is kept open, the possibility of movement is kept alive. Yet is it just a quibble to insist that to comprehend the prospects for *China's Uninterrupted Revolution* more then is required, no matter how decisively and brilliantly offered, as is the case with this landmark book, to counter the critics and make real the immense living, local achievement? There is now a powerful, centralized state. What is the relation of state and revolution?

EDWARD FRIEDMAN

The Politics of Class and Class Origin: The Case of the Cultural Revolution. By GORDON WHITE. [Canberra: Australian National University, 1976. Contemporary China Papers no. 9, 97 pp. A$2.00. U.S.$3.00 overseas.]

Gordon White's essay on the Cultural Revolution is a welcome contribution to the discussion of inequality in socialist China. White takes up the question of the ambiguity of class in the midst of that most conflict-filled movement. 17 years after Liberation, and in the aftermath of dramatic structural changes in the organization of society, the Maoist appeal for renewed class struggle was subject to varying interpretations by newly mobilized Red Guard activists.

The central problem of the Party's class policy on the eve of the Cultural Revolution was how to treat the class designations (*ch'eng-fen*) which indicated former relationships to the means of production. The formula offered by Mao and other leaders was ambivalent: "Pay attention to *ch'eng-fen*, but do not pay exclusive attention to *ch'eng-fen;* put the major stress on behaviour." Left unresolved was the degree to which class conflict was organized around old, pre-socialist distinctions.

For young people, born since Liberation and without class designations, the question was one of family background: should the ascribed status of birth take precedence over the achieved status of political activism? White sets out two trends which emerged in the Red Guard movement in response to this issue. Initially the most aggressive stance – known as lineage theory, or the doctrine of natural redness – was taken by those who held that children of former capitalists, landlords, and the like should be excluded from making revolution, and indeed, should be among the targets of revolution. The opposing view, which White calls "origin theory," held that behaviour was all-important, and that family background was an unfair standard by which to analyze classes in socialist China.

White effectively relates these positions to the social situations of their advocates. Not surprisingly, the children of high cadres often favoured natural redness, by which measure they fared quite well, while children of less favourably classified parents often argued most strenuously on behalf of behaviour. The often confusing elaboration of this polemic is traced in some detail, although White perhaps too

readily discounts the extent to which natural redness theorists may have attempted consciously to shield their well-placed parents against radical attack.

Especially useful is a 22-page translation of the major statement against natural redness, "Origin Theory," which has not previously appeared in full in English. Although White directs his attention to student politics, there is a helpful discussion of the role taken in this controversy by such central leaders as Chou En-lai, Lin Piao and Ch'en Po-ta.

White concludes that this noisy argument resolved little: that the two extremes of stressing only behaviour or only family background were ruled out of bounds, but that the internal contradiction of the Maoist class policy remained after the Cultural Revolution. While this formulation possesses an appealing symmetry, the debate on family background may alternatively be interpreted as a process by which class policy was clarified. White consistently over-emphasizes the distance between the position set forth by the origin theorists and the Maoist perspective. To say that these are "clearly at variance" is to put the matter too simply. There is variance, but it is rather unclear, and the suspect parentage of the origin theorists makes the gap seem greater than is in fact warranted. Early in the Cultural Revolution, natural redness had been declared illegitimate, but the behavioral emphasis, expressed in different ways by Maoists and by origin theory activists, remained at the end. And although there have indeed been reappearances in more recent years of ideas of natural redness, they have been criticized vigorously, and most likely represent backsliding within a broader secular movement in China away from the old class designations and from calculations of family origin.

RICHARD KRAUS

Power and Policy in China. By PARRIS H. CHANG. [London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975. 276 pp. £8·10.]

Whatever its fate in China, the Cultural Revolution has had an immense impact on the western academic community. As a result of the dissemination of previously unknown information through the various Red Guard (and other mass organization) documents of that time, not only do we know more about the period before 1966, but our perspectives on that whole period have changed drastically. This is particularly so with respect to the study of Chinese politics. No longer is it plausible to describe the Chinese political process in monolithic or quasi-totalitarian terms.

Stimulated by the Cultural Revolution, the reaction to this essentially Cold War model of communist politics has resulted during the last few years in the growth of interest in the Chinese policy-making process. As its title suggests, this process is precisely the focus of this book. Its