

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES. UNITE!

# The Workers' Advocate

## Supplement



50¢

Vol. 5 #2

VOICE OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY, USA

February 15, 1989

## The government's "war on drugs" is a war on black people and youth

Reprinted from a leaflet of Jan. 16 produced jointly by the Revolutionary Action Group and the Seattle Branch of the Marxist-Leninist Party:

The U.S. government has declared war on drugs. Each politician is out to prove his credentials as the toughest fighter against drugs. "War! war! war!" chanted the Congressmen when a recent "anti-drug" bill was passed. The crusade has swept up government officials, the management of many companies, school administrators and the

law enforcement agencies, including the National Guard. The Pentagon has given preliminary approval for the National Guard units in 44 states to join local law-enforcement efforts in the "war". Their artillery will include "11 Huey transport helicopters, 19 Kiowa helicopter gunships, 29 vessels docked at the Port of Tacoma and M-60A3 tanks". (Seattle Times, 1/11/89)

Unfortunately, these government figures have no intention of solving the many problems associated with drug abuse, or even starting to solve them. The pretext of

Continued on page 19

## Michigan NOW issues statement denouncing "direct confrontation" NOW vs. the pro-choice militants

The liberal bourgeois leaders of NOW are dead set against any militant resistance to the anti-abortion fanatics of Operation Rescue. All across the country the NOW higher-ups have done their best to prevent the holy hypocrites of Operation Rescue from being confronted by masses of angry people. The Michigan leadership of NOW has gone so far as to issue a disgusting statement on Jan. 21 that denounced the progressive masses up and down and blamed them for the violence at Michigan abortion clinics.

This statement brings into the open the sabotaging role of NOW against the mass movement. It illustrates that the NOW higher-ups are doing their best not to mobilize opposition to Operation Rescue (OR), but to keep people from anti-OR demonstrations. Even some local Michigan chapters of NOW wanted to participate in opposing OR, but the Michigan NOW leaders headed it off.

According to the NOW leaders, the only role for the people is to hide when OR comes to town and to humbly petition the police. NOW goes so far as to say that anyone who disagrees isn't really pro-choice.

The liberal leaders of NOW are afraid to do anything that alienates the bourgeoisie. This is why they make sure

to reassure the bourgeoisie, as the first thing in their  
Continued on page 18

### INSIDE

Western hypocrisy on chemical weapons .....	2
Why is Washington attacking Libya? .....	3
Chicago mayoral primary .....	5
Reinstate mail carrier Mark Mitchell! .....	7
Detroit casuals and regulars vs. harassment .....	8
No to speedup at Swingline .....	9
Study plan on socialism (part one) .....	10
From the Third Congress: Discussion on speech on stage of work on socialism .....	11
Trotskyist BT against Afghanistan .....	16
Workers victimized by capitalist war on drugs ...	23

## STUDY PLAN ON THE MARXIST-LENINIST IDEA OF SOCIALISM (PART ONE)

The speeches on socialism at the Third Congress of the MLPUSA referred to the party-wide study program on the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialism. Below we reproduce the syllabus of study followed in the first part of this study. The numbering does not reflect the length of study, with most divisions requiring a number of study sessions.

- 1) From the **Communist Manifesto** by Marx and Engels:  
Ch. II: "Proletarians and Communists"  
Ch. III: "Socialist and Communist Literature"
- 2) From Engels' **Socialism: Utopian and Scientific**  
Ch. III
- 3) On the Paris Commune  
From Marx's **The Civil War in France**  
The introduction by Engels  
The first and second address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War  
The address of the General Council "The Civil War in France"  
  
Additional reference material:  
Lenin's **State and Revolution**, in particular Ch. III and Ch. IV Sec. 5, which discuss the views of Marx and Engels on the Commune.  
Some historical notes based on material from Frank Jellinek's book **The Paris Commune of 1871**.
- 4) **Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program**  
And Lenin's **State and Revolution** Ch. V, which elaborates on Marx's Critique.
- 5) On transitional measures and the October 1917 socialist revolution  
Lenin's **Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?**, end of September-October 1917  
Also suggested, Lenin's **The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It**, September 1917
- 6) From the immediate post-October period  
Three articles by Lenin.

**The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government**,  
March-April 1918  
**Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat**, October 30, 1919  
**A Great Beginning**, July 1919

7) Lenin's views on the revision of the Bolshevik Party program

**Preface to the pamphlet "Materials relating to the revision of the party program"**, April-May, 1917. This was written between the February and October revolutions.

