and selfishness of the mill owners.

The question of the benefits derived from charity is still under discussion. In Carlyle's time, and indeed up to very recent years, it was much believed in though there were always the two opposing sides, for and against the maintenance of charity. Carlyle spoke for the minority of his day. At the present time, however, there is a tendency to return to the ideas which he preached, especially that of severe punishment for crime. Capital punishment, hard labour, and, still more recently, corporal punishment such as the lash, are in effect in British territory. On the other hand science has proved that certain men are not responsible for their criminal tendencies and therefore must be regarded as objects of pity, who are to be cared for rather than punished.

a question

The actual benefits of charity for the unemployed is still undecided, but it is safe to say that Carlyle's insistent suggestion for just labour conditions as a cure for the need of charity is absolutely just.

Another question closely associated with social reform, which Carlyle deals with, is slavery. Up to 1807 slavery was in practice in all the British Colonies, and the slave traffic was a general source of income. In that year, however, the slave traffic was abolished, and in 1833 slavery in any form was done away with throughout the British dominions. The colonies most affected were Mauritius, Cape Colony, the West Indies and Guiana. In Jamaica of the West Indies particularly the emancipation of slaves brought social disturbances. In 1865 a Negro insurrection broke out. Governor Eyre put this down with such rigor that he was recalled for unjustifiable cruelty, and indicted by the government. Carlyle went into his defense whole heartedly, and his influence in a great measure brought about the Governor's release. Some years before this, however, when slave emancipation was beginning to take full effect in 1849, he stated most of his theories concerning slavery in the pamphlet, The Nigger Question. The immediate occasion for this outburst on Carlyle's part, was the fact that he saw thousands of Irish peasants and English industrial workers starving and unable to find employment, while the negroes of the West Indies, then emancipated, lived on the rich lands there without producing according to their strength. They were no longer compelled to work, and hence

they merely lived their own savage life, working as little as possible. The sight of the misery and poverty of his own countrymen touched Carlyle very deeply so that he was moved to write on their behalf against the existing conditions in the Indies. In the Governor Eyre case, he simply acted upon his convictions.

His theories upon the subject of slavery are connected closely with his general social theories. First, as has been mentioned before, he believed that all men are not born equal. Some are born the inferiors of others, and hence should be in subjection to the others. The Negro race he believed belonged to the latter class. Secondly, according to the Gospel of Work every man must work in this world according to his talents. Likewise the land should belong to those who make the best use of it, in this case to the British who had improved the West Indies. Therefore he argued, that since the Negroes had not developed the West Indies, and were not working according to their ability, they should be forced to do so by the rightful owners of the land.¹ If the Negro will not work in the proper fashion when emancipated, he should be forced to do so as a slave. In fact Carlyle rather favored the slave relationship since it involves a permanent contract, one of the important points in his theory of successful labour relationships. What he did insist upon emphatically in all dealings with the Negroes was justice. Whether

¹ "The Nigger Question", Critical and Miscellaneous Essays. 1899, vol. iv, collected works, vol. xxix, p. 355.

slave or free, their white overlords must be just to them. The condition most needed was "that your relation to the Negroes, in this thing called slavery . . . be actually fair, just and according to facts;--fair, I say, not in the sight of New England Platforms, but of God Almighty, the Maker of both Negroes and you,"¹ and a little before this, "Unjust master over servant hired for life is, once for all, and shall be, unendurable to human souls. To cut the tie and 'fling Farmer Hodge's horses quite loose' upon supply and demand principle . . . is not the method! But by some method, by hundred fold restrictions, responsibilities, laws, conditions, cunning methods, Hodge must be got to treat his horses justly."² So, whether as slave or freemen, a happy relationship will be evolved between master and workman, so long as justice is maintained. Furthermore, he suggested that, instead of indiscriminate emancipation of slaves, there should be a certain fixed price for freedom. Thus "For example ought there not to be in every Slave State, a fixed sum, on paying which, any black man was entitled to demand his freedom? . . . If the poor Black can, by forethought, industry, self-denial, accumulate this sum, has he not proved the actual 'freedom' of his soul?"³ Such a money value would be the pledge of the Negro's qualifications to become a free man. Justice on the part of the master, and talent as the criterion of social

1 "The Nigger Question", Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 1899, vol. iv; collected works, vol. xxix, p. 371.

2 *ibid.* p. 370.

3 *ibid.* p. 372.

standing is here as always the basis of Carlyle's social formulas.

What Carlyle did not see is that slavery is a degrading condition for any human being. He says "You may lift the pressure from a free man's shoulders and bid him go rejoicing, but lift the slave's burden, he will only wallow the more composedly in his sloth,--a nation of degraded men cannot be raised up except by what we rightly name a miracle."¹ By this he implied that the slave is permanently a slave, just because he is such. History and experience, however, teach us that the practice of slavery in nations of the ancient world always brought degradation to their civilization in the end. Slavery kills a man's sense of independence and initiative. A slave is not like a criminal who often deliberately debases himself, and becomes a dangerous vagabond. The slave usually loses his freedom because of external conditions beyond his control; as when he is forced by tyranny and hard circumstances to submit to a master in such a way as to entail the loss of his freedom. The Negro was not a slave in his own land and Carlyle had no right to consider him permanently inferior, as certain criminal classes and idlers of his own people certainly were. No matter how long and tedious the process of re-educating the slave to the status of a freeman, it is not such a miracle as Carlyle would have us believe, and the effort is always worth while. Carlyle, who

¹ "Corn Law Rhymes", Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 1899, vol. iii, collected works, vol. xxviii, p. 159.

is usually correct in his fundamental principles, as of justice, and the worth of ability, here *made* the mistake of confusing the criminal with the slave. He did not see the possibility which has been realized in our time, wherein the Negroes have been moderately educated to take their place in white civilization as free men.

