Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 16, Issue No. 9, June-2019, ISSN 2230-7540

Arthur Hugh Clough's Theory of Political Economy

Miss. Sheetal J. Chaudhari*

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of English, Hemchandracharya North Gujarat University, Patan

Abstract – Clough attempted to combat some of the ruling economic dogmas of his time. He went a step further than Carlyle in respect of his interest in political economy. He attempted to combat some of the ruling economic dogmas of his time. In July 1844 he said:

"I am considerably inclined to set to work at Political Economy, for the benefit of the rising generation ; and to see if I cannot prove 'the Apostle of Anti-Laisses-faire".

----------X----------

His declaration clearly shows that he wanted to lay bare the evil that lay at the heart of industrial society and to resolve that it should no longer remain unremedied. For Clough political economy was basically a hand-maiden to morality. In a letter to the editor of The Balance he defined political economy as a " science most needful for Christian men'. Society was contractual ; social and economic relationships depended on the division of labour and the exchange of its results, and from a study of these alone could proceed a right appreciation of those relations, and a knowledge of our duties in them, it was true he conceded, that the 'pure law of economic science' had been applied rather to the low practical question' of making money than to than to the high practical imperative of doing justice to one's neighbor, but he asserted, numerous moral applications may be found, numerous cases occur where moral guidance would be given by the principles of political economy; numerous actions are daily done whose evil is justified by these principles misunderstood, and where they rightly understood, would per chance be corrected".2 Some notes, Clough made in 1945 and in 1949 (Rome) indicate that he started with a labour theory of value which he formulated as 'Labour or difficulty + utility generate value' and which incidentally, tended to provide scientific authority for the ideals of work and service he had been educated to uphold, Although, Clough started with this basic proposition of classical economics, but he was uneasy about the consequences drawn from it in the Ricardian theory of wages and in the laws of supply and demand. The notes show him trying to feel his way towards some form of organized protection for labour against unrestricted competitions in the fixing of wages:

"Competition –

Given a thousand labours with no present subsistence; -You have a stock of corn, -- clearly it is your duty to Divide the corn and the labour requisite for the Reproduction of it equally amongst them……..

Granted :

But what people do is not this. They do not give work and pay to all but put up the work at action for the lowest contractor. Clearly the value of the article to the purchaser does not alter by the fact that there are four or five labourers anxious to produce it, where there were two or three before…… If there is no other occupation or the supernumerary seamstresses the only fair way is to divide the work and pay, both alike, between them all; clearly it is no fair way at all to give the whole work and the half pay to a portion of them".3

He rejected and criticized the unfairness and unchecked competition as an economic principle. He considered, the feasibility of establishing within a capitalist economy, some collective and regulative mechanism to fix wages and profits on the basis of adequate living standards: He says,

"The Natural price of labour viz…… the cost of rearing and maintaining, underlies the market price-- is not this settled in a manner by legislation, viz …. the poor law ------ Might not this minimum be otherwise fixed and regulated ? – It is on a moral ground of keeping a crops de reserve for possible demands in the labour market – and why not carry that principle further? – Supposing an Irishman and an Englishman equally skilled and equally ready to work – might not the law protects the former in maintaining his standards of wages – In refusing to go bare foot and filthy ? But how? By

*saying you must, if you take the Irishman, pay him Englishman's wages? Or at any rate may not the law insist on the schools being kept up – habits of a certain nature adopted – and the master (manufacturer or otherwise), still more so".*4

Clough condemned spending on luxury consumption. Such consumption was justified in the cause of education, in the encouragements of the arts, he approved of the capitalist, who saved his money and invested it in reproductive enterprise. He liked any kind of investment whose return is moral and spiritual that is good to the country. He attacked the idea that luxury – spending justified itself on economic grounds, that it justified itself by creating employment. Instead of wasting money and labour in luxury he advocated 'reproductive' investments in mills, farming improvements, mining companies, canal and railway projects.

His views on savings investment show, that Clough's mind was not occupied by the wealthy society but by the just and human one. In his sixth final letter to The Balance he made a declaration of the 'Laws of fairness and honesty'. His economic theory was firmly grounded on the higher principle of equity. Taking his stand on the basic principle of fairness he asserted that the uses of economic theory were to increase wealth, multiply production, accumulate capitals but in equal measures. The capitalists were to ensure that the labours may receive their share. That the money may be made but also ensure that work may be paid.

