

Surreptitious Substitution of Theory of Reconciliation of Contradictions and Classes for Revolutionary Dialectics Must Not Be Permitted

by Ai Siqu [1910 - 1966]

(Beijing, *Renmin Ribao*, May 20, 1965)

Translated in *Survey of China Mainland Press*, vol. 3475, 11 June 1965, pp. 1-11.

"Combining two into one" is a theory of reconciliation of contradictions and classes—a revisionist viewpoint disseminated by Comrade Yang Xianzhen. For some time some people were unable to see its erroneous nature. A very important reason is that the theory of "combining two into one" is cloaked in a false outer garment of dialectics. Comrades Yang Xianzhen and others have tried by all means to make this false outer garment look genuine, so that for some time people were deceived.

Comrade Yang Xianzhen says: "What is unity of opposites? There is an old Chinese saying [which illustrates the unity of opposites very well], and that is 'combining two into one.' This saying means that a thing is a unity of two sides. It has the same meaning as 'one dividing into two.'"

A careful analysis will show that this is a surreptitious trick of substitution—the metaphysical formula of "combining two into one" is substituted for the revolutionary dialectical principle of "one dividing into two."

This can be even better shown if we concretely analyze Comrade Yang Xianzhen's basic thought, which is contained in the following words of his:

"The idea of unity of opposites merely means that the two sides of a contradiction are inseparably linked together."

"All things are two combined into one. Therefore, in observing problems, it is necessary to 'divide one into two,' to adopt the method of one dividing into two."

"To learn the law of the unity of opposites is to acquire the ability to link two ideas together. It is necessary to remember always that the two sides of a thing are inseparably linked together, to grasp the opposites in the unity of opposites. In this way it will be possi-

ble to avoid one-sidedness in practical work."

This basic thought of Comrade Yang Xianzhen is systematically explained in his lecture notes and in essays written by others at his instruction. These include his views on objective things as well as his views relating to the way man's subjectiveness learns things and solves problems. To sum up, these explanations are: objective things are two combined into one. Therefore, the method which man adopts for knowing things and solving problems (including the formulation and execution of guidelines and policies) must strive to attain "combining two into one" through "one dividing into two." This is the object of his so-called "dialectics of learning." Two combined into one is the law of the existence of objective things as well as the object and principle of man's subjective knowing of things and solving of problems. It is a world outlook as well as methodology. That is Comrade Yang Xianzhen's basic thought.

What position is there for the dialectical viewpoint of one dividing into two in this basic thought? It is only an accessory. It is quite clear that Comrade Yang Xianzhen wants to make thorough use of the metaphysical "combining two into one" to negate and surreptitiously replace the dialectical one dividing into two.

Objective Things Are "One Dividing Into Two" and Never "Combining Two Into One"

It is certainly not the dialectical thought of Marxism-Leninism to call objective things "two combining into one." It is absolutely

impossible to find any basis for such an assertion in works on Marxism-Leninism. Let us first quote some dialectical theses on objective things from Marxist-Leninist works and then elaborate on them theoretically and practically.

Engels' thesis is:

"The so-called objective dialectics dominates the whole world of nature, whereas the so-called subjective dialectics, that is, dialectical thinking, is only a reflection of the movement which is found everywhere in the whole world of nature and which is produced through opposites, which determine life in the world of nature by their ceaseless struggle and their ultimate mutual transformation or change into a higher form." (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 174)

Lenin's thesis is this:

"One dividing into two and cognition of its contradictory part...is the substance of dialectics." (*Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. 38, p. 407. The original translation reads "The division of a unity into two parts..." but may be translated as "One dividing into two.")

"The identity of opposites...means the recognition (discovery) that all phenomena and processes of Nature (including both spirit and society) have contradictory, mutually rejecting and opposing tendencies." (*Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. 38, pp. 407-408)

"The unity (accord, identity, union) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transient, relative. The struggle of mutual rejection and antagonism, on the other hand, is absolute, exactly in the same way as development and movement are absolute."