The remaining point of special interest which Carlyle deals with is Emigration as a means to relieve the congested labour conditions of the British Isles. Up to the time of Carlyle's writing, emigration had been carried on in a very haphazard fashion. There was no system of emigration, since the government paid very little attention to this department of their administration. What emigration there was, was carried on through private means or simply as the individual felt the necessity of removing himself to a newer country. The land enclosures of the early part of the Century and the famines in Ireland caused a great deal of emigration to the various dominions, but there was no assistance given from their home land to these humble emigrants.

Carlyle was an ardent imperialist who wished intensely to see Great Britain a mighty Empire under the domination of the Anglo-Saxon race. He saw that England, Ireland, and Scotland were being crowded with an ever increasing population for whom there was neither employment nor food within the limits of the British Isles. This population, for the most part, consisted of men who were willing to work and anxious to support themselves. Outside, in the colonies and the

new lands of the Empire, there was an abundance of rich untilled land as well as great resources of wealth and comfort for mankind. It was his dearest scheme that the excess population of the British Isles, who were at that time living in squalor and at the point of starvation, should be sent out to the colonies to increase the necessary comforts of life, both for themselves and others by their willing labours in a land where there was scope for their activities. Such emigration was to be under the regulation of the Government and with properly organized labour conditions. "Then again, why should there not be an 'Emigration Service', and Secretary, with adjuncts, with funds, forces, idle Navy ships, and ever increasing apparatus; in fine an effective system of Emigration; so that at length before our twenty years of respite ended, every honest willing Workman who found England too strait and the 'Organization of Labour' not yet sufficiently advanced, might find likewise a bridge built to carry him into new Western Lands, there to 'organise' with more elbow room some labour for himself?"¹ The suggestion that organization of labour should be carried out along with emigration is implied rather than directly stated, but Carlyle would certainly have such a movement carried on under able leaders who would be responsible captains of the emigrant workers. As has been pointed out in the previous chapter, all idle war ships and government apparatus of that kind was to aid in emigration

¹ Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1915 reprint, Bk. iv, ch. iii, p. 256.

when not engaged in their own special work. Emigration is the safety valve, in Carlyle's opinion, for over population by which every willing workman may find worthy employment: and which at the same time, would allow comfortable social conditions to be maintained both in the home land and in the land to which the emigrant goes.

In Carlyle's scheme of Social reform there are many suggestions for reform which have been accepted and put into practice. His influence is not always directly traceable in the accomplishment of the reform, as I have said before; but by his biting ridicule of the evils of his day and his sound principles as to the basis of social life, he did much to point the way to the necessary reforms. He had a profound sympathy for the working classes because of his parentage among such people. He saw their needs, and at the same time realized their weaknesses.

The Industrial Revolution had given rise to conditions absolutely unprecedented in the economic history of the world. Men were striving to find solutions to the problems involved in these conditions; and in the early stages many errors were committed by the political and social economists. Carlyle among these, however, often gives suggestions which subsequent events have proved to point towards true reform. His suggestion of Organised Labour especially seems to be the forerunner of much of our modern labour movement. It is true that the present labour organization is still almost entirely a combination of the workers against the mill owners and chief

employers, while in Carlyle's plan it was to be a friendly partnership between owners and employers on the one hand, and the workmen on the other. Still workmen, as now organized in Labour Unions, do recognize their leaders, much as Carlyle wished them to recognize his "Captains of Industry." At least the chaos and injustice of the early part of the 19th Century has been replaced by a certain measure of understanding and cooperation between labourer and employer. Cooperative ownership, as it is now being satisfactorily carried on in many places, comes much nearer to Carlyle's ideal of industrial labour relationships. Emigration too, has come to be carried on very much along the organized lines as suggested by Carlyle. Emigration is now an important department of government, which carries on its work very systematically, with a view to the greatest benefits both to the emigrants and the land to which they are going. His criticism of charity, Poor Laws, and work houses also seem to be just, from evidence found at present. Certainly the discontent caused in the British Isles by the dole system since the Great War seems to point out that all such systems of charity and poor relief bring only misery, discontent, and degradation to those who are supposed to be benefitted by them. The only possible remedy as yet seen is that which Carlyle suggested in which relief comes through a better organization of labour, with better moral principles as the basis of the individual's life. These are the most important points in which Carlyle's practical suggestions have proved themselves correct.

There are, of course, certain of his theories which have been shown to be absolutely impracticable. For example, he did not thoroughly understand the aristocracy and would sweep that class out of existence because of its apparent idleness. It was true that the members of the aristocracy had ceased to perform their function as actual governors who were representative of the country; but Carlyle did not realize that even though they did not govern the country, they were necessary to perpetuate the culture and more refined life of the nation. Furthermore, the problems of land ownership and of the place and power of the aristocracy in government readjusted themselves through time to the new conditions of the age, because of their vital importance in the well-being of the people. They were not solved, however, by the aristocracy becoming the autocratic rulers of the country which is the remedy that Carlyle would have us accept. In his treatment of slavery he also missed the fundamental principle of the degrading influence of that institution on any nation or any people, and his plans for prison reform have likewise proved themselves to be not entirely satisfactory. The theory, that just punishment, even though severe, must be meted out to the criminal, is again beginning to be accepted among authorities. On the other hand, his suggestion for the deportation of criminals to convict colonies has proved to be a failure, since the institution of such colonies has proved to be a great evil both for the country to which the convicts are sent and to the convict himself, as in the case of the Botany Bay settlement in Australia.

As was found in discussing his theories of political reform Carlyle's greatest value as a social reformer lies in the ethical basis of his social theories. Justice, a sense of the varying abilities of different men, and the necessity of a desire to do honest work on the part of every individual, are basic social principles the value of which he earnestly seeks to impress upon all his readers. If the above ethical rules are fully realized by all, and both masters and men recognize and live up to their responsibilities to each other as individuals and as members of society, the social problems of England will adjust themselves happily of their own accord without the interference of so many economists and politicians, for men's hearts will then be at one with the laws of God and nature. Here, as always, Carlyle perceived the root of England's social troubles and shows that improvement in the fundamental matters of ethics must come before permanent practical reforms can be accomplished.

