

Persist in "One Divides into Two," Oppose "Combine Two into One"

- A Talk to Basic-Level Cadres on the Great Polemic on the Philosophical Front  
edited and compiled

by  
Jao Ching-huang (饒景璜)

PART I

(Canton Nan-fang Jih-pao, January 11, 1965)

Question:

What is, after all, the polemic on "one divides into two" and "combine two into one" which has been unfolded on our philosophical front? In what way is it significant? How does it bear on our practical work?

Answer:

At present, a polemic on "one divides into two" and "combine two into one" is going on on our philosophical front. This is a struggle between those who persist in and those who oppose materialistic dialectics. Those who advocate that "one divides into two" as the basic law of things stand on the side of materialistic dialectics those who advocate "combine two into one" as the basic law of things stand against materialistic dialectics. The two sides are clearly divided and opposed to each other. This is a reflection of the class struggles in the ideological [sphere]. This struggle was provoked by Comrade Yang Hsien-chen.

"One divides into two" is the law of the unity of opposites which Chairman Mao has fully and thoroughly discussed in "On Contradiction." He points out that the development of anything is always based upon "one divides into two." This is to say, there are in all things two aspects which stand against each other.

These two aspects unite with and struggle against each other, hence impelling motion and changes in things. This is the core of Marxist dialectics. The proletariat observes and transforms the world in accordance with this law of objective things. Hence, "one divides into two" becomes the world outlook of the proletariat.

Since an objective thing is based on "one divides into two," in order to understand it it is necessary "to divide one into two". In order to reform it, it is also necessary "to divide one into two." Therefore, "one divides into two" also becomes the proletarian methodology for transforming the world.

According to this theory of Chairman Mao, it is acknowledged that contradictions are inherent in things, that the two aspects of a contradiction unite with and struggle against each other, and that contradiction is the motive force that impels the development of things. The identity of opposites is relative, and the struggle of opposites is absolute. Consequently, materialistic dialectics never covers up, but rather, exposes the contradiction. It finds out the correct way to solve the contradiction, promotes the transformation of one aspect of the contradiction to the opposite aspect, thus attaining the object of transforming the world in a revolutionary manner.

In order to use this world outlook to analyze class society, we must acknowledge class contradiction and class struggle. We must acknowledge that class struggle is the motive force for the development of society, carry through the class struggle to the end, and realize the social revolution.

"Combine two into one" is what Comrade Yang Hsien-chen advocates. He holds that "everything is 'combined from two into one,'" and adopts the method of "one divides into two" only for the observation of problems. He deduces that the law of the unity of opposites in the development of things shows that "the two aspects of a contradiction are inseparably connected." He holds that the opposites are "inseparable."

He also adopts the tactics of passing fish eyes for pearls, saying that "one divides into two" and "combine two into one" mean one and the same thing and both refer to the law of unity.

This is a distortion of Marxist dialectics as well as a distortion of Mao Tse-tung's thought. If society is observed according to the "combine two into one" theory as advocated by Comrade Yang Hsien-chen, it is necessary to eliminate the class struggle, thus leading to the theory of class reconciliation and calling for the capitulation of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie.

It can be seen that the world outlook of the "one divides into two" theory is distinctly different from the "combine two into one" theory. They stand for two kinds of world outlook--the proletarian world outlook and the bourgeois world outlook in antithesis.

With different world outlooks, the ways to know and transform the world are also different. Therefore, as methodology, "one divides into two" and "combine two into one" are also fundamentally antithetic.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung 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." This is to say, the objective of our studying dialectics is to expose and analyze the contradiction, to find out the way for solving the contradiction, to promote the transformation of one aspect of the contradiction to the opposite aspect, and to attain the goal of transforming the world.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen preaches a theory that runs counter to Mao Tse-tung's thought. He says: "The study of dialectics seeks to learn the ability of linking the two antithetic ideas together." He says: "It is necessary to remember at all times that the two profiles of a thing are inseparably connected." He says that it is necessary to find out "the demand in common" or "the point in common" to the two opposites, thus "seeking the identity and preserving the difference."

Since the antithesis of two kinds of world outlook and two kinds of methodology are involved, this polemic is not a contention in terms of terminology. Rather it is a contention involving the question of right and wrong on issues of major importance, a contention in pros and cons for Marxism-Leninism, a contention in pros and cons for Mao Tse-tung's thought. It is, in the final analysis, a contention between proletarian and bourgeois thought. The center of this polemic is whether or not the core of materialistic dialectics--the fact that the law of the unity of opposites is the basic law of things--should be acknowledged, and whether or not materialistic dialectics should be acknowledged as the world outlook and methodology of the proletariat.