Thus, within a capitalist economy Clough rejected its procedures and revealed a crucial ambivalence in his sense of truth. One the one hand, he believed in the evolutionary and relative nature of truth, but on the other, he was deeply attached to the idea of truth as unitary, immutable and comprehensive. The tension of that ambivalence becomes intense, and difficult to endure, as he grew older. Each man has to fight for himself in an unrestricted economic competition against the single enemy on the earth . He says :

"I am not to regard myself as engaged in a petty warfare with all those for who I work for me……. we are not adventurers, soldiers of fortune, each man for himself and chance for us all …… True it is, at first sight it seems otherwise; as in ancient warfare so now in modern trade, each man is ordered to fight for himself. But the army is not therefore disbanded, we are still under orders. And as in modern warfare it has been found that organized corporation is, if less stimulant of individual enemy, nevertheless, more effective of general success, so may it be in future days with modern trade. But…… whatever the tactics, whatever the commands, we are still to all intense fellow-soldiers a single army engaged for the common good against a single enemy, which we have to subdue, the elements, whose resources we must force".5

Clough's call to aristocracy and land owing gentry shows Carlyle's influence on him. He called land-owners to enter into trade and refuse to adopt this commercial spirit as it is, they should impregnate trade with their own ancestral feeling of service owed and duty to be done to the country.

These letters to The Balance show his concern for the problem of society. By this time he was an active member of the Decade, the debating society which had caused him so much soul searching as an undergraduate. The decade meetings provided Clough with an opportunity for clarifying his ideas on contemporary social issues. It was now that he combated on contemporary social issues. It was now that he combated the doctrines of 'laissez faire' and the omnipotence of the action supply and demand than hardly disputed in England. Clough's diagnosis of the emerging structure of political, social and economic power is acute, and clearly it owed a great deal to Carlyle. In the perspective of the forties the industrialists could legitimately be seen as a champion of the reformers and of the oppressed rural workers; Clough could, quite sincerely voice his sympathy for popular causes. Church remembered him in the same speech electrifying 'some even of those among his audience who were by no means ultra-conservative' by the vehemence of his expressed feelings about 'the claims of the poor, the duties incumbent upon holders of property. In showing this faith in 'master manufactures', and the part they could play in shaping a new and less unjust England and however, Clough was succumbing to the same authoritarian temptation that Carlyle had fallen to he was throwing in his lot with the ascendant class.

Unlike John Staurt Mill, neither man saw that the crucial problem was that of seeing up a multiple and balancing set of power groups. Carlyle had exhorted the captains of industry to become heroes; Clough was attempting to persuade them to become gentleman. He saw class characteristics as a kind of abstract human fund, available to all men from which one could draw the appropriate qualities as required. Like Arnold, he failed to see that without self-interest there would be no class.

Clough's pamphlet on the Retrenchment Association, written in 1844 came to be at the height of Irish famine as a deeply serious and long pondered argument. It derives its energy from Clough's moral indignation, but the Carlylean rhetoric of concern also encompasses a seriously held theory of economic life. In his address to a privileged Oxford audience, Clough stresses on the necessity of cultural tradition, on both moral and traditional grounds to a consideration of the role the traditionally privileged should play in a society rapidly moving away from a rigidly stratified, land centered economy.

The years 1842-48 were a period of great personal and intellectual growth for Clough. This was the era that he letter called of his 'great force' when he named himself Carlyle's 'Apostle of Anti-Laissez faire' and he began to get that practical knowledge of "the great machine of social system".6 At this stage he earned the reputation for sincerity, originality and complete commitment to his beliefs.

His opinions constituted neither literally the 'Chartism' nor the 'communism' nor indeed the mere 'Carlyleanism' of which some critics have accused him.

Clough's writing on social and political matters during this period, however, cannot be separated from certain aspects of his personal achievements. He was selected to a fellowship at Oriel in 1842 after almost a year of poverty. His first duty was to get hold of his responsibility as a teacher and member of the college. He was loved and respected by every member of the college. In the same month he undertook to write the first of the seventy-seven biographical contributions he was to make to a famous classical dictionary. His hard work and evident ability brought him the post of college tutor. In 1847 he was appointed Sub-Dean, a position close to top of college's hierarchy. The post, quite probably, carried with it additional money. His income was large and it affected both his personal and professional success at Oxford. Under the Oxford system a dean was free to take as many private tutorial students as he wished, and each paid him a fee which was additional to the sum the college gave him as a fellow.

His income therefore was between £700 and £800 a year, and this was not merely respectable; it was quite handsome. At that time £700 was considerable as an excellent income for a well-to-do man.