IV

E D U C A T I O N

In every part of Carlyle's program of social reform, the point stressed most as a reconstructive means is education. By education he would prepare the Governor of the country for his position, and by education he would lift the masses to a higher level, where they would be capable of appreciating and aiding good government. It will make his position clearer as a positive reformer then, if a separate chapter is devoted to a discussion of his theories of education and their application in his positive political and social reforms.

In the first place, one must understand what were the conditions in the educational system of England as Carlyle knew it. England's educational system up to Carlyle's time was founded upon a purely religious basis. Just as in the Middle Ages education was entirely under the control of the Roman Catholic Church, so after the Reformation, it still remained under the control of the Established Church of England. While under the Roman Church, education was practically free to all classes, but when it passed into the hands of the Established Church it became more restricted, tending to be aristocratic in extent, and often excluding the poor who wished an education, merely because of their position. In either case the masses of the people were not educated. It was only some of the yeomen, the middle classes and the aristocracy who received an education, or who were in any way

made welcome to take it. Even the first two classes, here mentioned, received very little except in odd cases. No provision was made for the peasants or workmen for any education. All public schools such as Eton and Harrow were privately endowed, and were maintained, in reality, as private schools open only for those whose position or influence was sufficient to warrant their entrance there. In 1604 a voluntary system of education was inaugurated for the poor, whereby, poor schools were maintained by private contributions. These, however, had very little influence on the great masses of people, and up to the time of the Industrial Revolution, education in England was carried on under the control of Church authorities, or else by private philanthropy. In neither case did it reach the majority of the population.

With the coming of the Industrial Revolution, it will be remembered, great changes were effected in the population of the country. The cities were crowded with peasant workmen of the lower classes, and child labour became prevalent. Thus, there appeared before public notice a large mass of uneducated people who proved to be extremely discontented with their lot. For these no education was provided, that they might intelligently understand their position or the needs of their country. An attempt was made to remedy this situation at the end of the 18th Century, when with the inauguration of the Evangelical Revival by John Wesley and others, Sunday Schools were established by Robert Raikes, where day school work and religious teaching were combined. But these schools did not prove very efficient, and did not reach any great number of

children. In the early part of the 19th Century it began to be recognized that some change must be wrought in the status of the lower classes through education, if the industrial world was to continue at all in any state of peace. Lancaster for the Dissenters and Bell for the Established Church, began rival systems of voluntary schools for the poor, and through their rivalry, crystallized the religious controversy between Dissenters and Established Church in educational matters, the discussion of which still exists at the present time. Neither system of schools was satisfactory or reached the majority of the population, so that in 1839 the government took the first step in England towards State control of education by instituting in that year a partial system of grants and supervision of the schools for the poor. Thus, up to the time of Carlyle's social writings, English education was still much as it was in the Middle Ages, aristocratic in feeling, entirely in the hands of the Church, and exclusive of the majority of the poor.

Furthermore, the actual content of the education was becoming out of date, especially for the working classes. As in previous ages it consisted chiefly in a study of the classics, philosophy, and mathematics, in a purely abstract fashion. There was no place for a course in the elementary subjects which would benefit the working classes, except in the voluntary schools for the poor, and in them the instruction was of a very low order. Neither was there much practical education which would lead to efficiency in any manual vocation. It was either a purely literary education in which

only the higher classes were interested; or a very unpractical education for a small portion of the masses. In fact, both in substance and application, education had been unchanged for centuries. It was still in the hands of the Church or supported by private means. It was still classical, literary and unpractical in its substance, and it was still limited in its influence. It was the last two evils which roused Carlyle most; since for him education was the one means whereby men as a whole might be uplifted, and at the same time given help in their life work.

Carlyle was thoroughly democratic in his ideas on education. He wished everyone, no matter what his rank might be in society, to have as much education as he was capable of receiving. In so far as the educational system of England was against such a democratic extension of knowledge and refused to take into consideration the newly formed labour classes, Carlyle wished to reform it in the best interests of society as a whole. Education to him was of benefit to all, and its aims as he outlined them were much broader than those commonly accepted in his time. Carlyle believed education to be "the acquisition of what may be called wisdom;--namely, sound appreciation and just decision as to all the objects that come around you, and the habit of behaving with justice, candour, clear insight, and loyal adherence to fact." We must remember that in the portrait of his hero, we find that

1 "Inaugural Address", Scottish and Other Miscellanies; Everyman ed., p. 157.

the latter is to be the man with force of character and spiritual insight rather than the possessor of mere book learning. Education, in his opinion then, is to be the means of forming character, true judgment, and above all, of instilling into man that love of truth and sincerity which for him are the foundations of a stable and happy society. Therefore it should be free to all who are capable of receiving it, whether rich or poor, so that all may have the opportunity of developing their character along the right lines; for he says "That there should one Man die ignorant who had capacity for Knowledge, this I call a tragedy, were it to happen more than ¹ twenty times in a minute, as by some computations it does."

This ideal state of education was to be realized in two ways; first through the acquisition of theoretical knowledge as found in books, and secondly by practice. As to the first named, books are to give information concerning past thought so that the student may have the knowledge of the previous ages on which to base his judgments concerning the present. Especially is history most valuable in this respect, since it gives background for important political and social judgments. All that pedagogy, ~~in the way of~~ schools, can really do for one in the matter of educating through books is to teach the student to read and appreciate what is in them. Thus Carlyle says of this matter "If we think of it, all that a University, or final highest School can do for us is still but what the

¹ Sartor Resartus; Everyman ed., 1921, Bk. iii, ch. iv, p. 172.

first School began doing,--teach us to read . . . in various languages, in various sciences; we learn the alphabets of all manner of Books . . . The true University of these days is a collection of Books."¹ Books then are to give knowledge, background, and refinement, and as such are indispensable.