Perhaps some comrades may say: No matter whether the question of world outlook or the question of methodology is involved, it is the business of the philosophers, and has not much to do with us who are engaged in practical work. This is wrong.

We all know that philosophy is a learning bearing on man's world outlook. What is called world outlook is the aggregate view and viewpoint of people on all things. It is the guiding thought for people in all cognitional activities and practice.

The correct world outlook--that is the world outlook of dialectical materialism--is capable of guiding us in correctly knowing the world and in formulating work lines, guidelines, policies, plans and measures that conform with objective reality. They can form on the basis of such correct knowledge for the effective transformation of the objective world. A mistaken world outlook cannot help us know correctly the world, and can only result in the failure of our work.

At the same time, any kind of world outlook reflects the interests and desires of a specific class. Different classes always interpret and transform the world according to their own world outlooks. Therefore, the question of world outlook also bears on the question of standpoint and viewpoint, and is a question of a basic nature.

Philosophy and politics are inseparable, and any philosophy is politically in the service of a specific class. The philosophical contention in "one divides into two" and "combine two into one" will surely find expression in the lines, guidelines and policies of the Party. The different stands taken by people toward the lines, guidelines and policies of the Party are also bound to find reflection in the philosophical thought.

Simultaneously with publicizing his "combine two into one" theory, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has put forward a basic question bearing on political principles. He asserts that the lines, guidelines and policies of socialist revolution and socialist construction are formulated according to the "combine two into one" viewpoint. He also wants other people to comprehend and execute such lines, guidelines and policies according to the "combine two into one" viewpoint. Are the lines, guidelines and policies of the Party formulated according to Chairman Mao's "one divides into two" viewpoint or Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" viewpoint? This is a question of principle. It can be seen from this that we cannot say that the philosophical polemic has no bearing on our practical work.

To give an example, we are presently conducting the socialist education campaign in the cities and the countryside. This is the outcome of the analysis of our present society with the "one divides into two" viewpoint.

According to this viewpoint, we must admit that right now there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggles in our society, and we must persist in the class struggle to the end before the victory of the socialist revolution and socialist construction can be guaranteed.

However, if we observe our society with the "combine two into one" viewpoint, we are bound to reject the existence of classes, class contradictions and class struggles and the necessity of the socialist education campaign. Even though we might acknowledge the existence of classes and class contradictions, we would not advocate the use of the method of exposing class contradictions and launching class struggles to solve the contradictions. Instead, we would advocate that the different classes "are inseparably linked together" and that "the identity must be sought and the difference preserved." This is also to say, we would advocate class reconciliation and oppose the class struggle.

Seen in the light of this example, how can it be said that this polemic has not much to do with practical work? Therefore, the broad masses of the cadres and people must pay attention to or participate in this polemic. Through this polemic, the idea of materialistic dialectics will surely overcome that which runs counter to it and the broad masses of the cadres and people will greatly heighten their understanding of Mao Tse-tung's thought and their cultivation in political theory.

## PART II

(Canton Nan-fang Jih-pao, January 12, 1965)

### Question:

Why is it said that the polemic on "one divides into two" and "combine two into one" is a reflection of the class struggle in the ideological sphere?

### Answer:

The "one divides into two" theory scientifically exposes the basic law governing the development of things. Comrade Mao Tse-tung made use of this theory to observe and analyze Chinese society, guide the people's democratic revolution in China, and score a great victory. Now he once again makes use of this theory to guide us in carrying out the socialist revolution and socialist construction and to lead us from one victory to another.

Over the past few years, acting in conformity with the situation of the class struggle in the international arena and in our country, our Party has intensified the publicity of "one divides into two" in the press. The revolutionary dialectics of "one divides into two" is better and better grasped by the broad masses of the cadres and people, and becomes a powerful ideological weapon for us to understand correctly the situation of the present class struggle at home and abroad. It is not a matter of coincidence that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen should play up his "combine two into one" theory to compete with the Party for an audience at this juncture. This is class struggle of the economic sphere reflected in the ideological sphere.