**Report on the review of the program and on changing the name of the party**, March 1918. It was delivered at the Seventh Party Congress. It deals, among other things, with the controversy with Bukharin over how to describe capitalism during the period of imperialism.

**Resolution on changing the name of the party and the party program**, which was adopted by the Seventh Congress of the RCP(B), March 1918

**Proposal regarding the revision of the program of the party at the Seventh Congress**, March 1918

**Rough draft of the program of the R.C.P.**, March 1919

**Report on the party program**, March 1919, which is a report to the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Among other things, it goes into the controversies with Bukharin on imperialism and self-determination.

**Speech closing the debate on the party program**, which was the reply to the discussion at the eighth congress, March 1919.

8) **The Program of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)** adopted by the Eighth Congress in 1919 during the period of "war communism".

A possible supplementary work on the RCP(B)'s 1919 program is **The ABC's of Communism**, by Bukharin and Preobrazhensky. This is a commentary on the 1919 program. It was used by the Bolshevik party, after the new program was released, as a means for mass public education on the program. While there appear to be some traces of the particular views of Bukharin, in the main it seems to be based on the party's program and not Bukharin's and Preobrazhensky's opinions. ■

## DISCUSSION FOLLOWING THE SPEECH ON THE STAGE OF THE PARTY'S WORK ON SOCIALISM

From the Third Congress of the MLP, USA  
Fall 1988

Below is a partial summary of the discussion at the Congress following the speech on the stage of work on socialism (see "It Falls to the Communist Party to Deepen and Extend Socialist Consciousness" in the Dec. 20 issue of the Supplement for part of this speech itself). This discussion mainly raised various additional or supplemental issues. Statements on the same subject have been placed together. As well, statements have been edited or, sometimes, summarized. This is not just for clarity and brevity, but also because the transcription apparatus at the Congress was, unfortunately, quite unsatisfactory, especially for statements from the floor, and there were gaps in the record of most statements, some of which were almost entirely lost. Nevertheless, we did our best to preserve the original meaning. We extend our apologies in advance to any comrade whose remarks end up presented incompletely or inaccurately.

As well, it can be borne in mind that comrades speaking did not have the opportunity to rewrite their statements for the better comprehension of a broad audience, or to do further work to refine the presentation. The value of summary of the discussion is, therefore, not in well-considered formulations, but in outlining further areas of interest and investigation. Certain internal Party issues have been omitted in this summary.

The discussion was chaired by two comrades, the comrade who gave the speech (Ch1) and another comrade (Ch2). Comments and questions from the floor are denoted (Fl).

### On the Albanian critique of Soviet revisionist state capitalism

Fl: You mentioned that the Chinese and Albanian critique of Soviet-style state monopoly capitalism was flawed. Is it possible for you to tell us what are some the major flaws we're looking into?

Ch1: There are two issues.

One of the central features of the Chinese and Albanian critiques of state capitalism in the USSR is that ostensibly there was a Khrushchov coup in the mid-50's, actually the '57 or '56-'57 period. And this coup was put forward as the dramatic change from socialism to capitalism.

As well, they tend to focus on various features of introducing market forms and extending the realm of private property; for instance, the sale of the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms, the reorganization of the industrial ministries, and things like that, which are in the

realm of the type of market socialist reforms that Gorbachev is also currently talking about. But state capitalism isn't necessarily just a question of the introduction of market features. They tend to place a great deal of stress on private forms of private, or near-private, forms of property as the crucial line of differentiation.

Ch2: Although overemphasizing the question of the private forms, as the comrade pointed out, the Albanians made an attempt to deal with state monopoly capitalism. But when we put together their main articles on the subject in [the March 1982 issue of] *Proletarian Internationalism*, and as we studied it, certain weaknesses appeared. Yes, they say there is such a thing as state monopoly capitalism, and that if you have state monopoly capitalism, the bureaucrats exploit the wealth from the workers. But what they had a hard time doing is distinguishing state monopoly capitalism from socialist state-owned industry. How is that distinguished from state monopoly capitalism? That is what they're actually relatively weak on. They give a whole series of general phrases on this, but when one tries to get more concrete and go behind the general phrases, there is no elaboration.