Now let us look at Comrade Mao Zedong's thesis:

"The law of unity of opposites is the basic law of the universe. This law exists universally, whether in Nature, human society, and the mind of man. Contradictory opposites are united and yet struggling, and so actuate the movement and change of things." ("On Cor-

rect Handling of Contradictions Among the People.")

Is there any point of accord between these dialectical theses on objective things contained in Marxist-Leninist works and Comrade Yang Xianzhen's idea of "combining two into one"? No, not only is there no point of accord, but they are basically opposed to each other.

Comrade Yang Xianzhen's idea of "combining two into one" merely stresses "the inseparable link between the two sides of a thing," while Marxist-Leninist dialectics stresses the "ceaseless struggle" between the opposites, "the movement produced as a result of the opposition," and the "mutually rejecting, opposing tendency" of all phenomena and processes.

It is true that Marxist-Leninists also affirm the link between opposites, pointing out that opposites are united as well as struggling against each other, thus actuating the movement and change of things. In this connection, however, they emphasize in particular the relative character of unity and the absolute character of struggle.

Marxist-Leninists will certainly never interpret the law of unity of opposites as something that "merely means that the two sides of a contradiction are inseparably linked together," but should stress the divisibility of this link.

Lenin summed up the main substance of dialectics with the concept of "one dividing into two." Comrade Mao Zedong further develops this idea, pointing out that one dividing into two is a universal phenomenon, that all things are one dividing into two, and that we should also use the method of one dividing into two in observing and solving problems.

Can it be that Marxist-Leninists have fallen in a fundamental error, so that Comrade Yang Xianzhen has to invent a combining-two-into-one formula in order to rectify it? Of course, it is not the Marxist-Leninists who are in error. What is basically in error is exactly Comrade Yang Xian-

zhen's rectification.

Here the decisive divergence lies in: Whether we are to recognize -the universe and all things as a mutually related and ceaselessly moving and changing process, whether we are to recognize this as an endless, advancing and developing process from quantitative change to qualitative change, from affirmation to negation.

Materialistic dialectics recognizes that objective things are just such a process, whereas metaphysics is opposed to such an interpretation, regarding objective things as something unchanging, stationary, and isolated from one another.

Even metaphysics has to make its own interpretation of the change and development of things. It interprets this as merely a quantitative increase or decrease, as an endless cycle of existing things. According to such a metaphysical interpretation, one may of course include objective things in the "combining-two-into-one" formula.

One may distort the unity of opposites as "merely" an inseparable linkage between two opposing sides, namely, "combining two into one." One may misrepresent development as the alternate emergence of two unchanging things, a cycle like circling figures in a Chinese lantern. That too may be said to be "combining two into one."

However, that is after all only a metaphysical theory of mechanical combination and cyclical theory. "Combining two into one" should be frankly admitted as a metaphysical formula. How can it be arbitrarily placed within the category of dialectics?

But if objective things are recognized as a process of dialectical movement and change, and the movement and change of things is recognized not as a simple quantitative increase or decrease and a simple cycle but a process of endless advance and development from quantitative change to qualitative change and from affirmation to negation, then matters will be completely different.

The formula of "combining two into one" can certainly not generalize such a process,

nor can it represent the substance of any aspect, link, or part of this process. This process can only be regarded as a unity of opposites or unity and struggle of opposites.

Unity of opposites is the unity of ceaselessly struggling opposites within things. Although a link, or even some indivisible link, may exist between these opposites, this "indivisibility" is after all, owing to the "ceaseless struggle," relative, conditional, and temporary. The ceaseless struggle between the opposites puts their unity constantly in a tendency toward splitting and disintegration. Moreover, the splitting and disintegration will be a reality sooner or later, so that things will change from their old form of movement to a new form of movement, from quantitative change to qualitative change, from affirmation to negation. This is exactly a process of one dividing into two, the essence of the law of unity of opposites.

