the Vance mission. However, the Washington Post‡, which frequently speaks in an unofficial capacity for the Carter administration, carried an editorial on Aug. 2 which underlines how strong the feeling is in some ruling class summits that People's China is all but in the pocket of the U.S.

"There is now an American consensus," says the Post, "shared even on the right by those with scant sympathy for Peking, that, whatever happened in the past, there is no longer any reason to consider China a menace to [the imperialist interests of—S.M.] the United States. Aside from Taiwan, the two governments have little to disagree about. In the 1970s," says the Post, China's alleged "fear of Russia, and the United States' perception that **it could use Peking to keep pressure on Moscow and to enhance stability throughout Asia, produced an accommodation**. [Our emphasis.] The two agreed in effect to postpone the Taiwan question in order to enjoy benefits on other levels. [But China did not!—S.M.]. . .

"Mr. Teng's rise," says the Post, "confirms an economic and political interest [in the U.S.—S.M.] on China's part [along with] the existing strategic rationale for a close Chinese tie to Washington."

The Post is happy that it will be "Mr. Teng, who received President Ford, as well as Party Chairman Hua Kuo-feng, who will be there to receive the Secretary."

Along with the rest of the capitalist press, this organ of high finance recognizes what Maoist adherents close their eyes to—that the rise of Teng will, as the Post puts it, "not only reduce the so-called disruptions of the Cultural Revolution but will introduce a host of moderate 'capitalist road' policies requiring good relations with the industrialized [imperialist] democracies."

Of course, the ouster of the leading Maoist group, of Chiang Ching, Yao Wen-yuan, Chang Chun-chiao, and Wang Hung-wen, is applauded by the Post and is one of the signs indicating that the Cultural Revolution has run its course.

LONG-RANGE VIEW OF SINO-SOVIET RELATIONS

While much of what the Post says is, of course, undeniably true, their basic assumption is geared to bourgeois geopolitical and strictly contemporaneous political and diplomatic issues. It carefully avoids the fundamental class issue. For while it is incontestably true that the swing to the right in China may facilitate and strengthen the U.S.-China anti-Soviet alliance, it is not altogether inevitable if one takes the longer perspective of history and views the rightist triumph

in China as mere **political** reaction—deep-going political reaction, of course, but not a fundamental change in class structure.

China still remains a socialist country with a mode of production which, however it may vary in certain attributes from the Soviet system, is nevertheless of the same social and class character. And this is what the ruling class as a whole does not easily forget. Far from it.

Their irreconcilable hostility to the social system may appear to be of a minimal character today as compared with the never-ending, vitriolic attacks against the Soviet Union. But that is due strictly to the diplomatic posture the U.S. has taken to China ever since the end of the Cultural Revolution, at which time the fierce and unbridled character of the anti-China campaign began to slow down.

The basic social irreconcilability towards socialist construction in China and the development of a socialist system is a permanent feature of ruling class orientation. It would be a grave mistake to overlook this.

It is one thing to make a specific current appraisal of ruling class policy regarding this or that social phenomenon at a given time. It is an entirely different matter to correctly appraise the **objective orientation** of the ruling class towards social phenomena, such as the working class as a whole, the oppressed people as a whole, and socialist countries as a whole.

Here the objective orientation of imperialism is quite clear. It is to undermine them, obstruct their development, and if possible to subvert and ruin them.

CRUCIAL ISSUE OF TAIWAN

It is interesting to note that the Washington Post, unquestionably mouthing the thoughts either of the State Department or some other grouping in the capitalist establishment, goes so far as to almost throw the Shanghai communique into the dustbin of history. "Aside from Taiwan," it says, "the two governments have little to disagree about." But Taiwan is a crucial issue! It is much more crucial now than it was before.

The new rightist elements in the Chinese leadership, who are by no means too securely fastened to their new positions even though the Cultural Revolution has run its course, must show some gains to the masses. And nothing would be more important to them than to finally get the U.S. to agree to surrender the Chinese province of Taiwan, as promised in the Shanghai communique, whose im-