ence " was totally absent from Chinese foreign policy pronouncements throughout the Cultural Revolution down to September of 1970 is similarly in error, as that theme had been raised explicitly by Chou En-lai in a widely publicized speech of November 1968. And the author's assertion that the Lin Piao affair reached crisis proportions " in the fall of 1971 after Mao's swing around the provinces " (p. 414) is also somewhat misleading, as Lin ostensibly died before the end of the summer. Finally, China's entry into the United Nations was erroneously stated to have occurred in September 1971 (p. 377), when in fact the relevant U.N. voting occurred on 25 October.

Such relatively minor errors of fact and judgment notwithstanding, however, *The Second Chinese Revolution* deserves careful reading by anyone – layman and specialist alike – interested in the enigmatic events of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Rich in detail and sensitively written, it is a book that adds substantial new information and insight to our understanding of recent Chinese history. Equally important, its critical, non-dogmatic Marxist approach to the analysis of the Chinese developmental experience affords a welcome alternative both to the tedious polemics of Mao's acolytes and to the stale cynicism of the chairman's Cold War detractors.

RICHARD BAUM

Liu Shao-ch'i and the Chinese Cultural Revolution: The Politics of Mass Criticism. By LOWELL DITTMER. [Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1974. 358 pp. Hardback $12.85. £7·10. Paperback $4.25. £3·20.]

By eschewing winners' history, Lowell Dittmer has produced a luminous political biography of Liu Shao-ch'i. He focuses on how the Cultural Revolution swept Liu into its vortex and destroyed him politically. Comparing Liu to Humpty-dumpty, the author nevertheless tries to reassemble Liu, to reconstruct what happened, and to evaluate its implications for China's future. His sympathetic approach to Liu is expressed in his thesis that " . . . Liu's life may be viewed as an attempt to combine order with revolution and equality with revolutionary efficiency and technocratic values " (p. 3).

The book is divided into three almost self-contained sections, which permit the author to approach his subject from three perspectives. This scheme provides useful flexibility to anyone who grapples with that conflict between social Utopianism and modernization which is apparently inevitable in underdeveloped communist countries. The first perspective is that of political history and implicitly assumes that people determine politics. A biographical sketch is followed by an analysis of the successive policy conflicts which, despite 30 years of collaboration, finally ruptured the Mao-Liu partnership. The roots and themes

of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution are traced to their origins in the decade of 1956–66 and the competing " conspiracy " and " spontaneity " theories of causation are analysed. Dittmer does not find evidence of an *a priori* verdict on Liu, but argues instead that Liu became the Cultural Revolution's logical victim as its themes began to evolve. He contends that as the Cultural Revolution proceeded, the legitimating principles of ideology and organization were undermined by Mao's thought and criticism of Liu escalated. Finally, Liu became a " condensation symbol " – a scapegoat for all grievances. His overthrow became the Cultural Revolution's " . . . greatest and most ineluctable achievement " (p. 170).

The second perspective, " Two roads," undertakes to reconstruct the Mao-Liu rupture by comparing their personalities, " political style " and policies. Here, political history is joined by configurative analysis. In his innovative chapter, " The capitalist road: critique and metacritique," Dittmer evaluates, as objectively as possible, the Maoist critique of Liu in its philosophical, political, economic and cultural categories. He is hampered by inadequate sources – skewed to the Maoist position. Well aware of the problem, he nevertheless convincingly tests the validity of the Maoist critique, using the criteria of " confessed error," " accurate " (independently verifiable), " valid " (at variance with Mao's thought) and " sincere " (post-Liu attempts to rectify " erroneous " policies). He concludes that the Maoist critique, that Liu permitted efficiency and order to take precedence over equality and revolution, is fuzzy and only partially valid. He cautions that there is no calculus for two additional criteria: Liu's proportional responsibility and internal consistency. To his critics, Liu's guilt was deliberate and consistent. Furthermore, Cultural Revolution criticisms of Liu obscure the fact that policy differences between him and Mao were often subtle, that the Maoist critique is based on unrealized norms and that China has not really been able to abandon " Liu Shao-ch'iism." In bringing this second perspective to a close, Dittmer separates Maoism from Bolshevism. Since Liu lived by the precept that the Party is the vanguard, such a separation is conceptually useful.

Semiotic analysis is the emphasis of the third perspective, " Criticism and self-criticism." This is less historical and more predictive than the other two. Liu is left behind as a personality and his political destruction is used as a means towards the end of defining and interpreting the effects of mass criticism. By means of content analysis, charts, diagrams, and other tools of the political scientist, Dittmer evaluates the impact of Liu on China's political future. He concludes that, through Liu as scapegoat, criticism and self-criticism, the original parameters of decision-making and discipline within the Party, were transformed by being taken out of the Party and put on a mass basis. This new version of criticism and self-criticism will be Liu Shao-ch'i's major legacy to Chinese politics.

Dittmer does not address himself to the question of why Liu did not fight back during two years of unmitigated polemical attack. He seems content with the explanation that Liu accepted his fate because he played strictly according to his view of the rules of Chinese morality, and also because he did not wish to plunge China, by his opposition, into an even more chaotic condition. Liu's passiveness deserves further inquiry. This consideration is the most serious shortcoming of the book. A more minor objection is that some aspects of the semiotic analysis seem contrived. Although all three perspectives abound in sensitive perceptions, the book as a whole is stronger historically than it is predictively.

Dittmer's study is a serious contribution to an understanding of Chinese politics. His conclusions are carefully drawn and he bolsters his ephemeral Cultural Revolution sources with the widest possible variety of other primary and secondary materials. This well-written, sophisticated analysis helps to reassemble Liu and to understand the forces for change in China during a crucial period.

RHODA WEIDENBAUM

Ombres chinoises. By SIMON LEYS. [Paris: Union Général d'Éditions, 1974. 312 pp. Paperback FF12.00.]

This is a special book: not the usual scholarly study (although the pseudonym conceals a fine scholar), but an openly subjective account of a six-month stay in post-Cultural Revolution China, coupled with many rather scattered notations and reflections on everyday life in China, the bureaucracy, cultural life (or the absence of it) and other topics. It is no more complete than it is balanced: economic transformations, for instance, are barely touched upon.

As the volume includes, furthermore, some exaggerations and hasty extrapolations, many potential readers might be inclined not to bother to read just another notoriously subjective "travel book." They would be wrong. In the first place, they will not be bothered at all: once they have opened the book, they will find it impossible to stop before reaching the last page. The book is so refreshingly provocative and beautifully written that it is a constant pleasure, sometimes even an exhilarating one, to read. I hope the English translation (for the book obviously deserves to be translated, and the sooner the better) will manage to maintain part of its passion, irony, indignation, fervour and grace. In the second place, even though unbalanced and incomplete, *Ombres chinoises* is a magnificently sincere and perceptive book, the work of a true writer, in the Orwellian tradition. Orwell is, along with Lu Hsün, the author most often quoted by Simon Leys but, even in places where he is not explicitly quoted, one is often reminded of him: for instance by the description of the organization of a "spontaneous" welcoming (*je-lieh huan-ying*) demonstration for important