Unity of opposites is the source of the movement and change of things, the basic law of all processes of development. It is certainly not a metaphysical static unity, a unity from which struggle has been eliminated, or a unity of unconditional peaceful co-existence. Therefore, its essence can never be described as "combining two into one."

Through the writings of Ai Hengwu and Lin Qingshan, Comrade Yang Xianzhen has cited many examples of the movement of things—from the mechanical, physical, and chemical movement and movement of life in the world of nature to the movement of human society and human cognition—to prove that all movement is constituted of the "combining two into one" of different opposites.

The truth is that the more examples they cite, the more will they reveal their utter ignorance of materialistic dialectics and their lack of elementary knowledge about the examples they speak of. This is because the movement of nature, society, and human cognition is exactly an expression of the contradictory struggle of the one dividing into two of a unity, and is certainly not

the "combining two into one" of "two sides."

What is the mechanical movement of a body? Consider this example: Through conflict, friction, and other means, the volume of energy of motion of a body may be transferred to another body. This transfer causes the former to lose its volume of energy and enables the latter to get the same volume of energy as that lost by the former. This is a mechanical motion. So far as the latter is concerned, it is acted upon by the volume of energy of the former, whereas to the former, its loss of volume of energy is expressed in the "reaction" of the latter to it. Therefore, action and reaction is only an expression of one dividing into two of the same volume of energy between two contacting bodies.

Mechanical motion—the motion of the transfer of a volume of energy between two bodies—is exactly a result of one dividing into two of the same volume of energy, the unity and struggle of action and reaction. It is absolutely not the "combining two into one" of action and reaction.

Attraction and repulsion in physical motion, such as those of electromagnets, are an expression of the one dividing into two of the same electromagnetic wave and its forming into two opposing poles. Like poles repel each other, while opposite poles attract each other. It is this unity and struggle that makes the electromagnet give an impetus to motion. This motion is certainly not a "combining two into one" of attraction and repulsion.

Chemical combination and decomposition are related in chemical motion. The combination of different elements is a repulsion and struggle against decomposition. Conversely, decomposition does the same to combination. The two are always in a process of mutual repulsion and mutual transformation into each other. How can they be regarded as "combining two into one"?

Anabolism and catabolism are the two opposites in the mutual relationship between living proteins and their environments. The unity and struggle between

these two opposites cause the metabolic movement of living bodies and the process of their growth, decline and death. This metabolic process of growth, decline and death is exactly a process of continuous "one dividing into two" of the new and old elements of the living bodies themselves. How can it be described as "combining two into one"?

The relationship between living beings and their environments is also expressed in the "one dividing into two" process of heredity and adaptation. In his *Dialectics of Nature*, Engels pointed out: "The theory of evolution has proved how through the ceaseless struggle of heredity and adaptation a simple cell advances step by step, evolving on the one hand into the most complex plants, and on the other hand into man." (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 174) Engels stressed here the "ceaseless struggle" between the two sides of heredity and adaptation, without regarding them in any way as "combining two into one."

In social life, productivity and production relations are an expression of one dividing into two of the same process of social production, while the economic base and the superstructure are an expression of the one dividing into two of a united social form. The contradiction between productivity and production relations and that between the economic base and the superstructure is in turn expressed as contradiction and struggle between man and man—class contradiction and class struggle at certain stages of history. This is the basic motive power that pushes human society forward in its development. If productivity and production relations and the economic base and superstructure of society are "two combined into one," or in other words they are "completely in accord" with each other and no longer expressed as class contradiction and class struggle or contradiction between man and man, and all people are completely in accord with one another politically and morally, then will the development of human society not be arrested?

None of the examples with which Com-

rade Yang Xianzhen and others want to prove their theory of "combining two into one" can hold water. All things are in a process of continuous motion, change, and development, and all processes of development are processes of unity and struggle between opposites, of "one dividing into two," or in other words processes of the steady exposure, development, aggravation and resolution of the internal contradictions of things.