But still more important, and made more so by the prevalence in these days of books which make the known wisdom of the world so accessible, is the need of practical education. The best means by which the power of true judgment may be formed, is by practice and actual experience. For this reason, the worker is most often the best educated in the Carlylian sense; for the labourer has worked with his hands and has intimate experience with nature, the forces of which control the elemental needs of human life and human happiness. He has actual experience with the fundamental requirements of man, and hence has a sounder basis on which to build his judgments concerning society. Thus Carlyle says, "The best educated man you will often find to be the artisan, at all rates the man of business. For why? He has put forth his hand and operated on Nature; must actually attain some true insight or he cannot live . . . A Burns is infinitely better educated than a Byron."²

In former times, this practical side³ of education was seen to by the custom of apprenticeship. Craftsman, priest,

¹ Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed. 1921, Lect. v, p. 390.

² Froude--Life of Carlyle 1795-1835; 1882, vol. ii, p. 227.

³ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works, 1898, vol. xx, Lect. v, pp. 177-8.

and noble, all alike, learned their trade by actual contact, and practical imitation of their seniors and masters. Even the nobleman's son was sent as a page or squire to the court of some great noble, there to learn his profession as governor and soldier through actual experience. The Industrial Revolution, however, had done away with apprenticeship since the workers then had to seek whatever employment they could find in the factories, without reference to their previous experience in the work. Moreover the schools and universities were only for the nobility, who gained there pedantic knowledge which did not at all fit them for their position in the practical world of men. Travel and observation as he mentions it in his scheme of education in Sartor Resartus, might help to supply the practical deficiencies of the higher classes, if carried out in a serious manner. On the whole, however, education as it was at that time, seemed to him only to prepare the student to speak, and for Carlyle, the end of education as a preparation of man for serious living, was quite other than that of mere speech. On the other hand men are to be trained to think, to judge and to act, for he believed that the human creature needs first of all to be educated not that he may speak, but that he may have something weighty to say.¹ Above all education is to make for formation of character. As in the Medieval Church it must be "strict training not only to whatever useful knowledge could be had from writing.

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works, 1898, vol.xx, lect. v, p. 179.

and reading; but to obedience, to pious reverence, self-restraint, annihilation of self,--really to human nobleness in many most essential respects,"¹ regardless of the social rank of the person to be educated. Until this outline of education through book knowledge and practical apprenticeship should be reestablished in England and made free to all classes, Carlyle maintained that England could not hope either to discover her true heroes and governors, or to have her labouring population find the ability to raise themselves from their present degradation.

Education, as a means of discovering the true ruler, as in his program of political reform is extremely important. The man of genius and ability, before all others, needs a sound education in every sense of that word, for leadership is the most important position to be held among men. Therefore he must be fitted for this task, by an education which will prepare him for its requirements. His description of the education of Frederick the Great's son points to what he believed to be the ideal education of a prince or future governor.² In the first place, the young Prince Frederick had sincere and earnest instructors, since, according to Carlyle unless the teacher is sincere, the scholar has no chance to learn sincerity. Secondly, these instructors taught the

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets; collected works, 1898, vol. xx, Lect. v, p. 132.

² History of Frederick the Great 1897, vol. i; collected works, vol. xii, Bk. iv, ch. viii.

young prince only what would be useful to him in his future life work. He was given a thorough instruction in the religious beliefs of the Protestant faith, together with a knowledge of nature, the world, and the Universe as a moral background. Then he was taught history, geography, and political economy with a view to his career as a statesman. Last of all he was given a great deal of practical training as a military leader, including mathematics, artillery, and practical drill in fortifications and the handling of troops. Above all he was trained to endure hardship and to have self-reliance. He received no classical education, and Carlyle believed this to be good, since in his opinion, the classics were dead languages which had no value in dealing with the pressing problems of the modern world. Thus the prince received a thorough grounding in practical knowledge which would prepare him for his life work. He was not taught useless classics exclusively, nor was he forced to be a past master in the art of speaking, as were the aristocratic youth of Carlyle's day. Carlyle censures the classical tendency of the Universities very severely as well as the stress laid on oratorical prowess by which means he says, the political leaders are only taught to speak, and are not given any practical training in their work. To think and act are their true functions. A practical preparation for their duties is what Carlyle wished for political leaders, in hopes of enabling them to improve their efficiency and their insight into the social and political needs of their country.

Not only can education improve the actual capabilities of the governor; it may also be useful in discovering who among men is the most able to fill the position of governor. If the leader is to be a man of ability, his ability should show to a certain extent in his capacity for receiving education. For this reason, Carlyle maintained that by giving everyone an education, and watching the varying degrees of ability which each one shows in the process of being educated, the real Hero may be detected and singled out for his proper position. The system of electing officials in China according to scholastic ability approaches nearest to the plan he suggests, although in that country the purely pedantic quality of the education given was against his principles.¹ What is most important in this part of Carlyle's program of reform is that every member of every class in society should have an equal chance of education in order that the real man of worth, no matter what his social position, should be chosen for the position of honour and greatest responsibility. Practical training and an instillation of the essential principles of sincerity and honesty would complete his plan for securing capable leaders for either political or industrial fields, as necessary for his program of reform.

