We have been lately told that the giving of relief in the form of work to those who in a time of distress come under the Poor Law is equivalent to national work-shops. This opinion was further asserted by the statement, not true to work-shops, or to establish a relation between it and the working classes, similar to that between the employer and the employed, and only result in the long run in producing far more frightful widespread and permanent misery, than it would have done. I am glad to see that the poor man’s right to receive work is recognized, and that the poor man is to be enabled to work and is willing to work, but unemployed in terms of course and protracted distress to him and the same thing with National work-shops, or equivalent to asking the State to step into the place of the ordinary employer. The difficulty is to show why the latter proposition can be peremptorily and consistently refrained from, the former proposition urgently and anxiously recommended.

A reference to the argument of my own, in which I will expound the judgment given by, who was certainly not ignorant of the principles of Political Economy.

John Stuart Mill, in his Vindication of the Poor-Law, Provincial Government of the French Revolution in February 1848, writes as follows: There remains another measure of the Provincial Government, which opens a still wider field of difficult and important discussion than the preceding; the recognition of the duty or at least of an obligation on society to find work and wages for all persons willing and able to work, who cannot procure employment for themselves. To one class of thinkers the acknowledgment of this duty or it may naturally appear a patentous burden, but it is curious to see that these are the most loudly protest. This opinion is identical with the act of the Provincial Government towards the necessitous citizens in the provinces, who were on the back of the Poor Law of Elizabeth and that the same thing should be so bad in France, which is perfectly right in the opinion of the same persons in England and Ireland. In the Poor Law of Elizabeth, and nothing more, and guaranteed to those who cannot, employment to those who can. This is the act of Elizabeth and this is the promise which it is so irascible in the Provincial Government to have made in France.
John Stuart Mill, in his Vindication of the French Provisional Government of the French Revolution in February 1848, writes as follows: "There remains another measure of the Provisional Government, which opens a still wider field of difficult and important discussion than the preceding: the recognition of the "Droit au travail," or an obligation on society to find work and wages for all persons willing and able to work, who cannot procure employment for themselves. To one class of thinkers, the acknowledgment of the "Droit au travail" may very naturally appear a patentous blunder; but it is curious to see who those are that most loudly profess this opinion. It is singular that this act of the Provisional Government should find its bitterest critic in the journalists who dislike so much the excellence of the Poor Law of Elizabeth; and that the same thing should be said in France, which is perfectly right in the opinion of the same persons in England and Ireland. For the French have heard of the Poor Law of Elizabeth, and nothing more, and quarrelled to those who cannot, employment to those who cannot. This is the act of Elizabeth, and this is the promise which it is so incurable in the Provisional Government to have made in France.

"On the English poor-law system the Law gives to every pauper a right to demand work or support without work, for himself individually. It appeared to the Provisional Government, as it must appear to every considerate and sympathetic person, that the earth belongs first of all to the inhabitants of it; and every person ought to have a subsistence before any one has more; that whoever works at any useful thing before any one able to work is allowed to receive the bount of benefits. These are moral actions."

Mill then declares: But the affirmation of the "Droit au travail" was followed by the execution of the "Code Morinniens," which indeed was to necessary consequence. He goes on to say, "It was the misfortune not the fault of the Provisional Government that the numbers requiring employment were so much greater at that moment than before. Hence we say, came the outbreak in June and Socialism."
It is obvious that all government, the Civil State, and all its legislative and executive action is nothing more than human society administering, protecting, and developing its own welfare. The whole action upon itself must be social, but between social and individualistic there is an insuperable gulf. The public life of a Civil State is the aggregate of the domestic life of its members. Whether the execution of its laws flows from a single person who is accepted as the representative of the whole society, or from more persons than one to whom that trust may be committed, the framing of the laws, which is impossible to the whole political society, is, in every well-ordered society, entrusted to those who by election of the people are made more or less adequately represent their welfare.

In this sense, therefore all legislation is social, even the privileges of railroad companies are justifiable only on public, that is, social, utility. The perfection of legislation is adequate and intimate provision for the welfare of society at large. All legislation, then fair and all government is, and must be, strictly social. If it fails to be so in any measure, in that measure it is bad. But in all this there is not a tinge of socialism. It describes the elaborate and mature jurisprudence of a well-ordered state, and in this sense the whole written and unwritten law of England is social.

