doubt remains but that Dr. Sternberg believes the working class here in this country should follow the same path of forming a Labor Party. Even though the workers would not be immediately establishing a new society, he stated, they could still retain this objective while working on their current problems.

The age-old question arises: Can a Labor Party accomplish the solution of capitalism's problems, and at the same time move towards the goal of "socialism?" Notwithstanding the collapse of the German social-democracy and the rise of Hitler, and the present failure of the Labor government in England to solve the problems of the workers there, Dr. Sternberg would answer this question in the affirmative.

As scientific socialists, we unhesitatingly answer in the negative. A Labor Party can not solve the contradictions of capitalism, and in addition it saddles the workers with state regimentation to one degree or another.

What is the basic difficulty of capitalism? That it does not share the wealth, and that therefore profits must be drained off to give more benefits to workers? This is the superficial approach, the reformer's approach. He would say, "Look, the capitalists are making too much profit. We will drain some of this off in the form of better housing, 'socialized' medicine, pensions, etc."

The reformer is limited by the amounts of profits that can be drained off (let us not forget the profit system is still in force under this "half-way" Labor government). Furthermore, in the long run there are few if any benefits at all for the workers, because what is gained on the one hand through such programs as state medicine is obviously lost on the other by generally lower wages. Whether in "free-enterprise" America or in Labor "socialist" Britain, the worker's labor-power is still a commodity which exchanges for enough in other commodities and services to produce and reproduce labor-power itself. That is why an expensive program like state medicine is accompanied in Britain today by a terrific cut in the workers' real wages which is manifested by government withholding (in the form of taxes) at a rate twice that in America. If the capitalist has to hand over twice as much to keep the British system working, this does not relieve the worker from "austerity" programs.

No, the basic dificulty of capitalism is the fact that it cannot release the chains of production, owing to the fact that its production is geared to the ability of the market, domestic and international, to absorb that production. This problem, this *basic* problem, the Labor governments cannot touch without saying: "Now we are through fooling around trying to make the profit system work for labor. We will just declare all the means of production to be owned in common, and produce according to the needs of the people."

This is socialism, the only society which can without embarrassment release the full forces of production. If the Labor Party wants to institute this new society, we would have no objection. But it would not be the Labor Party any more.

Precisely our point: that the Labor Party cannot solve this problem of capitalism without becoming socialist, something it shows no intention of doing.

"LABOR" STATISTS

There is another side to this picture, however. A more ominous side. That is, the reformers to carry out their program must constantly increase the authority of the state. They become statists to one degree or another. Nor can they help themselves, if they seek to use the state apparatus to put their "half-way" program across, and at the same time maintain the profit system temporarily.

Do the workers want more wages? They must work under the terms laid down by the government which cannot rave its "over-all" program upset. Hence the recent lockouts by the British Labor government of miners, who are told to come back to work under "government terms." Do the workers strike to enforce their demands? Then the armed forces of the state must be used against the workers, as in the dock strike of a year ago. Is there opposition within the Labor Party to the official policies? Then the opposition must be eliminated, in order for the Party to retain a united front (and political power) in the face of the Conservative threat. No, gentlemen, however good your intentions, the objective results of your "progressive" Labor governments will be (1) Negative: you will not eliminate crises and depressions nor the wars flowing from them because, in seeking to solve the workers' problems through the stomach, as you put it, you escape the heart of the question; (2) Positive: you will saddle the workers with regimentation when they try under your system to improve their conditions, wages, etc. in contradiction to your particular method of thinking.

Another important question arises of just how far these reformers with their insistence on helping the workers through the state, are not unwittingly aiding also the capitalist class when the latter must move towards its particular type of state regimentation. "Government ownership, nationalization, state intervention," cry the labor reformers and labor statists. Then when the capitalist class needs state ownership in order to salvage its system, the ideological path will have been prepared for it in advance. The rut toward state capitalism is instituted by the reformers, and the workers fall into it.

Are we unfair then, when historically speaking, we state that the social democratic reformers in Germany during the 1920's did nothing to educate the workers against the evils of state capitalism (Hitler), but on the contrary, through their miseducation smoothed the path a little for such regimentation to the ultimate?

Does not the same danger exist in this country? The only method of combating this trend towards statism, whether it be capitalist or "labor"-directed, is the education of the working class to socialism, to the understanding, that half-way measures under capitalism will not solve their problems. With a socialist working class, the reformers will have not only the opposition of the capitalist class which wants to reform its system in its *own* way (Churchill said recently that the Conservatives in England can administer "socialism" — he means state capitalism — better than the Laborites), but also the opposition of the socialist workers.

In the end, the growth of socialism within the working class will be the best answer to the question of whether capitalism can be reformed. And, upon our word as socialists, we faithfully promise that under socialism the reformers will have plenty of opportunity to debate whether or not socialism is possible.

We will even provide the armchair — with cushions.

K F.

*Our statement, not Dr. Sternberg's.

Lodge Says Latins Bar U. S. Investors

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14 (AP)—Sen. Lodge of Massachusetts said today that some Latin-American countries are discriminating against United States investors.

Lodge told the Senate that this discrimination should bar these countries from participating in President Truman's plan to guarantee American private investments abroad.

Countries mentioned by Lodge included Argentina, Colombia and Guatemala.

BOSTON POST

Definition Department

"*Depression*: A period during which people who are out of jobs would, if they had jobs, be able to afford the things that were too high for them to afford when they had jobs."—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.