By way of changing the existing state of education Carlyle insists, first, that the masses must be educated; and to obviate the petty jealousies and rivalries of the two

¹ Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed., 1921, Lect. v, p. 397.

religious factions which had hitherto prevented much serious work being done in this direction, education must be under government jurisdiction and must also be non-sectarian. "Minister of Education ? Minister charged to get this English People taught a little, at his and our peril! Minister of Education; no longer dolefully embayed amid the wreck of moribund 'religions', but clear ahead of all that; steering, free and piously fearless, towards his divine goal under the stars!"¹ A Minister of Education, a Department of Education, and first of all an Education Bill embodying the above principles of free undenominational education are the reforms which he suggests in this matter; for he says "May this one Bill, which lies yet unenacted, a right Education Bill, is not this of itself the sure parent of innumerable wise Bills, --wise regulations, practical methods and proposals, gradually ripening towards the state of Bills? To irradiate with intelligence, that is to say, with order, arrangement and all blessedness, the Chaotic Unintelligent: how, except by educating, can you accomplish this?"² Such is the hope which Carlyle has in the efficacy of education, in dealing with the social evils of his age.

The end of such educational reform was not only to choose the proper leader with its help, but also to rearrange the tangled mass of the labour population, left by the changes

¹ Latter Day Pamphlets 1898; collected works, vol. xx, Lect. iv, p. 148.

² Past and Present; Everyman ed. 1915, Bk. iv, ch. iii, p. 255.

of the Industrial Revolution. With reference to this point, in speaking of the restless chartists, who were the product of that new age, he says "What intellect were able to regulate them? No one great and greatest intellect can do it. What can? Only Twenty-four million ordinary intellects, once awakened into action; these, well presided over may." ¹ Knowledge, and understanding in each individual so that he shall himself recognise his destined place in society, is the only thing, in Carlyle's opinion, that could bring order out of the Chaos of industrial society which then existed. Such an understanding was necessary for the accomplishment of his plan of Government by Heroes. "He" meaning the sincere man "alone can love, with tight gratitude and genuine loyalty of soul, the Hero Teacher who has delivered him out of darkness into Light;" ² and education was for Carlyle the chief means of bringing a man into a state of sincerity, and to an appreciation of his superior's heroic qualities. Thus it is through education that society is to be given a sound basis in which well regulated basic social distinctions will be recognized. For these reasons Carlyle insisted that education is the first duty of government. "To impart the gift of thinking to those who cannot think, and yet who could in that case think: this, one would imagine, was the first function a government had to set about discharging." ³ Education, indeed, was for him the

1 "Chartism" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 1899, vol. iv, collected works, vol. xxix, p. 194.

2 Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed., 1921, Lect. iv, p. 357.

3 "Chartism" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 1899, vol. iv, collected works, vol. xxix, p. 192.

one scheme of value in all his practical hints on reform. Free non-sectarian education for all is his great cry; not that he believed in no religious education for to him "An irreverent knowledge is no knowledge;"¹ but simply that all petty jealousies between different sects should be laid aside for the great cause,--that of raising human society to higher and happier level, through giving men a knowledge of themselves and of the facts of the world; a knowledge which should be practical as well as inspirational.

Modern thought in the educational field is at one with Carlyle in two points; first in that practical knowledge must be taught by actual practice in the matter to be learned; and secondly, that education should prepare the student for his place and work in society. The old theory of a classical education being the only one worth while has now died out, especially in America and the Colonies. Even in England, schools for practical teaching, such as Technical Institutes, and Training Schools in different vocations, have been inaugurated. In America, this plan has been carried still further. Even in the public schools an attempt has been made through manual training courses for boys, domestic science for girls and athletics for both, to give the young students some knowledge of the practical world in which the ability to act is most important. The pedantic side of their training,

¹ "Chartism" Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, 1899, vol. iv; collected works vol. xxix, p. 195.

is also given a more practical bent as one may see in the effort which is being made to give all their studies some relation to actual life. In fact, practical education in all spheres, has largely taken the place of the purely pedantic and classical education which existed before 1870.

Some attempt is also made in modern education to prepare man for his duties in society. Social duties and functions are often worked out in miniature among the school children as an exercise, and they are also given some grounding in moral and patriotic principles, which will stand them in good stead, when they become active citizens of the country. Moreover Carlyle's program of Government Reform in Education has been fully accomplished. In 1870, while he was yet living, the first important English Education Act was passed making education compulsory for all classes and at the same time bringing it under state control. Thus the difficulties of religious rivalry and aristocratic prejudice then prevalent in the private schools were largely overcome. In the New World, in Canada and the United States, the theory of compulsory state education has been carried out to the full, and the idea of practical education is ^{also} most advanced in these countries. Perhaps Carlyle's ideas on character development and moral training through education have not been put into practice as much as he would have wished, but in so far as they have been found practicable, they have been well worked out in recent years. Certainly as far as State compulsory education will do it, his idea of giving every man his opportunity to develop the best in himself, and to become an intelligent member of

society, has been given a fair chance of success.

Of all Carlyle's theories ~~of reform~~, his program of educational reform is most consistent. He is consistently democratic in his ideas on educational methods: ¹ and also in his belief in the beneficial results to be derived from it, for all classes of society. Man is the highest of God's creations with something in his possession which is above the instincts of the brutes, and which may be cultivated as their instincts may not be. In the words of Mr. C. F. Thwing, who ably summarizes Carlyle's theories on education "He (man) is not, according to Carlyle's interpretation, a worm of the dust, nor is he a butterfly of beautiful existence; rather is he a child of God, a creature born into an infinite universe and destined for an eternal existence. For him the centuries have labored, through him all the past is given to the future, and to him all the future is bound in behalf of its worthy creatures yet to be. No prize is too high for his struggle, and no training is too severe for this child of the gods, this brother of the immortals. For him too, this creature of origin so noble, of destiny so sublime, no education is too enriching." ² Education for Carlyle, was to reawaken the immortal instincts in the masses of humanity, which had been deadened by the unequal struggles with the evils of industrialism. It was to reawaken man's spiritual nature, and enable him to realize

¹ R. C. Garnett--Thomas Carlyle; p. 128.