While Clough was making headway in his personal career, England was undergoing one of the worst economic crisis of the century (the so-called) Hungry Forties, of which a trade unionist wrote during a depression in 1884 that though his fellows might think they suffered now, "never in their darkest hours did they suffer a tenth part of the hunger and starvation which the atrocious Corn-Laws inflicted upon their forefathers".7 It was an era as turbulent as any in England's modern history. The bad harvests and American bank failures with their English repercussions of the late 1830's had been succeeded by severe and deepening economic depression. The Chartists, a working –class party which eventually numbered millions among its petitioners had sprung up in 1838 to secure what would have been revolutionary power for the masses.

'The House of Commons is the people's house'

Its first manifesto read in aggressive, Cobbett

Like tones which are also rather moving. "and

Their our opinions should be stated, there our rights

Should be advocated, there we ought to be represented".8

The Anti-Corn Law League, founded in 1839 to repeal the importation duties which artificially maintained the price of wheat thereby keeping wages and manufacturing costs up while benefitting the land – owners – and penalizing the middle class businessman – was also agitating more and more fiercely. Strikes, riots, lockouts, even murder became part of the political picture throughout industrial England. Many of the poor starved to death in the miserable cellars and back alleys of cities like Manchester and Liverpool, flooded by Irish immigrates when Clough in the early 1840's helped his sister with her Church School in Liverpool or with her visited the poor to distribute the only supplies – coals, potatoes, and flour that stood between them and starvation; he was learning at first-hand what the condition of England really was.

Throughout this period parliament set up investigatory Commissions to inquire into the conditions of labour. They published their findings in six full scale reports between 1842-45. Prior to this the workers carried their first chartist petition to London in1839 in the belief that parliament and the Queen must be merely ignorant of their condition and would help if they knew the true facts. They were repulsed, and their second petition was not brought out until 1842 in a winter when misery and bitterness were at their greatest. John Bright later, the famous quaker M.P., tried to organized a general lockout; his aim was to provoke a revolution that would force the government to repeal the Corn Laws.

Their revelations of the grossest kind of abuse of labourers finally shocked the middle-classes into taking minimal regulatory action beginning in 1844 with the Ten Hours Act. But because of religious rivalries then there was to be no general public education in England until 1870's and John Staurt Mill said that "the English working class was the most uneducated and depraved in Europe".9

Under the new poor Laws, so called 'outdoor relief' was no longer available, and no public assistance could be got short of moving into workhouse. There were no public medical dispensaries, no public savage or lighting systems especially no health services at all. Choleras swept through London and government did nothing about it. The ills of England in 1840's caused a feeling of dissatisfaction and roused the conscience of some members of the public to what was wrong. Men like Arnold and Carlyle started awaking the people from slumber.

In 1842 the Chartists had listed as one of the monopolies by which the upper classes oppressed them- "The means of travelling and transit".10 The Railway industry born in 1830's began to born in the next decade but no provisions had been made either for protecting investing public or for bringing the fares within reach of working class. At one time 'five distinct companies' were formed to build a line between London and Bridgeton – and "all of (their) shares at some time or another were at a premium".11 Gladstone's proposal of 1844 aimed at satisfying workers' demands for cheaper transportation while curbing this dangerously unregulated competition Clough summed it:

I am glad to say that we are offered by the Ministry, Acurate Gladstone, a grand anti-laissez-faire Railway Bill, empowering the Board of Trade, when profit rise above 10 percent on the original shares, to insist on a decrease of fares: also in certain condition to purchase railway for the Crown; also to insist on certain accommodations for the poorer passengers. I hope it may be passed in its full integrity but there will doubtless be sharp opposition".12 The bill not merely ensured that the poor should not pay more than a penny per mile when they took special trains provided for them but Gladstone, a Tory and a high Church man with manufacturing ties, should even have contemplated the ultimate purchases of an industry by the Crown. This may be one of the reasons why Clough threw his support behind the peelite when he stood for Oxford in 1847.

The Earlier letter quoted shows Clough's interest in Carlyle.