Fl: It seems to me that we also somewhat lack a fully fleshed-out analysis of how state monopoly capitalism differs from socialism. Sometimes in the articles in the *Workers' Advocate*, it might say "workers' struggles in Eastern Europe", where we're dealing with the fact that obviously workers are coming up against the state. We just say that this shows that Poland, Hungary, fill in the blank, is not a socialist country, but is a state monopoly capitalist country. Just like that. So it just leaves it kind of hanging.

Ch1: We do have a general analysis of state capitalist countries. As well, some of the countries in Eastern Europe are somewhat easier to deal with, in the sense that they've actually been pretty much mixed economy-type countries for a whole period of time. What Gorbachev is trying to do in the Soviet Union today has long been done in places like Hungary, even Poland.

So we do have a general idea of what we consider state capitalism -- a country where, despite the means of production, distribution and so forth being owned, or largely owned, by the state, there is a class of rich bureaucrats and managers and so forth functioning as a ruling class, living off of the labor, exploited labor, of the working masses.

What we don't have is a fully fleshed out analysis of how this whole situation works, as well as distinguishing it from the situation for instance in the mid-30s, which

we'll get to in a separate speech. The point of the speech was that there is an issue of developing further the theory on this front. It wasn't to say that we already have a fleshed out, complete theory and analysis of revisionist state capitalism. That is something we face.

Today state capitalism is obviously in acute crisis, and one can point to the big fat managers and bureaucrats in the Soviet Union; at the same time there's a lot of promotion that East Germany is allegedly an "efficient socialist country", and that it has planning and nationalized property and so forth. The Spartacist League writes long, long articles promoting East Germany as the model of where planned economy works today in a "deformed workers' state". The SWP promotes Castro and his speech of July 26, where he claims he will not follow the Gorbachev model, and says that they made an experiment with private farmers and decided that this just creates capitalism. So state capitalist models are promoted, and they do need to be refuted, and we do need to develop the analysis of those things beyond what we have.

Fl: [The comrade referred to the recognition of the issue of revisionist state capitalism by the Albanians and the Chinese and went on:] I assume that you have some facts, some indications, some other indications why that is state capitalism. However, when the comrade gave the presentation on the question of the concept of socialism, I believe that what was said was not different from what Enver Hoxha says about state capitalism and revisionism.

Ch1: The point was not a dispute over definitions. The point was how do you analyze a state capitalist society. The Albanians have actually said more than [just that it is private market relations]. In Enver Hoxha's writings and the Albanian articles, you can find things saying just that, but you can also find other things. But it's left at that level [i.e. at the level of general assertions]. And then when you look at their analysis, you see certain inadequacies and flaws.

One flaw, for instance, is trying to make the case that there is this coup, and then after the coup it's a group of capitalists that comes to power. But these are the same capitalists as before, under Stalin, and they weren't allegedly state capitalists then. But the same bureaucracy which existed under Stalin now becomes a capitalist ruling class. It is very hard to make that distinction, that this coup is the distinction between state capitalism and socialism. That a whole society, a whole ruling class, minus Stalin, Malenkov and Molotov, is state capitalism, and with those guys it's socialism.

There is the question of revisionism. If Khrushchov said something, it's revisionism. But when Stalin said the same thing, it's not [according to the Albanian analysis]. This is linked up with the Khrushchov coup theory.

On the other hand [the Albanian analysis] also has this other phenomenon of [focusing on the development of the private sector] as the definition.

So that dispute was not over the general definition of the features of state capitalist society, but over the analysis.

Ch2: The Albanian definition, the Albanian discussion [of revisionist state capitalism] is, I think, superior to the Chinese. It gives various general features. But when one looks at it concretely, and tries to question it very deeply, one finds it doesn't give [an elaboration of these features], and it falls back on the things the comrade pointed out.

So one doesn't find that there is this one great flaw [in the Albanian analysis]. It isn't that way. But then one goes much more closely into the subject. They say state capitalism has exploitation and so forth, but why is the Soviet system state capitalism? That's where they're a little bit shaky on giving concrete backing to their general arguments.

### What's going on inside Albania?

Fl: The speech outlined a comprehensive theoretical work on socialism which represents a big advance over Second Congress, a big step in filling in the holes. The speech points out that it's an important thing whether there's a socialist country in the world, but we're not basing our whole orientation on whether there is a socialist country.