² C. F. Thwing--"Education According to Carlyle" in School and Society Magazine, vol. 2, p. 649.

the extent and value of his own ability, so that every man would seek his own natural god-given place in the ranks of society and thus stabilize and pacify the social world once more. As to how far Carlyle's theories have justified themselves in this respect, as they have been carried out, is still a question of doubt. Perhaps some of the unrest and trouble in the labour population at present may be due to the fact that his ideas on educational reform have not been carried out to their fullest extent with regard to the training of character and morals. More likely such disturbances exist because no human scheme of reform, whether educational, social or political, will quite meet all the human variances of temper which lead to social evils. Certainly, Carlyle, as one of the first advocates of State control of compulsory education, has done more than anyone to uplift the masses of workingmen and to give them the opportunity of taking an equal place with the hereditary aristocracy by giving them the opportunity of showing their ability as developed through education.

MODERN CRITICISM OF CARLYLE

It is nearly half a century since Carlyle died at his home in Cheyne Row. During that time many changes have occurred in the political and social life of the British Empire which so interested the Chelsea sage. It is my purpose in concluding this study of his social and political doctrines to trace briefly the influence which those doctrines have had during the years intervening between his death and our own time. This influence has varied greatly from time to time. It was purely general immediately after his death, but more recently it has attached itself to certain special phases of social events in world history, where his theories are more or less accurately judged by those historical events.

In the years immediately following Carlyle's death, when the impression which his great works had made on the public was still fresh in the minds of men, criticism dealt with all aspects of his work. Several works on the life of Carlyle were written in the first decade after 1881, of which the one by James A. Froude is the fullest and most important. Other men, such R. H. Hutton, W. L. Courtney, Edward Caird, John MacCunn and Leslie Stephen, dealt with his works by way of criticism. Their chief aim was to place his social and philosophic writings in the scheme of English prose writing, and point out the weaknesses and good points in his philosophy.

In matters of political and social thought, they, as a whole, realized his sincerity, love of truth, and his interest in the social life of his time. At the time of his death, however, most of the social reforms stressed so much by him, had been realized, in part, or were well on the way to complete realization. Labour conditions were greatly improved, since the time when Carlyle began his social tirades, while the Education Act of 1870 had largely fulfilled his desires in this respect. England was prosperous in the last quarter of the Century, and the political thought tended to democracy, rather than to Carlyle's scheme of autocratic government by heroes. Therefore his popularity as a social reformer died down very quickly after his death; the interest in his works then being only an interest in the literary works of a great author with whose personal life they were acquainted.

Thus such men as Courtney, writing in 1888, says of the social writings of Carlyle "Yet they all have much the same traits--a certain intolerance of their immediate surroundings, a certain visionariness of speculation, a retrograde and reactionary impulse, a generous weariness as those born out of due time,"¹ and states later that Carlyle's influence was already evanescent. This was the attitude of those critics who made only a superficial study of Carlyle's social doctrines and found them of very little immediate practical value. Moreover, his peculiar style offended many by its

¹ Courtney--Studies New and Old; 1888, p. 31.

verboseness and ironical satire. Certainly his theories of aristocratic government offended those radicals who were striving to make democracy an accomplished fact in England. Thus after his death, there was a small school of adverse, superficial critics, who for the most part overlooked his fundamental greatness as a preacher of renewed spiritual life in a distraught industrialized society.

There were, however, a large proportion of the critics at this time who were sympathetic to Carlyle's teaching, and who realized the greatness of his contribution to a peaceful reform of English social conditions, though they were not blind to his faults. They realized that his powerful and moving description of England's social and political evils was the greatest value in his social fiat. His greatest permanent social creed, was the reinstilling of sound spiritual ideas into society, so that its foundations might be right. His dislike of the tendency to popular government and disbelief in the kindly forgiving spirit of the Christian religion¹ were the stumbling blocks to these keener critics, such as Richard Garnett, Edward Caird, and Leslie Stephen. That they recognized Carlyle's permanent quality as a social reformer is most evident in R. Garnett's remark in which he says that Carlyle's lasting quality comes chiefly from his power to influence human life spiritually.² It is most remarkable that they should have caught this dominant note of

¹ Hutton--Modern Guides of English Thought in Matters of Faith; 1914, ch. i, p. 35.

² R C. Garnett--Life of Carlyle; 1887, p. 178.

Carlyle's social teaching so soon after his death.

From 1900 to 1914 there was very little interest taken in Carlyle as a writer on social and political questions. The literary men of great influence in his own day, such as Tennyson, Dickens, William Morris, Kingsley, Froude, Mill, and Ruskin with whom he had had great weight on such subjects had all passed away. These men, each in his own particular field of literature, had dealt with the social and political problems of their time, and had sought to bring about improvement in these matters. Carlyle, and his chief disciple, Ruskin, were past masters in the art of denouncing such social evils. But by 1900, these men were all gone, and interest in ~~such~~ social teachings^{such}, as we find in Carlyle's works had almost disappeared because of the lack of able literary advocates and because the fundamental social problems for which they were written had been remedied to a large degree. Occasional essays dealing with special aspects of his social theories appeared from time to time. John MacCunn's essay on Carlyle as a Radical thinker in 1910, in which he ably deals with Carlyle's democratic tendencies and his sympathetic suggestions for the relief of the labourers, is one of the best in this period. Other odd efforts were made by scholars to determine the extent of his indebtedness to former authors and to foreign influences. Such is C. E. Vaughan's essay on Carlyle and His German Masters in the same year, but on the whole interest in Carlyle, and especially interest in Carlyle for the sake of his social and political writings had almost ceased to exist.