I am considerably inclined ," he writes:

"to set to work at political Economy for the benefit of the rising generation ; - and to see if I cannot prove 'the Apostle of Anti-Laissez-Faire."13

In assuming that Apostleship, he is responding directly to Carlyle's call for such followers. His relations with Carlyle's thought are interesting but complex one. Clough's early letters are full of references and proofs that "he read Carlyle and during London years became a friend of the famous writer. Carlyle, in fact, got Clough the job at Education office for which he returned to England from America in 1853".14

Clough accepted Carlyle's views more or less in Toto. Carlyle's influence on Clough is best evident in his prose style. Clough's admiration for Carlyle was not uncritical as some studies have suggested, and it is clear that even as an undergraduate Clough chose rigorously, even rather narrowly, from among ideas and attitudes that Carlyle offered, Clough remarks in a letter in 1841 ;

"I keep wavering between admiration of his exceedingly great perceptive and analytical power and other wonderful points and inclination to turn away altogether from a man who has so great a lack of all reality and actuality". 15 It is a mistake to assume that John Holloway's definition of Carlyle's idealism, or 'anti-mechanism' is a sufficient summery of his meaning for Clough. Moreover, it is often impossible to distinguish ideas Clough may have got from Carlyle, and which have been ascribed to the Scott's influence, such as his hostility to cut-throat competition or his trust in the 'Ideal' , from those he had already learned from Arnold.

In his early writing Clough failed to accept some of Carlyle's strong points. The poet never appreciated, for example, Carlyle's reverence for heroes or strong men. Such reverence did not interest him. He specifically rejected the concept of heroism which he feared might lead man to choose glory over common honesty. Another of Carlyle's favourite target was the idea of democracy. Carlyle held democracy to be but a "zero…… a regulated method of rebellion and abrogation". It was the "consummation of No-Government and Laisser faire" 16 the expression of the flunky's resentment of order and "despair of finding any heroes to govern you". Clough began by sharing Arnold's distrust of democracy but until around 1848 or 50 his attitude grew increasingly egalitarian. And even at his most conservative stage there is no trace in Clough of his determined and ingrained hostility to democracy, indeed, the reverse is often in evidence.

Thirdly, Clough was unmoved by Carlyle's authoritarian aspect of thought. He disposed the idea that might could make right. He lacked Carlyle's passionate faith in order. Carlyle's thunder about judgement- the punitive side of morality, found no response in Clough. Over simplification, judgmental attitude, authoritarianism – none of these was native to Clough's personality.

Nevertheless, Carlyle did have a strong effect on Clough's writing as well as acts. He furnished him with elements of vocabulary. Though he rejected the idea of heroism yet he claimed to be capable of the profound heroism of right action like an ordinary citizen if not like a hero. He gained from Carlyle's exhortations a sense of reinforcement towards action.

In 1835, The Decade, a society to provide a form for the discussion of serious questions, was founded. It elected to membership the cream and select few- undergraduates. Matthew Arnold, Tom Arnold, Clough, E.M.Gaulburn, the future dean of the church. Coleridge, himself the future Lord Chief Justice, and authors who were to be prominent in parliament and professions, were the member of the decade. It flourished for some twelve or fifteen years. Clough belonged to The Decade from 1843 to 1848. When he spoke it was with unusual power and influence. Both Matthew and Tom Arnold felt that "no member of the society spoke in so rich penetrating, original and convincing a strain as

Clough".17 The Secretary, John Connington, wrote more than years later:

I can recall his commanding manner, and the stately serene tones in which he delivered a kind of prophecy of the new era which in a few days (with the imminent repeal of the Corn Laws) was to be inaugurated, and told us that 'these men' (the manufactures) 'were the real rulers of England.'18

Clough's recognition that 'these men were the real rulers of England' echoes Carlyle's respect for the (Captains of Industry).

The earliest record of a speech by Clough at The Decade is of one made arranged 1844 in support of Ashley's Ten Hours Bill, an act bitterly opposed by the manufacturing interest and defeated when first brought forward; the battle being fought on the grounds of laissez-faire. This seemingly modest piece of legislation would have applied to the textile industry. It limited to ten hours daily, the work not of the 'operatives' the man who ran the looms, but of the women and children who tended and supplied them. The manufactures and such publications as The Spectator opposed the measure, admitting that they pursued (on Malthusian Principle) a deliberate policy of repressing wages, while trying to compete with the more cheaply staffed continental mills.

Their major defense, however, was the principle of unrestricted competition and it was this that Clough attacked "In supporting the resolution Tom Arnold wrote, "He combated the doctrine of 'laissez- faire' and the omnipotence and sufficiency of the action of supply and demand, then hardly disputed in England, with an insight marvelous in one who had so little experiences of industrial life, and at the same time with a strict and conscientious moderation".19

Clough's views were expressed strongly in a letter written on June 25, 1844.

