Creswell Sounds the Retreat.

"LABOUR PARTY" BUT NOT A "PARTY OF LABOUR."

During the week, Mr. F. H. P. Creswell has addressed himself to the Labour Party's "party in the street" in the right rank and file of the lower middle class, promising all things to all men, this year, next year, sometime, never the less. The phrase was long ago coined for Colonel Creswell. So far from bringing enlightenment to him it has总决赛 him in his grandiloquent claims of middle-class democracy. This is no great concern of ours or of the working class. But it is our business to point out to the leader of the Labour Party whither they are being led by their "Daily Mail"-blessed leader.

Creswell summarised thus: First, a description of the evils of the present economic system, in language reminiscent of the 'Daily Mail.' Second, and most militantly, he sounds the tocsins of reform—tocons undistinguishable from those which led ten million men to slaughter—all-embracing words like Wilson's—leading to love, or wrath consuming quite, according as "plutocracy" or "tyranny." Then follows a criticism of the orthodox political parties—the Labour Party included. He says: "The Labour Party is the "Labour Party."

Then a wholesale denunciation of all politicians, both in the Labour Party and the Nationalist Party; while these parties are out to safeguard the "pecuniary interest of the manual workers," the Labour Party is out to back up the "pecuniary interest of the manual workers." (Note word quotation.)

In so far as Creswell objects to narrowing a party of Labour to certain sections of manual workers he is right. But that is not his complaint. Indeed he means the non-voting black worker. But he does not want to spread out in that voiceless direction, otherwise we should have seen little of this Creswellian screech in the capitalist press. The thing to go for is a vote-getting political party, with the best vote-getting name and the best vote-getting platform. That is the support service we are being called upon to do. That is bad enough. But fancy a "leader of Labour" talking about the "pecuniary interests of the industrial workers in opposition to the pecuniary interest of the property classes. He seems to have forgotten what little he once knew; that the opposition is not a merely "pecuniary" one, but the opposition of rested interests of property to the demand of the interest for life and for liberty. "Pecuniary interest of the manual workers!" There is the exclamation of the. The truce of the quarters of a Labour leader. Let the workers protest the "suits with loud and irreverent laughter."

So assured Creswell of the "manual workers that he warns his party that if reliance on them will lead to "continued ingraining and more coarse corruption in the ranks of the party of which we have had recent painful experience." Therefore he urges his party to scrap its cumbersome platform and decide on six or ten main-heads such as abolish values taxation, "Municipal enterprise," "abolition of indented labour," and so on, all very desirable, but of course outside the political dictatorship of the proletariat. But the means to the end is the acid test, no least of the end itself. We have had enough of "objectives," and the high-sounding slogans of reform. How you propose promoting a "triumph of work as this is of your sincerity. Creswell discards the proletariat as the power of emancipation. He gives the lie to the notion of a "working class movement" that emancipation of the working class must be the task of the workers themselves and that the working class movement for the workers' Ten Points is the way in Russia, under the regime of the middle-class, a great fine example of inscrutable blindness, so much despised as a political and moral force. It is only the intellectual shortcomings and political stupidity of that lower middle class whose political ideas represent that could produce the incongruous spectacle of a Labour leader denying the political existence of those he is leading—or misleading. But for that stupidity, the chance the working class would be that to mislead is his direct aim.

But this is nothing to what follows. Having said in effect: They base our party on the appeal to the manual workers, it will lead to ingraining and corruption," this political morality, he proceeds to say: "The party should require all its candidates to place these ten points in the forefront of their addresses as policies they are pledged to, and outside of these matters should be free to settle with their constituents, and those with whom they rely for platform and other support, as to any particular views of their own."

If Auckland Park Sporting Club (or "other support") wants you to vote their way, you are free to bargain any "particular" views of your own with this. "Chock overboard the driving power of the "manual workers" with no bribes to give away, that is, the immediate class support!—that the same middle-class whose interests vary in every constituency, watering its milk here and sugar there, and pand to the tune of high Creswellian moralities.

As for Creswell's complaint about the exclusion of the "women workers," that is too thin altogether. None knows better than he that this distinction is never made in the Labour movement. Either they are not really party at all, or its true value, not that of the "Rand Daily Mail," and encourage its writer to go and form that middle-class "Democracy" party of his heart's desire outside the ranks of Labour.

D.L.J.

"Elections for the Petrograd Soviet, according to a wireless message from Moscow, have resulted in a triumph for the Bolsheviks in sympathy with Bolshevists: 147 from the United Labour parties; 237 Depatrocity or Independents."

The tyranny of a minority! The export of tea and coffee from Holland, except to Bolshevik Russia (and Hungary) has been sanctioned by the Dutch Minister of Holland.—"The Times." No blockade!

The Development of Capitalism

The geographical position and, most important of all, the economic stage of development reached in this country, are both factors that will influence the way in which the country falls in line with the social conditions ensuing on the recent European war. In the past, the war has been largely a war of the skilful, that it would take many years to develop modern capitalism in this country. The part-time wage class consists largely of small farmers, small workers, and other lines of supply. Raw materials are in demand to-day and South Africa's natural wealth is certain to play a considerable part in determining the conditions in this country. Viewed from a capitalist's 'efficiency' standpoint, the enormous supply of cheap native labour and skilled workers in our methods of production, recruited by taxation from agricultural pursuits, lends itself too inordinately to production than to highly industrialised demands.

Then there is the farming interest whose economic and political position has been strengthened. The war has given this branch of social activity a lift, as the Trade Comminiumt (1918) shows. The demand for food before the Royal Society of Arts (February 8th, 1918), and although so far the middlemen has reaped the benefit, the fact remains that agricultural interests are a force in the country; hence the urgent need for a moderate policy between capitalists and farmers. This moderate policy will incidentally benefit farming and mining will enable South African natural wealth to be exploited for the country's market. The working class if they allow this development to take place will have to face a period of greater struggle. In England at the time the process of performing skilled work by simplified machines and specialisation has been introduced. In South Africa, reducing the number of skilled workmen required and therefore increasing the number of workers needed for these jobs, some will drift into the sphere of semi-skilled work, in turn dragging others down the same path as the skilled.