In these processes a struggle goes on ceaselessly from beginning to end between the opposites, so that from unity the opposites go to a state where they cannot maintain unity, from mutual dependence for existence they go to a state where their mutual dependence disintegrates and breaks, and finally they change in the opposite direction or into a higher form. This is the resolution of contradiction. It is the process from quantitative change to qualitative change, from affirmation to negation.

As soon as an old contradiction is resolved, a new contradiction appears. With it there come the unity and struggle of new opposites, a new process of one dividing into two, a new transition from unity to disunity of opposites, from mutual dependence to disintegration and breaking up, and the transformation into a higher form.

In this way all things are, through ceaseless unity and struggle of opposites, in a process of forward motion from quantitative change to qualitative change, from affirmation to negation.

So long as we recognize this dialectical development of all things, we must also recognize that the link between the opposites of the unity in all things is certainly not indivisible, but must disintegrate and break up.

Comrade Yang Xianzhen's one-sided emphasis on the "inseparable link" between opposites, his obliteration of the absolute character of the struggle between opposites and his distortion of the law of unity of opposites into "combining two into one" is completely without any foundation.

The Method of Knowing Things and Solving Problems Is Also One of Dividing into Two and Never "Combining Two into One"

Let us discuss the question of method of knowing things and solving problems. Comrade Yang Xianzhen's basic thought is attainment of "combining two into one" from one dividing into two. There are two concrete interpretations of this idea. The first interpretation is that things "combining two into one" should be known by the method of one dividing into two, but that in formulating and carrying out lines, guidelines, and policies, the formula of "combining two into one" must always be followed. The second interpretation is that the method of knowing things and solving problems includes the two aspects of analysis and synthesis, and that one dividing into two applies only to analysis while "combining two into one" applies to synthesis. These interpretations are included in Comrade Yang Xianzhen's lecture notes.

There is no basic difference between these two interpretations. Both sum up the method of knowing things and solving problems as "combining two into one," and both claim that it is "only" necessary to "link together the two opposite ideas"--either "combining them" in formulating and carrying out lines and policies, or "synthesizing them" when studying theory. Comrade Yang Xianzhen's so-called "combination" and "synthesis" have no essential distinction between them here.

Such thought of Comrade Yang Xianzhen runs radically counter to the dialectics of Marxism-Leninism.

Let us make a comparison by quoting some of these from Marxist-Leninist writings.

Lenin said:

"Dialectics in the proper sense is the study of contradiction in the very essence of objects: Not only is the phenomenon short-lived, moving, fast vanishing, and defined only by

assumed limits, but the essence of things is so too." (*Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. 38, p. 28)

Comrade Mao Zedong says:

"This dialectical world outlook teaches us primarily how to observe and analyze the movement of opposites in different things and, on the basis of such analysis, to indicate the methods for resolving contradictions." ("On Contradiction")

Again:

"In order to reveal the particularity of the contradictions in any process in the development of a thing, in their totality or interconnections, that is, in order to reveal the essence of the process, it is necessary to reveal the particularity of the two aspects of each of the contradictions in that process; otherwise it will be impossible to discover the essence of the process. This likewise requires the utmost attention in our study." ("On Contradiction")

"When we speak of understanding each aspect of a contradiction, we mean understanding what specific position each aspect occupies, what concrete forms it assumes in its interdependence and in its contradiction with its opposite, and what concrete methods are employed in the struggle with its opposite, when the two are both interdependent and in contradiction, and also after the interdependence breaks down." ("On Contradiction")

How can these principal theses concerning the dialectical method in Marxist-Leninist classic works be summed up as "combining two into one," and how can it be said that it is "only" necessary to "link together the two opposite sides"?

What is said here is "the study of contradiction in the very essence of objects," that phenomena should be regarded as "short-lived, moving, and fast vanishing."

According to the even more developed view of Comrade Mao Zedong, it is necessary to analyze and reveal the contradiction of things, study how the contradictory opposites depend on and struggle with each

other, study what methods are employed in their mutual struggle while they are interdependent on each other and after the interdependence breaks down, and on the basis of such study indicate the method for resolving the contradiction.