*I …….. believe that the worker has not his proper proportion (of gain) that capital tyrannies over labour, and the government is bound to interfere to prevent such bullying and I do believe too that in……. some way or other the problem now solved by universal competition, or the devil take the hindmost, may receive a more satisfactory solution. It is manifestly observed that to allow me to get my stokings ½ d a pair cheaper the operative stoking weaver should be forced to go barefoot. It is surely not wholly Utopian to look for some system which will apportion the due reward and the various sets of workman and evade this perpetual struggle for securing (each man to the exclusion of his neighbours) the whole market.*20

Clough saw that inequities were caused not merely by the failure of the upper classes to lead as Carlyle argued, but grew from denying to labour its positive right.

Although Clough put his faith in master manufactures, but he was also able to see beyond this position to the fact that the classes' interest were not identical, that 'bullying' was and would be the rule while one class held all the power, and that only the creation of more powerful central authority that could secure for the workers their 'due reward'.

Like John Staurt Mill, he believed that the free operation of supply and demand was a myth, and there is always a master who throws his sword into the scale, and the term are such as he imposes. Such remarks were popularly regarded as revolutionary at the time they were made. Clough deserves credit for the company his ideas kept, particularly when he reached conclusions parallel to but independent of those of Mill.

In 1846 Clough developed his friendship with Bonamy Price, who was one of the sponsors, together with his great Whig and Evangelical friends, of the newly recognized weekly. Clough held it to be a weak paper. Its major innovation was a 'working man's column' which was to include subjects of interest to the artisans and the peasants. The economy of the cottage and the workshop articles and extracts likely to be read by the laboures neutralizing the injurious effects of infidel writings, and exposing the fellows of the discontented and designing.

Clough was to differ radically from this typical middle class and Arnoldian attitude when he later insisted on presenting the workers as a man with rights than as a charity case.

The five letters relevant to our study here (here sixth deals with the militia and will be omitted) are all concerned with the nature of the social and economic conditions and changes which England would or might experience with the coming repeal of the Corn Laws. Though Clough was opposed to the action of unlimited competition, yet the voice and attitudes were his own and these often differ from Carlyle's. In Chartism Carlyle had tended to see in education along the means of political change. By 1849, in the Nigger Question, for example, he was advocating that the Jamaican Negroes be forced to work, and slavery reinstituted, so that the white might prosper and the 'slavery of the wise to the foolish' be avoided. Clough, meanwhile, was moving leftward. He omits Carlyle's reverence for the captains of Industry, preferring now to idolize such figures but to identify himself as an employer and proceed to lay upon him those moral strictures and responsibilities any honest man should feel. Clough does fortell, theorizes and assert certain moral propositions, but we do not feel as we do after reading Carlyle, that a prophet has spoken for God; rather we have heard a voice developing the argument from certain assumptions that he had and we can take almost for granted. His efforts lie in turning those

assumptions into action of getting down to just that 'reality and actuality' that Clough had found wanting in Carlyle.

In a letter which first appeared on January 23, 1846, and dealt with the imminent repeal of the Corn Laws. England, Clough foretold, was on the eve of a great economic change in which labour would leave the farms and the cities would grow. "It may be, though this is a question, that labour will have to remove from the field to the Mill and such transfers are pretty sure to be attended with hardship, but the money which the country saves will are long be benefit to all --------. To the nation at large, and in the long run, the change will be economically a blessing. We shall stand better in the columns of the national account book".21

In his second letter he begun to attack the basis of 'the evil' ; unlimited competition. He was to end his series of letters by asking some pointed question about the system to free enterprise itself. Political economy, he pointed out, was a more complex matter than merely the idea of 'laissez-faire' could explain.

Mill pointed out, the law of competition as it governed supply and demand generally considered the only operative one in political economy from being the study in what manner a nation may be made rich to one that informs us of the law which regulates the production, distribution and consumption of wealth.

It is very likely that Clough read Mills Logic enthusiastically and broadened the scope of political economy including the study of proper distribution of wealth.

The repeal of the Corn Laws raised the question not merely weather the nation will be richer, but probably more important, weather a part of the community be not receiving unfair wages.

The rest of his letter is devoted to attacking conspicuous waste; the unproductive consumption. Mill granted that some unproductive might be necessary for man's well – being but he distinguished between psychological and economic benefits. Clough followed the same line in his fourth letter; "There are things…….. that do great moral good, and yet cost much money and of money spent in this way at present let no question be raised. Only let none say or suppose that expense of this or any other kind is a benefit to themselves, or to others".22 It was a wastefull consumption when a rich man buy a horse and never rides it; a lady buys dress and wears it once. Clough admitted that for rich suddenly to change their habits would also be unfair to labour but pleaded with them that "If the hands already employed can have work of a different, a reproductive kind found for them, the sooner they take it the better"23

Clough preferred and supported emigration of labour to supporting twenty idle fool men or useless shop boys at home.

