forth the results of a one-month investigation of industrial China. They totally ignore the mind control, State repression, the persecution of political and industrial dissidents, and the actual class structure existing in China. They are not alone. While Barbara Tuchman does talk about the mind control and other repressive aspects of the Maoist regime, she writes that

> In a country where misery and want were the foundation of the social structure, famine was periodic, death from starvation common, disease pervasive, thievery normal, and the graft corruption taken for granted, the elimination of these conditions in Communist China is so striking that negative aspects of the new rule fade in relative importance.[3]

It is also a historic fact that Hitler ended unemployment and Mussolini made the trains run on time.

To Goldwasser, Dowty and Tuchman, what Raya Dunayevshaya wrote in 1967 is particularly apt:

> Some self-styled revolutionaries are ready to forgive Mao every crime in the book and leave a few blank pages for those he might invent later. . . They are ignorant of fundamental class divisions within each country, China included, and illogically link those opposites, war and revolution.[4]

The purpose of the present article, however, is not to carp at the Maoists and their sympathizers, but rather to examine the available literature to see if "workers' management of the means of production" does indeed exist in China. What are the groups that control the means of production, and how are these means of production controlled? Since this is a magazine article and not a book, discussion will be limited mainly to the same areas covered by Goldwasser and Dowty – the shop floor. Covering other areas – foreigh policy, foreign trade, the activities of Maoists in Hong Kong trade unions, the continued existence in China of private capitalist enterprises, party power struggles, etc. – would only support the conclusions reached about Chinese society at its economic base.

WORKERS' CONTROL VS. WORKERS' MANAGEMENT

In China, the differences between the two concepts, "workers' control" and "workers' management," become obvious. Management means *total* control – making decisions, initiating them, and enforcing them. As Maurice Brinton put it,

> To manage is to initiate the decisions oneself, as a sovereign person or collectivity, in full knowledge of all the relevant facts. *To control* is to supervise, inspect or check decisions initiated by others. 'Control' implies a limitation of sovereignty or, at best, a state of duality of power, wherein some people determine the objectives while others see that the appropriate means are used to achieve them.[5]

Goldwasser and Dowty write that ". . . China's workers and peasants have been busily constructing a new socialist society."[6] They define "socialism for us:

> Socialism means the economy and government are run by workers in their own interest – a 'dictatorship of the proletariat' which has replaced the previous class dictatorship of the capitalists.[7]

In China – as will be shown below – reality is somewhat different. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is actually a "dictatorship over the proletariat." Workers do not control – they merely participate in the low-level technical and procedural aspects of production; they do not manage. Things in China are controlled by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), and not by the working class. There exists a very marginal form of "workers' control" – but certainly no "workers' management." "It is important to point out that the party is the ultimate and dominant authority in Red China. The party can and does determine dominant attitudes toward authority, responsibility, and subordination in industry and business; and enterprise personnel tend to adopt the prescribed part attitudes quite quickly when there are official changes in the party's position."[8] This is implied, but never stated straight out, in Goldwasser and Dowty's article, and must be remembered if Chinese "workers' control" is to be understood.

The now-discredited Liu Shao-chi stated that:

> The system adopted in managing our enterprises is a system which combines a high degree of cnetralization with a high degree of democracy. All enterprises must abide by the unified leadership of the Communist Party and the state, and by *observing strict labor discipline,* ensure unity of will and action among the masses. At the same time, they should bring into full play the initiative and creativeness of the workers, develop the supervising role of the masses, and get them to take part in the management of their enterprises.[9]

Let us see how the above is translated at the factory level.

REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEES, PARTY COMMITTEES, & THE 3-IN-1 COMBO

Goldwasser and Dowty describe the mechanics of workers control in the Eastern Workers' Paradise:

> Chinese factories have two leading organs which make and administer decisions: *The Party committee is the basic decision-making body and exercises top leadership. The revolutionary committee is the top administrative body, carrying out the decisions of the Party committee.* Most factories we visited also had a workers' representative congress, a new mass organization formed since the Cultural Revolution.[10]

Forture magazine's Louis Kraar apparently missed the Party Committee, for he writes that "Every factory and farm is nominally controlled by a 'revolutionary committee' of workers, party members, and Army personnel."[11]

Since the Party Committee makes the top decisions (the Revolutionary Committee only carrying out the Party Committee's decisions), it is clear that the Party Committee – and thus the Party – is what runs the factories. Logically enough, only CCP members can serve on the Party Committee.[12] Goldwasser and Dowty write that "About 15 per cent of the workers and cadres in the factories we visited were members of the Chinese Communist Party." The Party Committee is supposed to be run on "three-in-one" lines (workers, cadres, army) whenever possible.[13]