With the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, however, renewed curiosity in one particular phase of Carlyle's political teaching was aroused. It was claimed that Carlyle's dictum that "might is right" had been one of the chief origins of Prussianism. Discussion on this subject was divided into two opposing camps, one of which maintained that the above mentioned doctrine of Carlyle's, together with his praise of the autocratic Frederick the Great of Prussia, gave great impulse to German militarism, which culminated in the Great War. The other side said that Carlyle would not have supported Germany in the recent conflict because he hated war and such ruthless tyranny as it expressed. Thus a lively discussion was waged by journalists and essayists in the better magazines and reviews during the years of the war. Stuart P. Sherman of the New York Nation is a good example of the group who were adverse to Carlyle in this matter. Writing in 1915, when feeling was bitterest, he held that Carlyle was a disciple of Germany and that his praise of Frederick the Great was entirely harmful. He says, "Carlyle denied that men have any rights whatever, and he violently declared that they can get along without happiness, a doctrine delightful to iron statesmen."¹ Moreover, Sherman maintained that obedience and military discipline were pleasing to Carlyle and that these ideas as expressed in his plan for labour organization in the Latter Day Pamphlets resulted from his study of Frederick the

¹ Sherman--Carlyle and Kaiser Worship; The Nation, 1918, p. 287.

Great. Finally in his blind patriotism this critic says that Prussianism has been streaming into Anglo-Saxon communities through forty volumes of Carlyle, thereby implying that all Carlyle's works were permeated with such doctrines of force and tyranny. He forgot entirely that Carlyle insisted primarily on a feeling of comradeship in all relations between superior and inferior in the industrial world. Prussianism, as Sherman takes it in the sense of sheer brute compulsion, was never in Carlyle's scheme of society. What Carlyle really admired in Frederick was his sincerity and the greatness of his purposes for the improvement of his country. The more brutish aspects of the man often disgusted him and gave him much worry concerning the worthiness of the hero of his book.

The other side in this question defended Carlyle chiefly on historical grounds. J. M. Sloan said in 1915 that Carlyle was prejudiced against France in the War of 1870 because his inherent Puritanic principles were offended by the morals of France and by those of Paris in particular. Besides this reason Carlyle held that France as the more powerful nation of the two had been a bad neighbor to the German states for hundreds of years before that war. Therefore he maintained that Germany was justified in meting out punishment to such a neighbor. Moreover the Germany of 1870 which had been striving to find new light in matters of thought,--striving earnestly to do this and at the same time to bind herself together into a true nation--was the Germany which Carlyle had really praised. He had praised her for her sincerity and for her progress in scientific and philosophic matters which were of benefit to

the world. In 1914, however, this Germany had disappeared, and a nation with a different spirit had taken her place--a spirit which was notable in grasping tyranny for selfish glory. Both Sloan in the Hibbert Journal of 1915 and Sidney Gunn in the Unpopular Review of 1918 maintain, I think rightly that if Carlyle had been living in 1914 he would not have upheld the German cause, but would have been bitterly disappointed in the spirit shown by her at that time. Certainly not one realizing Carlyle's democratic sympathies with the poor and his desire for universal betterment of the human race would believe for a moment that he would approve of the tyranny and moral degradation evidenced in the recent War. His theory of "might is right" often seems to be contrary to his more Christian principles but it must be remembered that Carlyle was looking beyond the immediate present with its petty rights and wrongs, to the ultimate, where he believed that right would, as a law of Nature, work out through a might capable of standing permanently. For him the Great War, in its result, would prove that the might of Germany was not the right. But what he did not realize, when he preached this gospel, was that during the process of quelling the wrong might and of proving which were right and which were wrong, the suffering, and wastage of valuable life and human energy would exceed any value which this method of selection might have. In spite of much controversy to the contrary, it still remains a fundamental fact that most rights have to prove their permanent right to existence through their possession of might. This theory is parallel to Darwin's

doctrine of the "survival of the fittest", in spite of Carlyle's detestation of the latter.

Still more recently a small group of Canadian writers have taken up a study of Carlyle's social writings especially with a view to looking into his references to the Colonies and his prophecies concerning Canada. H. L. Stewart of Toronto is the most important of these. His articles, from 1919 to 1921, cover a period when criticism of Carlyle had recovered somewhat from the prejudices of the War, and show a return to a discussion of Carlyle's social and political doctrines. He points out Carlyle's democratic sympathies and the fulfillment of his prophecies concerning Canada, which have been dealt with previously in this essay.¹ A still wider study has been recently made of Carlyle's social doctrines by F. L. Roe in Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin, 1921, and ^{by} E. Neff in Carlyle and Mill, 1924, who compare his theories with those of his contemporaries. In all such post-war criticism there is a distinct return to Carlyle as a social reformer. His theories of Government by Heroes and of "might is right" are now regarded simply as the peculiar views of a great man and the expression of rabid individuality. They have no value in human society and hence are ignored in their practical applications. What these modern critics are interested in are his suggestions for the improvement of popular conditions in the world of labour and industrialism, as well as, his message of spiritual uplift to humanity. In this last

1 Vidi supra, ch. ii, pp. 53-4.

point they have touched the one really permanent value in all Carlyle's works.

Whether Carlyle is regarded as the Puritan with his prejudices peculiar to that sect against pleasure and the frivolous life of this world as the end and satisfaction of man's existence, or as the grim hearted Scot with his love of strength and human might as exhibited in his doctrine of "might is right" and in his love of an autocratic Hero Governor; neither of these phases of his character affect his permanent worth as a social reformer. As the man who insists that every man shall have an equal chance to prove his worth in the leadership of his fellows, he must ever appeal to the democratic world of today. Furthermore, it is he who has pointed the way to our modern conditions in emigration, labour organization, and education, in a time when society was in a state of flux following the upheaval of the Industrial Revolution. Effectively organized emigration, a realization of at least partial justice in labour conditions and compulsory public education under state control are the practical results of Carlyle's efforts to show the need of these and their effectiveness so many years ago. And still more important than these points is the way in which he reaches down to the fundamental causes of social disturbances and gives for its healing a new gospel of spiritual sincerity and vigour in which truth, justice, and the doing of useful work shall put new life into the social relationships of men. He may not believe very explicitly in "the love of God" in the Christian sense of that phrase or in the purely cultural

elements as necessities in human existence, but he does see clearly the necessity for man to have his spirit renewed within him in relation to God and man so that he may realize a just and mutually helpful relation with his fellows. His stress on men's willingness to help each other, and on comradeship between all men should prove that his Hero worship in government was based on surer principles than mere autocracy. Such is Carlyle's permanent message to society. Critics immediately following his death recognized the permanent value of his theories; and now, after years of prejudice and temporary misunderstanding, critics are returning to the idea of the permanent value of his spiritual gospel. It was needed for the society of his own day, when it did much to lift men out of the mire of mammonism into which they had fallen, and it is still needed as a warning to us. Carlyle, the advocate of spiritual rightness in social relationships is necessary in every age, as long as man exists in his present state of mortal frailty. Thus as a minister to man's spiritual needs he has his permanent value as a social reformer.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I