Later on Clough's thought centered on a strong central government working through ministries and commissions to regulate the economy in the interest of all.

Clough in attacking the 'Law of laissez-faire' questions the actuality of the law itself. He sees it as were expedient. He puts the case for protecting the labourers.

He held the opinion that a slight degree of thought would suffice to overturn the fundamental misconceptions that the common rules of trade do in themselves constitute the laws of fairness and honesty. These rules required the continual interference of higher principles, as of equity. Clough did not accept any social, problem as insoluble as the problem of the law was regarded to be. The idea that strong economic policies could not exist simply because they never had existed before was anathema to him. Equity and not cheapness should determine prices. The central authority such as he conceived might control the building market for the good of all, so the state should be empowered to demand work from its citizens, to compel shoe – makers to make shoes as it has to exact their services from soldiers in the army, sailors in the navy or judges in the bench. Clough rejected the pattern set by Mr. Dombays, the Crakers and little Grinders:

I am not regard myself as engaged as engaged in a pretty warfare with all those for whom I work or who work for me. It is not a scramble who shell get most and do least. We are not adventures, soldiers of fortune, each man for himself and chance for us all; ……..24

This is the essential code of ethics by which Clough tried to live in a commercial society, a code based on a sense of personal dignity and pride.

Clough looked for the equalization of labour and held that if a man did not work neither should we let him eat. But to term his flatty a 'socialist' might be misleading. He did not want a centralized organization with an all-powerful state owing and running the means of production, distribution and exchange. He did not question the private ownership of property; rather he limits himself to envisaging a government endowed with certain broad regulatory powers exercised for the benefit of society as a whole.

Clough wrote a pamphlet titled as 'Retrenchment' and the occasion was the Irish Famine. Irish Famine had been the great fact of political and economic thought since 1846. The repeal of the Corn Laws was achieved in May of that year, but

the freer importance of wheat did not, under Russell's callous mishandling of the problem of disease and transport, prevented, continued and even worsened suffering. The English people were not ready to believe soon enough that the stories of terrible suffering were true. Peel's government fell a few months after the necessary repeal had been instituted, and under Lord John Russell "Adherence to Laisser-faire' was carried to such a length that in the midst of one of the major famines of history the government was perpetually nervous of being too good to Ireland and of corrupting the Irish people by kindness and so stifling the virtues of self-reliance".25

This act of cruelty distressed Clough and now onwards he assumed literary mask in his prose writings. In his poems he could express what he could not have said otherwise.

Clough was neither a revolutionary nor a Utopian. He stood midway between those who, like Carlyle or Newman, held that no social advance could be authentic without first improving man's moral nature, and those architects of social changes like Owen or Fourier who hoped that by the planning of new towns and new societies man might progress to a pantisocratic state of moral perfection.

In his Letter to Christian Socialist Clough expressed his views on Christian Socialism, a movement started by two Clergyman F. D. Maurich and Charles Kingsley, and J. M. Ludlow, an Englishman educated in France. They felt the need to Christianize and ameliorate the brutal conditions in which the workers lived. It gained more effectiveness when joined by a Frenchman, named Lachevalier, who persuaded them to espouse the cause of workman's co-operatives. These shops, run by skilled artisans who shared the profit among themselves, had been tried with some success in France before and during the revolution as a means of combating the worst effects of laissez– faire capitalism. A working Tailor's Association was formed in 1850. On November 2, 1850 the first issue of The Christian Socialist : A Journal of Association was published.

Clough objected to this association and held Christian Socialism identical with Christianity. According to him Christianity and Socialism alike stood against the idea of self – interest or profit and under neither could rivalry, competition be sanctioned. Co-operative association meant merely the practical application of Christianity to the purposes of trade and industry. This movement was based on the hypothesis that England was a Christian nation and that they might expect the English to cast out the evil spirit of selfishness, greediness, tyranny, and the like. But, in fact, though England baptized mostly, English society was not truly Christian. They ought not to go to establish a system on this hypothesis which was yet unattainable. The success was doubtful.