At the same time, we do, among the theoretical questions and practical questions, among the questions of agitation, still have one irritating one. We have a resolution in the documents of the Second Congress hailing and supporting socialism in Albania, and we also have a distinct lack of enthusiasm about it presently.

Ch1: There's a paragraph on the subject in the resolution on the international movement, which will be in a later speech.

But in any case, in general terms -- sooner or later I think we have to settle the question of Albania. My personal view is that theoretical work on the history of the Soviet Union is actually going to be crucial for this along with examination of the actual situation in Albania. Those two things together will end up settling the question of Albania.

At the moment we do know that there is nothing revolutionary in its foreign, international policy, and that's the thing we actually agitate on. And we also know that internally a process of degeneration is taking place. Exactly how far along in that process it is, we don't know; and a lack of actual factual information on Albania is a big factor.

Fl: [Raises that it was mentioned that there is degeneration inside Albania. Apparently asks about the concrete features of this degeneration.]

Fl: Over the years there's been a lot of talk in our literature. We've discussed before that the campaigns for

the internal revolutionization of society simply are no longer discussed in Albania. We don't have the full facts that they don't exist, but actually we do have some facts. Some of our friends from Sweden have gone there and reported to us that these campaigns have in fact disappeared. They've asked the Albanians about them, and gotten very unsatisfactory answers.

The rotation of cadre has either stopped, or is no longer discussed. The question of combining higher education with physical labor has stopped. And a whole series of things like that. I would stress that a complete study of this has not been done, we have not been focusing our attention on Albania. Our Party has limited forces, and it can only concentrate on so many things at once.

We have general outlines of what's happening, and we will get to this issue. I have read in *Albania Today* various striking things about the danger of the concept of equalization in relation to certain specialists, in regard to artistic work. And the need to reward people adequately for their artistic contributions. And other things. These are to me clear signs of the further creation of a bourgeois intellectual stratum, which is one of the main dangers in the process leading to restoration of capitalism.

I think we're on very firm ground saying that there is an internal process of bureaucratization, internal sclerosis. Even take the accounts of the pro-Albania parties. One of them, for example, has an office in Albania, and its people there report they're shocked that on May Day there is no mass mobilization on May First, or on any day in Albania, among the workers. And the level of political education in Albania, as far as mass education, is no different than the literature we see from abroad. So for example, the main source of news in Albania for the Albanian worker is the Italian news broadcasts -- that's the capitalist Italian news broadcasts. Plus the Albanian news reports, which are equivalent to what we see in *ATA*. It is not a class training that takes place in Albania.

I could go on. We have definite, firm ground for our belief that the general political situation is quite bad.

Fl: [Raised the issue of dealing with Albania with respect to the sympathizers of pro-Albanian groups and such questions. Also went on to say:] I think it's important to say, when people ask about socialism today, whether there's a model. My opinion is there's not, there is no model today.

Fl: [Among other things, there was discussion from several comrades of the dissemination of various materials to show the nature of what is going on in Albania today. We omit this discussion. It dealt briefly with dissemination of materials and analysis that the Party has developed.]

Fl: A couple of points about elaborating agitation and propaganda that's pro-socialism. [The comrade apparently said that we deal with Albania not to present it as a

model today, but to raise various lessons that can be learned from its history.] ... Albania not as model, but to bring out a whole process taking place after the revolution, to bring the working class forward.

I don't think we can separate the economic structures set up and the political structures set up, because the question that comes up both in my mind and in discussions with workers is: "What is socialism? What is it you want?"

In respect to that, and with respect to the Soviet Union, the question comes up: "Well, how do you stop that? Is it inevitable?" I think in elaborating that you do have to hit at the point we make about economics, and how you organize the working class to maintain control. How one goes about setting up workers' control is very important.

Fl: [This comrade gave some examples of what the Western press is saying about developments inside Albania, pointing out that "the source is not particularly reliable."]

Fl: I believe that in the past, when Albania was following a revolutionary proletarian internationalist line in foreign policy, it was a credit to the Party in promoting Albania as socialist, a fine example of proletarian internationalism. Unfortunately that is not the case today. We have a regime that's supporting this Khomeini regime, that's anti-working class, there are so many examples which the Party has given. [The examples of Albanians stands on Greece is given, and the visit of neo-fascist Strauss of Germany to Albania.]