Philosophy is a kind of social ideology and has its clearcut class origin. In class struggle, the different classes inevitably proceed from their own class interests, put forward different kinds of views, and generalize such views in philosophy for serving their own classes politically. When there is the revolutionary philosophy of the proletariat--dialectical materialism and historical materialism--there is also the reactionary bourgeois philosophy--idealism and metaphysics. The struggle [between them] is inevitable.

Within the proletariat, some people with the bourgeois world outlook and some people influenced by it also use the reactionary philosophy of the bourgeoisie to oppose the revolutionary philosophy of the proletariat. This very well demonstrates the law: "The proletariat wants to transform the world with its own world outlook, and the bourgeoisie also wants to transform the world with its own world outlook." (Chairman Mao's saying)

Some comrades may also find it surprising that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen who "talks about Marxism-Leninism" day in and day out would also oppose Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. As a matter of fact, there is nothing strange in this connection, for this is in complete conformity with the law of class struggle. History tells us that whenever the class struggle grows acute in the political sphere or the economic sphere, the class struggle in the ideological sphere also inevitably grows acute. It is bound to be reflected within our Party and among the ranks of the Marxist theorists. The emergence of the Deborin school which opposed the revolutionary dialectics in the Soviet Union toward the end of the twenties in the 20th century was a good example. At that time, the Soviet Union was on the eve of a major change marked by the launching of a large-scale attack along the whole line of socialist revolution to exterminate the kulak class and to realize wholesale agricultural collectivization and socialist industrialization. The kulak class and the bourgeois forces put up a desperate resistance, thus making the class struggle in Soviet society very acute. There emerged within the CPSU the Bukharin-Trotsky anti-Party gang.

It was precisely at this critical juncture that the Deborin school emerged in the Soviet philosophical circle. Deborin distorted the law of the unity of opposites as the reconciliation, integration or synthesis of opposites. He excluded the struggle of opposites within things. Proceeding from this theory, he also disavowed the existence of class contradiction in Soviet society.

Thus, Deborin's anti-dialectical philosophy was useful as the ideological weapon to the Bukharin-Trotsky anti-Party gang. The Central Party of the CPSU headed by Stalin sharply criticized the philosophical viewpoint of the Deborin school. This struggle in the ideological sphere was precisely a reflection of the acute class struggle in Soviet society at that time.

The fact that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has given wide publicity to the "combine two into one" theory in recent years is precisely a reflection of the present acute class struggle at home and abroad. We know that in recent years, the imperialists, the reactionaries of the various countries and the modern revisionists have frantically sung in chorus against China. They have opposed the national liberation movement and the people's revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In conformity with the needs of imperialism, they have given wide publicity to "peaceful co-existence," "peaceful competition," "peaceful transition," "country of the whole people," "party of the whole people" and other modern revisionist theories. They have spread fallacies which call for elimination of the class struggle, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The people and Marxist-Leninists of various countries are waging a sharp struggle against the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the modern revisionists.

At home, the reactionary ruling classes who have been overthrown are not reconciled to their doom. They adopt the tactics of peaceful evolution to carry out counterrevolutionary activities for the restoration of their rule. In conjunction with the new bourgeois elements and the degenerated elements, they launch rabid attacks against socialism.

We have universally launched the socialist education campaign in the cities and the countryside, and are in the course of heightening the class consciousness of the broad masses, organizing the revolutionary working forces, and waging a sharp, tit-for-tat struggle against the capitalist and feudal forces hostile to socialism so as to thwart their attack against socialism. This struggle has developed to a new and intensified stage. All this will inevitably find some reflection on the theoretical front. And this is precisely the fact.

Faced with such a situation in the class struggle at home and abroad, the Party Central Committee and Chairman Mao stress the need of employing the "one divides into two" viewpoint and the Marxist-Leninist view on class struggle. This is to arm the cadres and the masses, to carry out the socialist education campaign in the cities and the countryside, and to repulse the attack of the bourgeoisie and the remnant feudal forces.

At this time, however, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen gives wide publicity to his "combine two into one" theory and competes with the Party for an audience. This is precisely what modern revisionism needs. He publicizes class peace and class cooperation for the modern revisionists, and publicizes the theory of reconciliation of contradictions. At the same time, this is also in conformity with the needs of bourgeoisie and the remnant feudal forces at home. He provides them with the so-called "theoretical" weapon to resist the socialist education campaign.

This is not the first time that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has opposed Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's thought has been antithetic to Mao Tse-tung's for quite a long time. He has consistently supported not socialism but capitalism. He consistently uses the bourgeois world outlook, but not the proletarian world outlook, to observe the problems of the Chinese revolution.