Clough who had been once the 'Apostle of anti-laissez-faire', who had insisted that honesty and fairness, not competition, ought to be the basis on which wages were set, now held that the world could not do without competition. It was a good thing for the man to be beaten in the race to learn. This reversal is noteworthy. Clough could not help coming to the theory of competition which involves or indirectly encourages capitalism, which he severely criticized. He sadly realized competition to be the most efficient way for teaching men this great law of a sadly uncelestial world.

Clough's efforts to build up a commercial society brought him nothing but frustration, disillusionment and alienation. But interestingly, the kind of economic changes Clough hoped for through more powerful governmental controls, rather than the other means, such as association, were in the mainstream of those measurers which England over the last century has ultimately come to adopt. It is Clough's originality of vision which anticipated the things to come, though they were not accepted in his time out of this tension and frustration arose Clough's best poetry.

The conflict represented by Dipsychus VS the spirit has a long history. In eighteen and nineteen century (upon the arrival of industrial and democratic revolutions) an increase of worldliness and bourgeois society provoked the feeling of alienation and secularism. The importance of wealth became more pronounced and more within the reach of man who had the energy to pursue it. "Idleness and luxury on the one hand, and on the other, intense and sometimes unscrupulous competition could not help but breed standard of value the samples of human nature that were ugly".26

These developments provoked the Puritan and Evangelical revival which later influenced Thomas Arnold, Carlyle and J.H. Newman to establish the Victorian ideal of moral earnestness. The goal of life became to root out pleasure, wealth and worldly success and to become Christ-like character. At Rugby Arnold's sermons, denouncing the lines of "selfish extra vagance……. Idleness ……. excess in eating and drinking" were constantly offering his pupils with the supreme chance between two paths – "the path which may lead most readily to worldly wealth and honour, or that in which they may best and safest fellow Christ".27

Clough felt the same tension at Oxford, for the path were then more conspicuous and Arnold's attack on worldliness was reiterated with greater stress by Ward, Clough's tutor. Thus Dipsychus was rooted in Evangelical struggle to check the secular spirit. But Clough made it clear in epilogue that the conflict between Dipsychus and spirit. "Is the conflict between the tender conscience and the

world".28 Clough appears to be advocating the life of a scholar gipsy.

He held the opinion that any contact with the world will mean the almost necessary loss of ideal purity. This is demonstrated in "Jacob", where the poet had his father, the cotton-merchant of Liverpool and Charleston, at the back of his mind.

Ah me : this eager rivalry of life,

This cruel conflict for pre-eminence

This keen supplanting of the dearest kin,

Quick seizure and fast unrelaxing hold,

Of vantage – place; the stony hard resolve,

The chase, the competition, and the craft

Which seems to be the poison of our life

And yet is the condition of our life:

(Jacob*, I, 81-88*)

Jacob hovers between the pathetic victim of circumstance, shamed by failure he could not prevent, and the guilt. He feels nostalgic for an earlier world of innocence and peace.

Alas : I know, and from the outset knew,

The first born faith, the singleness of soul,

The antique pure simplicity with which

God and good angels communed undispleased.

(Jacob, I. *29-32)*

The same tension of Jacob is the core of the poem Dipsychus. In scene IV the spirit celebrates the pleasure of good living, including the pleasures of now and then giving a crust to the poor.

A gondols here, and a gondols there

'Tis the pleasantest fashion of taking the air,

To right and to left; stop, turn and go yonder,

And let us repeat, o'er the lade as we wonder,

How pleasant it is to have money, heigh ho :

How pleasant it in to have money.

(Dipsychus, Scene IV, 198-203)

In scene IV, Dipsychus sees a dream but he is too clear-sighted to fall for a fancy dream. He sees that the pleasures or illusions and that the mirth and joy are hallow. With the same ironic praise of the new order and the same despairing comment, Dipsychus speaks of the law, of the sword supplanting 'Merchant Justice' and the police. But he says that the-

Lawyers are villains, soldiers too;

And nothing's new and nothing's true.

Dong, there is no God; dong:

(Dipschus, Scene V,105-107)

In scene IX, then apart from any high morality, puritan or heroic, the increasing size of factories and offices in an expanding economy had a depressing effect :

At the huge members of the vast machine,

In all those crowded rooms of industry,

No individual soul has loftier leave

Than fiddling with a piston and a valve.

Well one could bear that also: one could drudge

And do one's petty part, and by content

In base manipulation, solaced still

By thinking of the leagued fraternity.

And of co-operation, and the effect

Of the great engine. If indeed it work,

And is not a mare treadmill: which it may be :

Who can confirm it is not ? we ask action,

And dream of arms and conflict; and string up

All self – devotion's muscles; and are set

To fold up paper, to what end? We know not.