These are a method of one dividing into two. They can absolutely not be summed up into Yang Xianzhen's "combining two into one."

Let us take "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong* as an example and study it. The essay analyzes the characteristics of every one of the main classes—which were in contradiction with one another and which included imperialism, the comprador class, the landlord class, the "middle-propertied" class or national bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the semi-proletariat, and the proletariat—in China at that time and then makes the following conclusion:

"To sum up, it can be seen that our enemies are all those in league with imperialism—the warlords, the bureaucrats, the comprador class, the big landlord class and the reactionary section of the intelligentsia attached to them. The leading force in our revolution is the industrial proletariat. Our closest friends are the entire semi-proletariat and petty bourgeoisie. As for the vacillating middle bourgeoisie, their right-wing may become our enemy and their left-wing may become our friend—but we must be constantly on our guard and not let them create confusion within our ranks." (*Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. 1, pp. 8-9)

This conclusion is a synthesis arrived at through analysis and at the same time lays down a general policy and line for the revolutionary struggle of that time.

What is the content of the synthesis? What kind of a line did it lay down? Can it be described as a line that "combines two into one"? It is exactly the reverse. The line is a reply to "the primary question of revolution" put forward at the very beginning of the essay, namely, "Who are our enemies and

who are our friends?" It is a line that distinguishes friend from foe, a line that divides one into two and certainly does not "combine two into one." The line divides one into two not only between friend and foe, but also among friends—distinguishing the closest friends from the vacillating ones.

If in matters of policy and line of revolution we cannot master this principle of one dividing into two but adopt the principle of "combining two into one," and instead of distinguishing friend from foe we mix them up, or desist from waging struggle among friends but only 'seek agreement and reserve differences," we shall not be able to "rally our true-friends for attacks against our real enemies," and moreover may lead revolution astray and cause it to fail.

A very good case in point was the errors caused by the opportunist line of Chen Duxiu at that time. Comrade Mao Zedong's essay was written exactly as an antithesis to Chen Duxiu's opportunist line that "combined two into one" with regard to friend and foe. By wanting to institute the formula of "combining two into one" as the basis for the Party's policies and lines, is Comrade Yang Xianzhen not following the line of capitulationism?

The line of revolution is the line that resolves class contradictions in society. The line of the new democratic revolution was designed to resolve the contradictions between the great popular masses with the worker-peasant, alliance as the foundation and led by the proletariat on the one side and imperialism, the feudal landlord class and bureaucratic capitalist class on the other. The line of socialist revolution is to resolve the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between the socialist road and the capitalist road.

To resolve class contradictions, it is first of all necessary to expose them, analyze the different classes that are in contradiction with one another, and also analyze their different economic positions and their different attitudes toward revolution. By collating the results of this analysis, it is possible to

indicate which class stand we should take in revolutionary struggle, with which classes we should unite ourselves and which we should oppose, which forces should be developed and which should be destroyed. That is the method of resolving class contradictions in society and the line of revolution.

To expose class contradiction means to divide one into two in regard of the contradictory classes. The line to resolve class contradiction requires the distinguishing of friend from foe as well as the pointing out of which forces to be expanded and which to be destroyed. That is also dividing one into two and not "combining two into one."

In an essay written by Ai Hengwu and Lin Qingshan at the instance of Comrade Yang Xianzhen, there is a quotation concerning the general line for the international communist movement. They try to create the impression that this line too can be made to conform to their "combining two into one." But apart from quoting the particular passage, they are unable to find a single word to support their view that the line is "combining two into one." The truth is that there is nothing of the kind to be found.

The general line for the international communist movement was put forward first of all as a result of a concrete class analysis of the four basic international contradictions, a result of the correct pointing out once more of the relationship between friend and foe in the world-wide revolutionary struggle—necessary in view of the reactionary thinking and underhand schemes of the modern revisionists to side with the enemy and betray the revolution. It is a "one-dividing-into-two" dialectical method of knowing and pointing out the world-wide class contradictions and their resolutions.

