asked. This has never happened, I was told, and if it ever did, a new candidate would be proposed for the job, and a new election would take place. A British diplomat who had been stationed in Red China for several years told me that employees wishing to vote "no" for a candidate in an election of this type would probably have to ask for a special pencil to mark his ballot and would become very conspicuous. It was implied that all candidates at the enterprises surveyed which had elections are elected with a 99 or 100 percent majority.[37]

And later:

At virtually all of the firms their directors and all their vice-directors – even where the enterprise had "elections" to choose their high-level managers – had to be approved by superior authorities. In a number of cases they had to be approved by higher bodies two or three levels above the enterprise, and at a few large firms final approval came from as high up as the state council. The same was true for party secretaries and vice secretaries at some of the enterprises. Their appointments had to be approved by higher party committees, and in a few cases formal approval came from as high up as the Central Party Committee in Peking.[38]

And this is what passes for workers' control! The only "control" is by the Party bosses, who control the workers. Such a system almost guarantees that any decisions made will be – like the onces who make the decisions – approved by the Party heirarchy. And if there's any question, there is a PLA man always ready to answer. Just as the class interest of a private capitalist is to raise productivity and make increased profits, so is the interest of the Chinese State Capitalists – the CCP. Read any contemporary writings on China – increased productivity is loudly lauded as a major achievement of the Regime. And then we look at the foreign trade deals – with the fledgling fascist Marcos regime in the Phillipines, with the U.S. and all of the others that the Maoists used to deride as "paper tigers" and general nogoodniks. And these elections are the basis of Chinese workers control – and our two proud Americans, Goldwasser and Dowty, see nothing wrong. If American unions ran elections in the same manner, these unions would be rightfully accused of election-fixing, pressure-tactics, and the crys would be long and loud about how such "elections" were in fact the exact negation of workers' democracy. But Goldwasser and Dowty blithely ignore all this, contentedly wallowing in the quotations of Chairman Mao. In their study of Marxism-Leninism they have conveniently overlooked the one about "the emancipation of the working class being the job of the working class itself!" Private capitalism is no worse than State capitalism – in both, workers' labor power is expropriated by the Boss Class. In both, those daring to do something about it are brutally suppressed. And in both, the apologists continue with their pantywaist explanations. Their rationalizations boil down to nothing more than "Mussolini made the trains run on time." The brutality of the regimes are ignored by concentrating on advances in health care, free housing, etc. Of course what these people forget is that if such social welfare measures were not introduced wages would necessarily have to rise in order to cover increased living expenses. A wage system is a wage system, no matter who the paymaster is; and wage slavery is wage slavery, no matter who the Master is.

Thus we have seen that the decision-making parties are firmly in the hands of the Party; the decisions must be ratified by the Party; and the members of the Party-controlled committees must be approved by the Party before being allowed to make their powerless decisions. This is not workers' freedom, workers' democracy or workers'-anything-else – except *workers' exploitation.*

THE WORKERS' REPRESENTATIVE CONGRESSES

Goldwasser and Dowty talk about a new organization that has sprung up since the "Cultural Revolution" – the workers' representative congresses. They cite this as another example of Chinese workers controlling their factories.[39] The activities of this outfit include the following:

. . . to organize workers' study and education, *to mobilize workers to fulfill the production plan* of the factory, to save waste materials, and to promote technical innovation and technical revolution. It is part of the tasks of the workers' representative congress to listen to the needs and demands of the workers, collect opinions and transmit them to the Party committee and revolutionary committee. They also organize sports and other recreational activities and arrange for cultural performances . . . [40]

Not all workers may belong, only "revolutionaries"[41] – and we can readily guess who decides that.

The workers' representative congresses have no power at all and have nothing to do with controlling the factories – that's in the hands of the Party committee. The revolutionary Committees merely carry out Party Committee orders. Thus the workers' representative congresses are nothing more than Maoist social clubs.

WORKERS CONTROLLED–WORKERS RESPOND

It is beyond the scope of this article to go into the disgraceful history of the CCP in regimenting and dominating the Chinese working class to its own (State Capitalist) interests. I am purposely confining myself to the present (that is, post-Cultural Revolution) situation. Suffice it to say that ever since the 1949 "Liberation," the CCP has consistently fought any independent working class initiatives and movements, branding them as "economist," "syndicalist," "anarchist," "Ultra-Left," "Trotskyite" and other ephitets of the Stalinist lexicon. Suffice it to say that the history of the CCP has been one of collaboration, not struggle, against capitalists, naturally at the expense of workers.[42] Suffice it to say that, in conjunction with the Chinese State Capitalist regime (in 1956, the CCP's Congress "declared China to be 'state capitalist' . . . "[43]), private capitalists continue to prosper, either in their old role as private capitalists or else as the managers of state firms.[44]

Let us once again note the basically boss role of the cadres; that all "workers' participation" must be approved by Party personnel, who – unless it is a trivial decision – must clear it with their Party superiors; that through the Party and Revolutionary Committee method of administration, the system becomes one of class collaboration, not class struggle.