



## English Hours



"Jobless Army in Britain is Growing (thin) Fast." \* \* \* "London, Oct. 18.—Unemployment is again increasing by leaps and bounds." Over there they don't know enough to shorten their hours. They go right ahead and "rattle" themselves out of a job.

How very thoughtless. Fie!

"Though an increase in unemployment is generally expected during the autumn months," (when the leaves begin to fall and nature adorns herself with a mantle of gold) "the increase this year is so rapid that it has occasioned considerable surprise and not a little worry." Many of the slowest of men, who were not expected to finish their tasks, have completed all that was required of them, on schedule time, greatly to the surprise of England's blue-blooded parasites. "Political circles, opposed to government"—politics and government apparently are a separate industry in that country—"have made the most of this increase and it has been the basis of pessimistic predictions on the future of British trade." How this can be said is not quite clear since the finished "work" naturally should simplify the selling problem—one would think that unfinished work would be a greater drawback on the future of trade, even the British. Oh, well, I'm dense, I do not pretend to understand commercial secrets.

"Politicians blame the increased unemployment on everything from the Dawes plan to the abolition of the tariff upon automobiles." The happy consummation of the work, that brought these men a living, accordingly was caused by the Dawes plan, or the tariff. The Dawes plan, no doubt, was the more to blame for the speed with which John Bull ran out of work—the nations needs too were satisfied the earlier, leaving nothing for the workers to do but rest; until such a time as England again needs something. But why call it unemployment? Why not call it a period of rest—a recess? And why should a period of rest

create restlessness—worry? "Not a little worry," he said.

150,000 lose jobs (gain rest).

On January 1, 1924, there were 1,289,000 registered unemployed in Great Britain—how many unregistered, not stated. The number declined to 1,052,000 in July. In August the number began to ascend and reached 1,152,000 and still it "ascends."

"Economists have been wrangling over Britain's unemployment problem since the days of the armistice" (and up to the days of the armistice) fully employed, but had they consulted T-Bone Slim, the great Economist of North America, their unemployment would have expired inside of 10 seconds—and the wrangle would have been over. We would have told them to shorten the day; give labor the full product of its toil and let unemployment take care of itself." Why worry about it? Without unemployment we would die in two weeks. As it is, an average person of 70 years has been employed only 20 years. The "rest" of his "time" is spent thus:

Asleep (unemployed) 22 years.

At play (unemployed) 10 years.

Eating (unemployed) 6 years.

Drinking (unemployed) 1 year.

Dressing (unemployed) 2 years.

Traveling (unemployed) 4 years.

Jail (unemployed) 1 year.

Why holler about unemployment, it is no problem; it's a necessity. The problem is elsewhere.

But come on, fellow worker, let us read further: "Over Population is Problem."

Ah, another war, eh?

Read on: "The sanest and soundest, (economists) however, maintain that Britain's unemployment problem is largely a problem of over population, and there will always be unemployment until Great Britain's population is decreased by at least one million." (I wonder if that means that there are 1,000,000 parasites in England to get rid of?) "A difficult problem despite the fact that British colonies are crying for settlers."

Sanest and soundest? How come?

Is it not true there was unemployment in England when her population was ten million less than it is now? How's the decrease of one million going to accomplish what ten million couldn't?

Decrease the population one million today, and tomorrow you will have one million unemployed. I would suggest that the work be divided pro rata among all the King's subjects—would there then be unemployment?

Shorten the hours! I don't mind helping these British economists every chance I get.

They won't need to send the million men to the disease-infested colonies to die; they won't have to recommend war to decrease the population, not while I've got a lead pencil—it's no trouble at all for me to disentangle their problems for them.

Further, I would suggest that "them" economists be paid 4 shillings per day until they become quite clear on this subject so well understood by American labor.

Shorten the hours!