(Dipsychus, Scene IX, 120-34)

Dipsychus goes on to say that at any rate we are paid for it and that he who eats must serve. Once work loses its 'goodness'. It is undertaken only from necessity.

And at what cost to the individual? in the face of increasing luxury in the upper classes and increasing mammonism in the middle classes, one might well wonder if he could be in the world and not of it, and if of it, than contaminated by it.

The Bothie on the one hand, is a kind of reaction to the social, political and religious conditions of Oxford, and, on the other, provides clues to the segregation in society on the basis of wealth, profession and position. The feast in the first section of the poem, where peasant and gillic and game keeper sit in due subordination with their social and political standard. The health of visiting reading party is drunk, and Hewson, the hero, of the poem is selected to reply for the visitors but with some misgiving, for Hewson is --

> *……. a radical hot, hating lords and scorning ladies,*
>
> *Silent mostly, but often reveling in fire and fury*
>
> *Feudal tenures, merchant lords, competition and bishops,*
>
> *Lineries, armorial bearings, among after matters the game laws…….*
>
> (The Bothie, I, 125-8)

These lines shows social discrimination and Hewson is the masterpiece of his creator i.e. Clough. He hates this sort of discrimination based on wealth and social position.

In the next section he violently scores conventional middle class notions of feminine charm and grace:

> *Oh, if our high born girls knew only the grace, the attracting,*
>
> *Labour and labour alone, can add to the beauty of women,*
>
> (The Bothie II, 75-76)

Clough emphasizes the importance of labour. This confirms his faith in equalization of labour, that all must work no one should sit idle. Philip's ideas are not just those of a Chartist with confounded equalite. They are also those of a young man whose experience counts heavily as his thinking. He also talks about far spreading economic consequences—

> *Truly the milliner's trade would quickly. I think at discount,*
>
> *All the waste and loss in silk and satin be saved us,*
>
> *Saved for purposes truly, and widely productive.*
>
> (The Bothie*, II, 25-9)*

These lines are expressive of Clough's ideas on 'productive' production in factories and rejection of the unproductive.

REFERENCES

1. Correspondence, I, 130.
2. Buckner Trawick, ed. Selected prose works of Arthus Hugh Clough (Alabama: University of Ala press, 1967, p.211-12 Request references will be made to the work)
3. Clough MSS. In Balliol College, Oxford. 441, fols, 6-7. (cited here after as Balliol MS).
4. Balliol, M.S. 441, fol.9
5. Buckner Trawick, 'The Spirit of Trade', p. 223-4-5.
6. Essay No. 13
7. Joseph Arch, Free Trade Versus Protection (Coventry and London, 1884), p. 110.
8. Enelyne Barish Greenberger, Arthur Hugh Clough: The Growth of a Poet's Mind, Cambridge: Harvard Uni. Press), 19 p. 58.
9. John Stuart Mill, Political Economy (London 1848, I, 129-130.
10. G. M. Young, ed., English Historical Documents (London, 1956), p. 447.
11. G. M. Young, ed., Early Victorian England: 1830 – 1865 (Oxford: Univ. Press), I, 65-66.
12. Correspondence, I, 130.
13. Ibid.
14. Correspondence, II, 394-385.
15. Correspondence, I, 104.
16. Thomas Carlyle, Chartism (London, 1841), p. 53.
17. Tom Arnold, "Passages" P.P.R. , I, 25-32. (Cited here after as Passages)

18. P.P.R., I, 31.

19. Passages, P. 59.

20. Correspondence, I, 126-127.

21. S.P., P.208-210 (Essay No. 4, January 23, 1846).

22. S.P., P. 217-221. (Essay No. 7 printed in The Balance, February 13, 1846).

23. Ibid.

24. Bodleian, M.S. Eng. Misc. fol. 513.

25. Cecil Woodham Smith, The Great Hunger: Ireland 1845-1849 (London, 1962), P. 410-11.

26. Walter E. Haughton, Victorian Frame of Mind (New Heaven 1950) P. 191-95.

27. Thomas Arnold, Christian life, Its Course, Its Hindrances and Its Helps (5th ed. London, 1849) p. 151.

28. A. L. P. Norrington, ed. Clough Poetical Works (London; Oxford University Press, 1968) P. 294.

Corresponding Author

Miss. Sheetal J. Chaudhari*

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of English, Hemchandracharya North Gujarat University, Patan

tayapawan0101@gmail.com