I believe that Albania is socialist right now. I believe that it's socialist technically. But to promote Albania, even saying here is the beacon of socialism, I believe would be wrong. It is not. It is not. Because it is impossible for a regime that is a splendid example of socialism to have a counterrevolutionary, anti-working class foreign policy. It is impossible.

Now we have exposed the Soviet Union beautifully after the Seventh Congress of the Communist International as following a revisionist line. Now there's a connection between when the Soviet Union became state capitalist and the revisionist foreign policy line of the Seventh Congress; there has to be a connection there. And that is not to say that at the moment of the Seventh International, at the moment of the signing of this revisionist line, that the Soviet Union was no longer socialist, that it was now state capitalist. That's a question that's very difficult to test without discussing the question of the Soviet Union internally at that time.

But would we have promoted the Soviet Union and its bureaucratic degeneration, even if it were socialist, would we want to promote the Soviet Union in its state of bureaucratic degeneration, when it was following a revisionist foreign policy, as a splendid example of socialism?

But we can be proud of the Bolshevik revolution. We can be proud of the party of Lenin. We can be proud of

the accomplishments of the Soviet Union when it was socialist. ... We can give examples. That doesn't mean we're going to copy-cat everything the Bolsheviks did.

Ch1: Comrade, I think nobody in this Congress has suggested raising Albania as a splendid example, so I don't think it's necessary to speak against something that nobody in the Party is raising.

Ch2: The detailed study of Albania ... isn't what is needed immediately. My personal opinion is that Albania is going through a process of sclerosis. That is what the other comrade said, and it seems to me these processes can last a long time. Now without the study one doesn't know for sure, maybe the process is over, but it's not unbelievable it could last a long time.

So the issues are (a) Do we promote Albania as a model of socialism? No, we don't. And (b) Is it in a process of sclerosis? And a general idea of what the negative tendencies are -- that's what we need. Exactly how far it's gone isn't that much of a priority at this time. If one wanted to know exactly how far it's gone, that would require a detailed study. I don't think we can do that now. But we can circulate information concerning this process, and we have done a few articles in our press occasionally on particular atrocities in the Albanian press, on Greece, on Ethiopia. We have actually done these things.

### On the foreign debt and socialism

Fl: You hear a lot about the international debt crisis. And in almost every capitalist country, whether they call themselves capitalist or socialist, the fact is they stay indebted to imperialism. I have wondered if it's correct to say, or for comrades to say, that the indebtedness of a country to imperialism is a criterion of whether it's capitalist.

Ch1: Indebtedness to the capitalist bankers and governments definitely squeezes you and cuts into your independence. For a socialist country to go heavily into debt would put you at the mercy of the world's bankers -- I don't think there would be any dispute over that. I would hesitate to draw a judgment that whether or not you're in debt determines whether or not you're socialist or capitalist. In the sense that, a country could very well not be in debt, like if it's a somewhat powerful capitalist country -- a country like Iran, which has a lot of oil wealth. But at the same time, that wouldn't determine its social system -- it does provide it with a certain room of independence in foreign relations that certain other countries under a great burden of debt wouldn't have.

For instance, the fact that Albania doesn't have debts is something that does allow Albania to stand outside the capitalist blocs and not be dragged along by some capitalist power or power bloc. But at the same time, that itself would not determine whether a country would be socialist or capitalist.

Fl: For a long time we said that one of the indications of Albania's socialist nature was the lack of any foreign debt. On the other hand, the Soviet Union during the best period was looking for [certain foreign "concessions" or investments] to help it build. But this was socialism they were building. They had to make certain compromises, certain sacrifices--one step backward, two steps forward.

Isn't the main question here ownership of the means of production? [As opposed to debt as an accident of the superstructure.]

Ch1: You can't use debts, or lack of debt, as a definition of socialism. We used to use the fact that Albania was free of debt to promote it. There's a certain point to promoting that if a country is free of debt, it allows it much wider ability to be independent of imperialism and the capitalists.

But the problem with the Albanians is they tried to make it a principle. Whether you accepted credits was the dividing line. One can't quite find this principle, especially if you read various of the concessions [investments from other countries] that Lenin and the Bolsheviks were considering allowing or even did allow after the October revolution. Debt is very much a judgmental issue. The question is whether or not one recognizes the dangers of it. There is a definite danger from debt, but debt's not the determining issue.

Ch2: One thing I wanted to raise is that the Albanians came out with this propaganda at a time when there was a big world fuss that you could solve all your problems with borrowing. And a number of the revisionist countries went this route.