What then is socialism? It is the notion of society governed by the hand of Nature only, under which the supreme, the supreme, the supreme, the supreme.

State is property landlord, and the supreme and therefore really the only employer of labour. It is thus for the neglect of all progress, and of all the social laws, which wisdom and justice have sanctioned and sanctioned. It is also an attempt to arrest, or to reverse, the natural inequality resulting from the intrinsic inequalities of intellect and moral of man and man, an impossible task, and a theory repudiate with every kind of injustice to men and to society. It is needless to say that the Poor Law of Elizabeth is in exact with social, without a tinge of surpassed socialism, and Mr. Spence, with his large fureight surely perceived the difference between the right of sustenance or work in a parish and the state on travel in theAbsent armament; nevertheless he pointed out the identity of class principle, justified the principle, and the same time it prejudiced it as supremely independent in the hands of any government, liable to [illegible] with a faith, and socialism to the unconverted and demoralized, to socialism in the deep parts of their souls. It can hardly be necessary to draw out the reasons, and if some, whose intelligence is so high and balanced, have been convinced of it is because their principles have been debased and perverted. The State of individualism has been [illegible] through long ages of organised and religious and political oppression; and yet in our time, in our generation, there is a natural and spontaneous growth of which we are all to be proud.
tongue of socialism. It describes the elaborate and mature jurisprudence of a well-ordered state, and in this sense the whole written and unwritten law of England is social.

What then is socialism? It is the vision of society governed by the laws of Nature only, under which the State is helplessly vast, and the supreme and therefore the only employer of labour. It is for the negation of all progress and of all the social laws which wisdom, justice and experience have sanctioned and moulded. It is also an attempt to arrest or to reverse the natural inequalities resulting from the intrinsic inequalities intellectual and moral of man and man, an impossible task and a theory replete with every kind of injustice to men and to society. It is needless to say that the Poor Law of Elizabeth is profuse with social injustice, with a tinge of Spartan socialism, and no State, with its large foreign debt, permitted the difference to exist in the right of sustenance or work in a parish and the work or travel in the Abbas realms; nevertheless, he pointed out the identity of the principle. He justified the principle, at the same time he foretold it as supremely inexpedient in the hands of any government, and able to produce both ruthless and criminal socialism, and set forth the disadvantages and demoralisation of such a state of things. It can hardly be necessary to draw out the reason, and if some, whose intelligence is so high and balance has not failed to express, that they must clearly know the distinctions of parish relief and national workshops. I would not weary my readers, if I have any, by determining them.

First, and above all, to make the State, beyond its own legitimate duties, of which we will speak hereafter, the public employer of labour is an exaggeration of the most danger in politics, coupled with the most fear of that danger, namely, exaggerated centralisation. The centralisation, inevitable and necessary, for the ordinary administration of Government, involving large patronage, with all its evils, is sufficiently dangerous in any state. The number of persons is always large but necessary, for intelligence and honesty, but the public man, that is, the government of the day, the employer of an unlimited number of the populace at large, who must, we surely be the least skilled, successful, and to a greatest untrustworthiness of the people would be a public and danger, fatal sooner or later to any Commonwealth, and in such a Commonwealth assuming a certain Cynical accomplishment. The safety of this country as M. Blumenberg wrote in 1892, is its great decentralisation. He then predicted the collapse of the Second Empire, by reason of its extravagant centralisation of power and profit in the hands of a Government ubiquitous and its immemorial absolute tenure.
National workshops in this country would destroy the labour market, would become political in influence in all its ultimate conflicts of our political parties, a source of the widest and lowest patronage, ravenously sought by all kinds and conditions of men, a never close field for every kind of job, in the cloud of officials created by it, and an of a waste of demoralization of the people at large.

In what single point has this any resemblance to the relief of the unemployed in a moment of distress, an official or an official within the limits of a parish, & under the eyes of vigilant care?

The administration of the Poor Laws, from the 16th Century downwards to our day has been sufficiently fluctuating in wisdom, prudence, profuse power, and severity, but nevertheless, there has been no shadow of danger of Socialism or National workshops.

But Mr, in consideration you found not to trespass at this time more than upon the space in your Columns, nevertheless I hope you will allow me to send a second letter in reply to other portions of the argument of your Correspondent G.