

The argument on which I have ventured to pass a censure is as follows: "The only way to make more work for the unemployed is for the employed to produce as much profit as they can - i.e. as much surplus as they can - over the cost of producing; for all that profit must be spent on employing some body in some way or other."

Your Correspondent & knows that to employ men for ~~days~~ ^{hours} a week at 4 pence an hour will not displace men who are in full work ^{at full wages}.

My first answer is that there is no solely ^{no} must in the case. There are other remedies: and no man can compel the employers of labour to provide the unemployed with employment. The point of the case is that there are multitudes of the unemployed and no surplus existing or forthcoming to employ them.

If there be no surplus they cannot & if you cannot compel the employers of hands to employ their profits is giving employment the remedy is no remedy. There is no must in the case. It may not be the intent, or the will of the Capitalist to take on more hands. He has other uses for his profits? Who can compel him? Once more it is especially in times of depression when there is little surplus in many trades, ^{more in others} that the ^{numbers} ~~multitudes~~ of the unemployed ~~are~~ multiplied, where then is the remedy? or is there no remedy for starvation?

Again if the rapidity of production shall have glutted the market, the ^{Capitalist} ~~producer~~ will have a surplus of unsold goods, where then is the surplus of money for more hands?

Still more there are trades such as iron, and joinery in which our raw material is sent over to Belgium, & wrought up & sent back & sold in this country at a price that underbills our own producers. What surplus is there here.

Further, let us suppose a surplus to exist in a few trades not in all the level of employment over the whole country will not be appreciably raised. All the water supply of London would

He never proposed to prevent the unemployed from being employed on standard

not raise the level of the Channel. A partial surplus is in effect no surplus - an universal surplus is dream-
~~increases to any migration of workmen from place to place in the ruin of man.~~
When I ask what is to be done with men women & children & hungry and distressed while this only
remedy is being realized your Correspondent of course makes no answer. But he confesses that "a lapse
of time may be ~~without limit~~ "an infinity of years." He thinks that men will die as fast if you feed them
as they will without food. This is beyond me. It also is "the tremendous calamity" caused by keeping down the
I confess that in this I see little brain work & less human compass, would have no will to wound
him and still less to offend him. I do not know whether he lives in daily contact with the poverty that
I do not know I do not think he has done justice to his heart; and if I am not
I do not know I do not think he has done justice to his heart; and if I am not
not in his town of old stockings & Teapots
altogether wrong I think he has done some injustice to his head.

with man-
just sufficient
to work up winter.

The letter of your Correspondent ^{concerns} is worthy of careful consideration. My belief of what I stated is unchanged
and I shall be happy to give my reasons when I shall have examined the statistics & their bearing upon my
belief.