Poland is one of the dramatic examples. They borrowed a huge amount of money. And not just for consumer goods, they borrowed it for factories. Oh, great! They're going to build up their productive facilities, factories. And-- they got smashed by it. Factories didn't work right, nothing worked right, and they ended up with a huge debt.

A whole series of countries went this route. Hungary also now has a huge debt crisis. It financed its alleged great prosperity by simply taking bigger and bigger loans.

So in that situation, some country says "Well, we're not going to take any debt", and it looks pretty good. But they made this into an absolute principle--for all times and all places--and that didn't make sense.

### On criticism of social-democratic "socialism"

Fl: I think it's very important to explain what socialism is and is not, and especially to deal with the Soviet Union, and I applaud the Party for taking up that campaign. But I think there's another aspect which was not dealt with in the speech, which I think should be covered. Besides those that have illusions in the Soviet Union or China or whatever, there is another group on the left

which seems to have quite a bit of influence that will agree "Yes, the Soviet Union is not socialist; China is not socialist." When you ask them what then do they think socialism is, they point to the Scandinavian countries such as Sweden, or they point to Britain. The social-democrats, the DSA in particular, are propagating the false ideology that socialism means Swedish welfare state capitalism, or even private capitalism. So I think it's necessary that the Party, in dealing with the question of the Soviet Union and its degenerations, should also tack on a discussion of such countries as Sweden and England.

Ch2: Our Party has paid a certain amount of attention on the question of Western state capitalism and welfare-ism. At various times we've stressed the fight against social-democracy and against the social-democratic models. But this speech was concentrating on dealing with a different subject.

Actually, there is a certain connection, in that a stronger criticism of Soviet state capitalism rebounds even more on the question of Western state capitalism. Now of course countries such as Sweden actually have very big private sectors, are hardly mainly state capitalist countries. Nevertheless the ideology of state capitalism is very strong, and it's a very common social-democratic conception that these are socialist countries or that the state sector is the socialist sector in capitalist countries. I think in general the study of socialism which we're engaging in, and the criticism of revisionist state capitalism, will rebound even more strongly on social-democratic state capitalism.

Ch1: To add on that: a good part of socialist agitation in this country does have to refute the welfare-state type of ideas, which are fairly common and widespread. If you ask various ordinary people what socialism is, there are certain conceptions that are prevalent.

One is the welfare-state idea. While we're not opposed to welfare measures, the idea that this equals socialism is something that we do refute in our agitation, and it is something that needs to be refuted.

As well, there is the idea that socialism means just nationalization of the enterprises, which is essentially at the

heart of the question of state capitalism. In that sense, analysis and study of the Soviet Union will rebound on these other countries. Sweden is somewhat exceptional, but with most of these countries the issue is the state sector being equated to socialism. [The reference to Sweden being somewhat exceptional was to that, although it has much state regulation and it is also one of the most developed welfare states, its actual state sector is fairly small in comparison to other major industrialized powers.]

The speech raised that there is a front of criticism of revisionist and reformist socialism, which should actually be taken broadly in the sense of criticizing various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois concepts. But at this time there is a particular focus that we want to deal with. The phenomenon of Gorbachev, and the capitalist campaign around it, has a particular edge to demoralize the workers, and that's why that question somewhat stands out in this period and work needs to be done on it.

The question comes up all sorts of ways. Recently we had to write on the upsurge in Burma. When this upsurge took place, the U.S. press originally, and repeatedly, argued that this would be the first case of a socialist country being overthrown by a mass people-power movement for democracy. [The regime hasn't fallen yet.] Now most people in the U.S. may not know where Burma is, so the bourgeoisie counted on a certain amount of ignorance, that some people would say "well, it must be one of those socialist countries." I remember when I was out leafletting one time, a cop came up to me and said, "Hong Kong is a socialist country, and people live in cages there." And he brought out a picture from the newspaper of somebody living in a cage in Hong Kong. I said, "Hong Kong is a British colony, it's hardly a socialist country," but since he had a gun I didn't push the discussion.

True, they try to use any example where some country calls itself socialist. But, for instance, next door across the border in Bangladesh, people actually think, "Burma might be socialist." And these things do have an influence in the world. So we had to actually refute the idea of Burmese socialism in our discussion of Burma, and show that Burma was actually state capitalist. These other models of socialism do come up, and we do deal with them. ■