

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*For the opinions expressed by correspondents, the Editor does not hold himself responsible.*

*Correspondence intended for publication should be addressed to the Editor and written on one side of the paper only.*

**SPECIAL NOTICE.**—*Correspondents are requested to be brief. Many letters weekly are omitted on account of their length.*

### DR. WALLACE'S REMEDY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE NEW AGE."

When I asked you for criticisms of my tract on "The Remedy for Unemployment," I expected that a Socialist paper would at least criticise it from a Socialist point of view. But Mr. Sharp's denunciation (for it is in no sense a criticism) is frankly capitalistic throughout, with all the crude or erroneous assumptions of the usual capitalist diatribes, such as we find in the "Saturday Review" or "Daily Mail." If it means anything, it clearly means that "production for profit" is always better and more economical than "production for use." His two "supposes," by which he thinks he has answered me, are both founded on this view, which, if true, denies the economic possibility of co-operative production for use, and thus demonstrates the fallacy of Socialism.

His misrepresentations, too, are amazing. He describes the scheme (in his third paragraph) as to be carried out by each "Local Authority." But I say that the problem "must be treated on broad national lines and with national resources" (p. 3), and, again, "It is pre-eminently a work to be devised and carried out by the Executive Government itself" (p. 4).

His statement that I propose "close protection to prevent competition from outsiders industries" is an equally absurd misrepresentation, and none but a writer imbued with the whole series of capitalistic and individualistic dogmas which are the cause of the very evil we have to remedy could have made it.

Such an article is too absurd to be answered in detail, since every point in it is answered in my tract, which I hope every reader of THE NEW AGE who is at all influenced by the criticism will expend a penny in obtaining and reading.

ALFRED R. WALLACE.

\* \* \*

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE NEW AGE."

I regret that Dr. Wallace should regard my article as a mere "denunciation." I admit that part of my criticism was based upon the economics of capitalism, but what else

would Doctor Wallace have? As I understand his pamphlet, he proposes that these unemployed colonies should be set up immediately in the very midst of the existing capitalistic system of industry; and one is therefore bound to criticise them as they might be expected to work in the midst of that system. As for denying the possibility of "production for use," I do nothing of the kind. What I deny is the possibility of maintaining a system of "production for use" at a number of isolated points in the midst of a great system of "production for profit."

As for the alleged "misrepresentations." On page 6 of Dr. Wallace's tract he writes, "tracts of land . . . shall be taken over by the State or Local authority, and be prepared," etc. I regret that the alternative was not stated in my article, but space was limited, and I attached no particular importance to the point. Again, in page 7 Dr. Wallace writes, "At least four-fifths of the work on the estate, *shall be done for home consumption, not for sale,*" the remaining fifth to be used to purchase articles "which the colonists could not produce themselves." (The italics are Dr. Wallace's own). If that does not mean close protection it does not seem to me to mean anything at all. For the rest, I gladly leave the matter to the judgment of your readers.

Since, however, mere negative criticism of other people's schemes is somewhat unsatisfactory by itself, may I, in conclusion, direct the attention of your readers to some constructive proposals which appear in the "Reformers' Year Book" for 1909? CLIFFORD SHARP.

\* \* \*