Works of Thomas Carlyle

- 1831 Sartor Resartus; Everyman ed., 1908, reprint 1921; J. M. Dent & Sons, London.
- 1837 French Revolution, in 3 vols.; vols. ii-iv in Centenary ed. of Carlyle's collected works: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., London, 1896.
- 1840 Heroes and Hero-Worship; Everyman ed., 1908, reprint 1921.
- 1843 Past and Present; Everyman ed., 1912, reprint 1915.
- 1845 Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches; in 4 vols.; collected works, vols. vi-ix.
- 1865 A History of Frederick the Great, in 8 vols: collected works, vols. xii-xix.
- Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, in 5 vols., 1899; collected works, vols. xxvi-xxx.
- Scottish and Other Miscellanies; Everyman ed., 1915. reprint 1923.

Essays

- 1829 "Signs of the Times"; Everyman.
- 1831 "Characteristics"; Everyman.
- 1832 "Corn Law Rhymes"; vol. iii.
- 1839 "Chartism"; vol. iv.
- "Petition on the Copyright Bill"; vol. iv.
- 1843 "Dr. Francis"; Everyman.
- 1849 "The Nigger Question"; vol. iv.
- 1866 "Inaugural Address at Edinburgh"; Everyman.
- 1867 "Shooting Niagara; and After?"; Everyman.

Note--Those essays marked "Everyman" are to be found in Scottish and Other Miscellanies, Everyman ed., as listed, under "works". The others are to be found in the volume named Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, Centenary ed. of Carlyle's works.

II

Criticism and General Reference

Caird, Edward

Essays on Literature and Philosophy; pp. 230-267;
The Genius of Carlyle; Jas. Maclehose & Sons, Glas-
gow, 1892.

Coore, G. B. M.

Education, National Systems of; Encyclopaedia Britan-
nica, 11th ed., 1911, vol. viii, pp. 971-984.

Courtney, W. L.

Studies New and Old; pp. 31-52; Carlyle's Political
Doctrines; Chapman and Hall, London, 1888.

Froude, J. A.

Thomas Carlyle, A History of the First Forty Years
of His Life 1795-1835; in two vols.; Longman, Green
& Co., London, 1882.

Thomas Carlyle, A History of His Life in London
1834-1881; in two vols.; Longman, Green & Co.,
London, 1884.

Garnett, Richard

Life of Thomas Carlyle; Walter Scott, London, 1887.

Gunn, Sidney

Carlyle and Kultur; in the Unpopular Review; July-
Dec. 1918, vol. 10, no. 19, pp. 66-78; Henry Holt &
Co., New York.

Hutton, Richard Holt

Essays on Some of the Modern Guides to English Thought in Matters of Faith; Macmillan & Co., London, 2nd. ed., 3rd. reprint, 1914.

Larsen, Laurence M.

History of England and the British Commonwealth; Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1925.

MacCunn, John

Six Radical Thinkers; Bentham, J. S. Mill, Cobden, Carlyle, Mazzini, T. H. Green; Edward Arnold, London, 2nd. imp. 1910.

MacDonald, P. M.

Carlyle as Prophet; in the The Canadian Magazine; Ontario Publishing Co.; Toronto; Nov.-Apr. 1920-21, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 314-316.

Mill, J. S.

On Liberty; People's ed., Longman, Green & Co., London, 1921.

Neff, Emery

Carlyle and Mill, Mystic and Utilitarian; Columbia University Press, New York, 1924.

Nichol John

Thomas Carlyle; English Men of Letters Series, Macmillan & Co., London, 1892.

Roe, Frederick William

The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin; Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1921

Sherman, Stuart P.

Carlyle and Kaiser Worship, in The Nation (New York); Sept. 14, 1918, vol. 107, no. 2776, pp. 286-9.

Sloan, J. M.

Goehte's Influence on Carlyle (Articles I & II), in the International Journal of Ethics; Philadelphia, Jan. 1911, vol. xxi, no. 2, pp. 178-188; no. 3, pp. 269-282.

Stephen, Leslie

Hours in A Library, vol. iii, Carlyle's Ethics; Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1899.

Stewart, H. L.

Carlyle and His Critics, in the Nineteenth Century and after; Spottiswoode, Ballantyne & Co., London, July-Dec. 1919, vol. 86, no. 511, pp. 505-514.

The Declining Fame of Thomas Carlyle in the Royal Society of Canada, May, 1920, vol. xiv, Section 11, pp. 11-29.

Carlyle in Canada, in The Canadian Magazine; Ontario Publishing Co., Toronto, Feb. 1921, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 320-340.

Thwing, Charles F.

Education According to Carlyle, in the School and Society; The Science Press, New York, July-Dec. 1915, vol. 2, no. 45, pp. 649-661.

Vaughan, C. E.

Carlyle and His German Masters in Essays and Studies
by Members of The English Association, collected by
A. C. Bradley; Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1910.

Willcocks, M. P.

Thomas Carlyle; in The Nation (English); National
Press, London, Oct.-Mar., 1919-20, vol. 26, no. 13,
pp. 453-456.