Dr. A. R. Wallace on Unemployment.

With every inclination to accord to Dr. Wallace the respect which is due to so distinguished a scientist it is impossible to congratulate him upon this essay of his in social politics. Indeed, it is difficult to take it seriously at all, and one would gladly avoid making the attempt. But in his letter published in The New Age of January 14 Dr. Wallace specially requested that his proposals should be criticised in these columns, and his request is the sole explanation for the appearance of this article.

Dr. Wallace does not profess to be the originator of the scheme which he advocates. He writes this pamphlet merely to call attention to a hitherto neglected work upon poverty and unemployment written by Herbert V. Mills and published about twenty years ago. It does not seem very surprising that the book has been neglected, since, to judge from Dr. Wallace's account of it, it must have been several decades out of date when it was first published.

The scheme has, however, the merit of simplicity, a quality which more modern treatises upon the subject certainly cannot boast. It is easily described. Each Local Authority is to purchase 2,000 acres or more of land and to provide upon it suitable houses to accommodate 4,000 or 5,000 of the unemployed, together with sufficient tools, machines, and buildings to provide the whole community with the necessaries of life. All such necessaries are to be produced within the boundaries of the colony so that it may be entirely self-supporting. It would grow its own wheat and its own flax, weave its own wool, make its own clothes, and its own paper and drain pipes. It would even produce its own sugar from home-grown beet-root. When its home-reared sheep and cattle had passed through the butcher's hands, there would be an ample supply of skins to provide employment for "tanners, curriers, saddlers, shoemakers, etc." Whilst "the bones and horns might be used to make handles of domestic cutlery and for old-fashioned but useful lanterns." Nothing would be wasted, not even "the refuse fat," which "would be made into soap for the use of the community." The power necessary for the various kinds of machinery, for electric light, and for cooking and heating purposes would be provided "by water or wind mills (or both)."

No money would be paid, but every worker would receive an "abundance" of good food, fuel, clothing, etc., from the common stock. Finally the organisation of the whole community would be in the hands of a "despotic" director, whose rule would continue until the inhabitants were sufficiently trained to be trusted with self-government. Dr. Wallace points out that the selection of suitable directors would be of vital importance, and suggests that such a post "would be congenial to many of our broad-minded clergy," also "to such sympathetic writers about the poor as Mr. Whiteing and Mr. Zangwill."

This brief outline will, I hope, convey to the reader something of the spirit as well as the letter of Dr. Wallace's proposals. The difficulty is to know where to begin to criticise them. Dr. Wallace has refused in advance to accept the criticism that his scheme "would

not work" unless the critic is prepared to give exact
details as to where it has been tried and failed under
the conditions which Mr. Mills and he have laid down.
Certainly I am not prepared to do that. I do not
suppose it ever has been tried, and I feel sure that it
never will be. It is unthinkable that such closely "pro­
tected" colonies should ever be set up in the midst of a
great industrial community like ours; and close pro­
tection, to prevent competition from outside industries,
is the most vital feature of the whole scheme. Nothing
is to be imported which can be produced inside the
colony, and only one-fifth at most of the produce of
the colony is to be exported in exchange for such
necessaries as tea and coal and iron.

The fiscal problem is thus raised in its most ele­
mentary and acute form. Suppose, after the colony has
become "self-governing," it finds that it can obtain
cheaper bread by using all its land for grazing pur­
poses and exchanging its surplus cattle for for­
grown wheat. Or suppose it found (as it almost in­
vitably would find) that it could obtain a very much
cheaper supply of electric power by exchanging its sur­
plus cotton goods (say) for current supplied from some
large outside power works whose machinery was more
efficient than windmills. Who would forbid the ex­
change? or enforce the prohibition? The Local
Government Board? If so, where is the "self-govern­
ment" gone? On the other hand, if the exchange
were allowed, free competition with outside industries
would quickly ensue, the economic basis of the whole
scheme would be destroyed, and the colony would "go
under"; for by hypothesis the colonies consist of the
dregs of the industrial population, and could not be
expected to hold their own with the outside world even
if their moral and physical regeneration were such as
to satisfy Dr. Wallace's most sanguine estimate.

This brings us to another great difficulty. Dr.
Wallace hopefully asserts that "the 'unemployable'
are in reality by no means numerous." The assertion
is vague and apparently groundless. But even sup­
posing Dr. Wallace were right, it remains a fact that
on the one hand the majority of the unemployed who
are to be absorbed by his scheme are unskilled indus­
trial town-dwellers whilst on the other hand the colonies
(if they are to be anything like self-supporting) will be
almost entirely agricultural, and the mode of life in
them will for a very long time be excessively primitive.

How many of the original colonists would stay for a
year? and what is to become of the deserters who we
are told "could not again be admitted"?

Two examples of successful co-operative communities
are cited by Dr. Wallace. One at Ralahine in Ireland,
and the other at Frederiksoord in Holland. The first
was composed of agricultural labourers, and the second
(we are told by Mr. J. A. Hobson) costs the Dutch
nation £23 per head per annum. Neither, therefore, is
of much value.

Dr. Wallace further assures us that his scheme would
make Old Age Pensions and workhouses unnecessary,
and it would abolish pauperism altogether. How he
reaches this conclusion he does not explain, and one
is left to wonder how the widows, orphans, infirm,
cripples, and insane, who constitute the mass of our
existing paupers, are to be provided for when the poor
rate is no more.

To be quite blunt, Dr. Wallace's scheme is no scheme
at all. It not only does not solve the problem
of unemployment, it does not even touch it. The two
great causes which lie at the root of the problem, trade
fluctuations and the casual labour system, are not so
much as referred to. The proposals outlined only pro­
fess to deal with the permanently unemployed, who may
be counted in tens of thousands; they offer nothing for
the intermittently employed, who may be counted in
millions. And our chief concern should surely be for
the latter—to save them from the demoralisation of
"the kerb," before it is too late. The 1,500,000
British wage-earners who were in work in 1907, are
unemployed now, and will possibly be in work again by
1910, and no place in Dr. Wallace's scheme, and,
therefore, even if it were sound to the limit of its pro­
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