Class contradiction and class struggle is the most obvious dialectics of real life that is most difficult to conceal. Its opposition to the theory of "combining two into one" is extremely clear and acute.

Accordingly, in their lectures and writings. Comrade Yang Xianzhen and others

have adopted a cunning tactics, namely, they avoid as much as possible directly commenting on matters of class contradiction and class struggle. When such comment is impossible to avoid, they just pass quickly over the matter like a dragonfly skimming over water. Or they would discuss only the united front between certain classes, stressing "the seeking of agreement and reservation of differences" and "common demands" but avoiding class antagonism and class struggle.

Comrade Yang Xianzhen and his friends concentrate their main energies on issues not directly appertaining to class struggle, in which they can conceal with comparative ease their true ideological colors. They concentrate on redness and expertness, work and rest, quality and quantity, industry and agriculture, and such questions of synthesis and coordination.

By virtue of its very meaning, the term synthesis is easily misinterpreted as a process of "combining two into one." It seems to suggest only questions of linkage between the two opposites, without any question of struggle between them, of the breaking down and disintegration of their interdependence, and of one side defeating and overcoming the other. It is this term 'synthesis' which Comrade Yang Xianzhen and others emphatically seize upon in manufacturing their theory of class conciliation.

If we leave the sophistic quibbling about words and analyze concretely the various issues of 'synthesis' in their essence, then Comrade Yang Xianzhen's theory of "combining two into one" will have nothing to stand on.

The concept of 'synthesis' may admit of two opposite interpretations. One interpretation is metaphysical. It is a method of compromise and "mixing" that mechanically joins together two completely unchanged things. Comrade Yang Xianzhen's so-called synthesis is essentially such a metaphysical interpretation.

The opposite is the dialectical interpretation. According to this interpretation, the

essence of the so-called synthesis is the mastery, through motion and development, of the interrelations between the opposites within a thing. These interrelations are exactly relations of unity and struggle between opposites. They are also expressed as a process of continuous revelation of contradictions, development of struggle, and overcoming of contradictions, as well as a process from unity of opposites to the disintegration of unity and a continuous cycle of struggle between opposites and arrival at a new unity of opposites through one side overcoming the other. In short, it is still a process of the motion of one dividing into two.

The interrelations between opposites in the course of development can be expressed only in two forms: Either the opposites provide each other the conditions for existence and exist together in a unity, or they transform into each other.

At the beginning opposites exist together in a unity under certain conditions, such as quantitative increases on a certain qualitative basis. However, this coexistence is not "combining two into one." It is not stable and unchanging, but keeps changing continuously. The opposites are not "inseparable" forever, but must eventually fall apart.

In the course of quantitative development, a new qualitative factor is produced which advances the quantitative development to a stage where it will break with the old quality, brings about the division of one into two with regard to quantity and quality, causes the original relationship of coexistence to change and disintegrate, and leads the opposites to transformation in each other's direction. This transformation of opposites is an expression of dialectical "synthesis," and moreover it is often the more important transformation than any other. Coordination between work and rest, for instance, is brought about principally through mutual transformation between work and rest.

Nor is the mutual transformation of opposites a "combining two into one" process

because each transformation is only one link in the development of things, and because mutual transformation is not a cyclical process like the Chinese lantern with perpetually revolving figures, but a process in which certain new and higher level things emerge ceaselessly and certain old things are continuously overcome, vanquished and destroyed.

The so-called "synthesis" of "combining two into one" advocated by Yang Xianzhen and other abolishes struggle. It is a "synthesis" that obliterates the metabolic relationship between the old and the new and regards the two opposing sides as things that endure all ages, with neither side being vanquished, overcome, or destroyed. Such syntheses is in fact only a metaphysical, subjective fabrication of Comrade Yang Xianzhen and others. It does not exist in the dialectically moving objective world.

Comrade Yang Xianzhen's theory of "synthesis" of "combining two into one" is in reality a sophist trick that makes use of the outward form of the term 'synthesis.' Under the pretext of opposing partiality, he distorts dialectics into eclecticism and provides a theoretical tool for the revisionists in their idealistic vain hope of covering up class contradiction and abolishing class struggle.

