Reading Goldwasser and Dowty, Tuchman, and yea! even Joseph Alsop, it would appear that Chinese workers are behind the Maoists body and soul. In fact, the only criticisms that appear in Goldwasser and Dowty's 24 page pamphlet are that job safety is not up to snuff, and concerning the necessity for "close relations between workers and cadres." [45] If Chinese workers are so enamoured of Big Brother, then how is a letter to the editor of the American anarchist journal *The Match!* (2/73 issue) explained, wherein Ying Yi-shi of the English Section of Peking's Foreign Languages Press writes:

> We have received your note in which you request some literature and materials. We will be very glad to send you what we have on the subjects you mention, though we must make clear our position on the question of "anarchy." We are against it, for the reason that now, when imperialism (headed by the USA) is going to its doom and bright socialism is winning world-wide victory, anarchy does not accord with the interests of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, to which class struggle inevitably leads. Chairman Mao says: ". . . deprive the reactionaries of the right to speak . . ."[46]

Why is Mao so afraid to hear ideas other than his own spread? Let us give one small example. In 1957 Mao (who supported the Russians in crushing the Hungarian workers' uprising of 1956) decided that he would allow criticism of the Regime. Response was immediate. Workers and intellectuals were quick to point out that the State Capitalist nature of Mao's China, the exploitation of the Regime, and the class nature of the Chinese State.

> This unasked-for eruption of opposition and censure prompted Mao and the Party to adopt immediate reprisals. A large number of outspoken intellectuals were either liquidated or sent to Sinkiang province, China's Siberia, to undergo thought-reform through hard labour and personal sufferings. From then on, any criticism of government or Party was considered high treason. At the present moment, deviations or abstinence from practising Maoist doctrines and policies constituted disloyalty to the regime and the nation.[47]

This was the "Hundred Flowers Movement". The name was adopted from a Quotation of Chairman Mao that he and others have never again repeated: "Let 100 flowers bloom, let 100 schools of thought contend." And now we have a professor at Nanking University saying that " 'We believe in constant criticism and re-education . . . Chairman Mao teaches us that if you wash your body, there is nothing wrong with washing your brains.' "[48]

But not all are so subservient and brain-washed! During the so-called Cultural Revolution, workers did not stand still and submit to Maoist outrages:

> . . . In the course of the Maoist terror mass opposition surfaced. Somehow the "handful" of anti-Maoists had managed to "dupe" so many that the ruling clique admitted that "perhaps we are temporarily in a minority." Even more important, the opposition had roots directly in production, in the factories and the fields. They were, in fact, the proletarian and and peasant masses. They wore no red armbands, waved no books of quotations from Mao but they went out on unprecedented strikes and fought pitched battles with the Red Guard "seize control committees" that invaded their factories.[49]

The continued existence of thought-control, "re-education" camps, and the presence of the PLA in factory committees is living proof that "something is rotten in the State of China," that workers are not just taking things lying down. J. Walker outlines 6 main groups of immigrants to Hong Kong, setting aside one group as

> Those genuine communists who do not sympathise with the bureaucratic Maoist regime. They are usually ex-Red Guards who used to be ardent followers of Mao, Chou and other members of the Chinese establishment red capitalists, red aristocrats or red bureaucrats. They fled to Hong Kong in order to prepare themselves for a genuine socialist revolution in China because the present regime is not, in their eyes, socialist to the least extent.[50]

The existence of an immigrant group large enough for definition indicates that Chinese workers are not so brain-washed as Goldwasser and Dowty would have us believe.

Chinese factories may be exciting for goggle-eyed new leftist rubber-neckers and devotees of Stakhanovism. But for those of us who believe in workers' management of the means of production, who believe that "the working class and the employing class have nothing in common," who believe that it is not an amelioration of the present system that is needed, but a new system altogether, a system of workers' freedom, in short of a new libertarian society—Chinese factories are not exciting places. They are simply Variations on a Theme by the Boss. That two supposedly intelligent workers should see in the Maoist system a panacea is surely a bad sign: it shows that they are still hung-up in the slave-ideology of elitism that began with Lenin and continued through Trotsky, Stalin and Mao. Elitism is of the very essence of capitalism, dividing into leaders and led, workers and bosses, Masters and Slaves. Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin all believed that essentially workers were too dumb and not to be trusted in running society themselves and for themselves; similarly with Mao. The elitists are afraid of the masses. As politicians, their interest is *power*—and they cannot see beyond the tips of their gun-barrels. The idea of real freedom scares them; so we are treated to maxim-ridden rationalizations for mass-murder, exploitation and oppression. It is high time to start looking at China—and everything else for that matter—with both eyes open.

FOOTNOTES

1. Barbara Tuchman, *Notes from China* (NY: Collier Books, 1972).
2. Louis Kraar, "I Have Seen China—and They Work," *Fortune* (Chicago: Time, Inc., August 1972 issue), p. 110. Kraar is an associate editor of this American business magazine.
3. Tuchman, op. cit., p. 3.