"Combining Two Into One" Cannot Be Called a Factor in Dialectics

In the course of the present controversy, some comrades have gathered a number of arguments in an attempt to prove that "combining two into one" is a certain factor in dialectics. In different aspects and to different extents their viewpoint falls into the error of the theory of combining two into one. While criticizing Comrade Yang Xianzhen's theory of combining two into one, it is also necessary to clear up this erroneous viewpoint.

Some comrades call "combining two into one" one facet of dialectics or of the law of unity of opposites. They maintain that while one dividing into two represents the struggle

between opposites, "combining two into one" represents the identity of opposites. They declare that things are not only one dividing into two, but also combining two into one, that "combining two into one" is complementary to one dividing into two. These comrades mechanically, metaphysically separates the struggle and identity between opposites.

In reality the identity between opposites is only a conditional identity of the opposites that ceaselessly repel and struggle against each other. Such identity can never be combining two into one." Only those who see only the externals of things and do not analyze their essence will believe that the interdependence of opposites is combining two into one."

First, interdependence of opposites refers to interdependent opposites that result from a self-splitting of a unity, and not to "a unity constituted" by mixing together two things. The opposing classes existing together in a society are a result of the splitting of the society itself into two classes. IT is not a society constituted of two classes. It cad be represented only by one dividing into two and cannot be said to be "combining two into one."

Second, while the two opposites co-exist in the same unity, they never cease for a moment repelling and struggling against each other. Accordingly, their relationship of interdependence is constantly in a state of imbalance, with one side in a principal, dominant position.

Comrade Mao Zedong" tells us that of the two opposite sides of a contradiction, there is always one that constitutes the principal aspect of the contradiction while the other forms the secondary aspect.

In a class society, the ruling position is occupied either by this or that class It is either a bourgeois or a proletarian dictatorship. Since the relationship between the two opposites in a unity is that between the dominating and the dominated, the primary and the secondary, it cannot be simply described as one of "combining two into one.

More important still, owing to the ceaseless struggle between the opposites, such relationship of interdependence is not completely stable, but is only relatively stable. There constantly exists a tendency toward disintegration and breaking down, and moreover the interdependence will sooner or later disintegrate or break down. Therefore, with regard to its tendency of development, identity too is one dividing into two and not "two combined into one."

Not only that, but even the relative stability of identity can be maintained under certain conditions only by virtue of the struggle between opposites. Since there exists between the opposites a relationship between the primary and the secondary, the dominating and the dominated, how can the side that occupies the primary, dominating position maintain such a position except through struggle?

The revolutionary united front must be led by the proletariat. How can the proletariat keep the right of leadership without struggle? The State is a class dictatorship. How can the ruling class insure the stability of its political power without struggle?

"Unity will exist if maintained through struggle, it will perish if sought through compromise." Is this not a truth that has been proved thousands of times in the practice of our revolutionary united front?

Imperialist acts of war and aggression can be checked and peace defended only by waging resolute, tit for tat struggle against imperialism. By appeasing imperialism and compromising with it, one helps to further imperialist schemes of war and aggression and encourages it to wreck peace. Is that not a truth that has been proved by the practice of the struggle by the peoples of the world against imperialism since the last two world wars? Have the opportunists and revisionists, who act contrary to this truth, not suffered repeated setbacks?

Comrade Mao Zedong says: "The character of struggle lies in the character of identity. Without struggle there will be no identity."

This is a philosophical generalization of the above-mentioned truth. It profoundly generalizes the one-dividing-into-two essence of identity.

Speaking of the united front, Comrade Yang Xianzhen only stresses the 'seeking of agreement and reservation of differences' and the "common demands" of the united front, but refuses to discuss how the proletariat must firmly maintain its own independent policy and independent organization within the united front, or how through various means of class struggle the proletariat must keep in its hands the power of leadership of the united front. Comrade Yang Xianzhen attempts to cover up this one-dividing-into-two content of the united front, and distorts it into a policy of capitulationism which requires the proletariat to "combine two into one" with the bourgeoisie.

Some comrades interpret "combining two into one" as a link in dialectics. They maintain that the revelation, development, and aggravation of contradiction is one dividing into two, while the resolution of contradiction is "combining two into one."

For instance, they claim that prosecution of revolution by the proletariat in a capitalist society and its struggle against the bourgeoisie represents one dividing into two, while victory of the proletarian revolution, the destruction of capitalism, and establishment of communism are "combining two into one."

Accordingly, these comrades put forward this formula: Things are in an endless process of alternation from one dividing into two to "combining two into one" and then back to one dividing into two. These comrades in fact misrepresent the dialectical motion of things as a mechanical cycle, which is a metaphysical view of development. Their thesis obliterates an important essence of dialectics, namely, resolution of contradiction is a result of the overcoming of the negative aspect of things by the positive aspect, the victory of new-born forces over old, decadent forces.

The ultimate victory of proletarian revolution is a result of the protracted, irreconcilable struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between the socialist road and the capitalist road, a result of the utter defeat of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist road by the proletariat and the socialist road. It is certainly not a "combining two into one" of the two classes and two roads. Is that not clear?

These comrades also try to misinterpret the law governing the correct handling of contradictions among the people which Comrade Mao Zedong has expounded—"starting from a desire for unity, to distinguish right from wrong through criticism or struggle, and then attain new unity on a new basis"—so as to make it conform to their cyclical theory. They arbitrarily call the first and the second unity "combining two into one."

As a matter of fact, unity itself contains struggle. Some sort of struggle always exists there, but the concrete content and form of struggle have different characteristics under different conditions.

Criticism and struggle based on a desire for unity is exactly a process of one dividing into two. The new unity on a higher basis is achieved through criticism and struggle and after overcoming of error, and is therefore also a result of one dividing into two. This higher basis is absolutely not a basis of "combining two into one" between correctness and error, but a basis of one dividing into two between correctness and error. In the new unity new difference of opinion may again appear, and it will continue to divide into two. After that, it is again necessary to enable the correct view to overcome the erroneous view through criticism and struggle, so that a unity on an even higher basis may be achieved.

Is it not highly preposterous to call such a process a cycle of one dividing into two and "combining two into one"?

Some comrades mechanically divide things into two categories, saying that one

category of contradictions is resolved through one of the opposites defeating, overcoming, and destroying the other, while the second category is resolved through a combining of the opposites. They assert that only the first category of contradictions has the character of one dividing into two, and that the second category is "combining two into one." Such an erroneous idea has already been in fact criticized in a foregoing paragraph in which we criticize Comrade Yang Xianzhen's distortion of the Party's policy regarding "synthesis." It need not be repeated.

We have already made a systematic analysis and criticism of Comrade Yang Xianzhen's basic thought of "combining two into one," and Xianzhen moreover pointed out the error of the viewpoint of those who under various pretexts want to misrepresent the combining two into one" theory as a facet, a link, or a part of dialectics.

On the basis of this analysis and criticism, we may arrive at this conclusion: Whether as a world outlook or methodology. Comrade Yang Xianzhen's thought of "combining two into one" is radically contrary to dialectics. It is a philosophy that systematically reconciles contradictions and abolishes struggle.

Many comrades say that Comrade Yang Xianzhen's thought is essentially the same as that of Deborin of the Soviet Union. That is true. Deborin's characteristic was his propagandizing of the theory of reconciliation of contradictions, his praise for the idealist Hegel, and his discount of Marxist-Leninist materialistic dialectics. Comrade Yang Xianzhen's theory of "combining two into one" is a form of expression of Deborinism in China.

But Comrade Yang Xianzhen's theory of reconciliation of contradictions and theory of class conciliation is even more manifest and systematic than Deborinism. Its reactionary character also surpasses that of Deborinism.