In December, 1939, and January, 1940, Comrade Mao Tse-tung published, respectively, "The Chinese Revolution and the Party's Tasks" and "On New Democracy." Proceeding from the history of the world and the history of China, he explained that the Chinese revolution was no longer the old democratic revolution led by the bourgeoisie, but a new democratic revolution led by the proletariat. He explained that the new democratic revolution was a preparatory stage for the socialist revolution, and that its future was socialism and not capitalism. He put forward the political, economic, and cultural program of the Party for the period of new democratic revolution.

However, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen published in August, 1941, the article, "More on the Question of the Social Nature of Anti-Japanese Bases Behind the Enemy Front." In it he openly put forward a complete set of political programs that called on the Chinese revolution to follow the capitalist road. This program was antagonistic to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory of a new democratic revolution and program. It opposed the development of the Chinese revolution from new democracy to socialism. He distorted the new democratic revolution as a thing that followed the capitalist road, and described the national economy of new democracy as "capitalism based on State monopoly" and a form of capitalist economy. He looked upon the establishment of a capitalist regime and the development of capitalist economy as "the basic tasks of the new democratic revolution."

It can be seen that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen was no longer a revolutionary of the proletariat, but a fellow traveler of the bourgeoisie more than 20 years ago. He was a bourgeois revolutionary wearing the badge of a Communist Party member.

When the Party Central Committee in 1953 promulgated China's general line for the transition period, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen again put forward the "composite foundation" theory which ran completely counter to the spirit of the general line. He held that the economic foundation of the transition period was a composite foundation comprising five kinds of economic ingredients. He called for the balanced development of the various economic ingredients. He also held that the superstructure of socialism should serve the other economic ingredients--including the capitalist economy--on an equal basis. He sought in effect to obliterate the struggle between socialism and capitalism for supremacy, and to oppose the Party's general line for the transition period.

In 1958, the Party Central Committee and Chairman Mao summed up the practical experience of the masses on the basis of the new situation. They put forward the three great red banners of the general line for building socialism, the great leap forward and the people's commune.

At that time, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen provoked the debate on the question of identity of thinking and existence. He fundamentally rejected the applicability of the law of the unity of opposites in the relationship of thinking and existence, and the dialectical identity of thinking and existence. He opposed, in essence, Chairman Mao's theory on the translation of matter into spirit and the translation of spirit into matter, and the theory of the subjective initiative of the masses. This also meant that he rejected the revolutionary effort of the masses. He poured cold water on mass movements, and was, in the final analysis, opposed to the three great red banners.

Today, he again uses the "combine two into one" theory to oppose the core of materialistic dialectics--the law of the unity of opposites. This is a continuation of his consistent opposition to Mao Tse-tung's thought. Now with greater headway made in the socialist revolution and with the class struggle growing more acute, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's opposition to Mao Tse-tung's thought and theory is expressed with greater baldness and is even more thoroughly exposed.

### PART III

(Canton Nan-fang Jih-pac, January 14, 1965)

#### Question:

What is the difference between the principles of "one divides into two" and "combine two into one?"

#### Answer:

Materialistic dialectics has three basic laws, namely, the law of the unity of opposites, the law of affirmation and negation, and the law of quantitative change and qualitative change. The law of the unity of opposites is the core of materialistic dialectics. "One divides into two" is a complete, scientific and popular way of expressing the law of the unity of opposites. It means to say that everything in the world (including nature, human society and human thinking) is "one divides into two."

The "combine two into one" theory concludes that the law of the unity of opposites means "the inseparable linking of the two aspects of a contradiction," and holds that the opposites are "inseparable." Hence, it holds that the law of the unity of opposites means "combining two into one;" that everything in the world is "combined from two into one," and that only when problems are observed is "the method of 'one divides into two' adopted."

The principles of the "one divides into two" theory and the "combine two into one" theory are different in the following respects:

(1) The law of the unity of opposites of materialistic dialectics that all things contain the two aspects of a contradiction; that contradiction is inherent in things. Chairman Mao says: "There is nothing that does not contain contradiction; without contradiction nothing would exist." The two aspects of the contradiction in a thing unite with and struggle against each other, thus impelling the development of things.

In regard to the law of the unity of opposites of things, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory holds that "the idea of the unity of opposites means only to say that the two profiles of a contradiction are inseparably linked together." It can be seen from here that the "combine two into one" theory acknowledges only the unity of opposites, but forsakes the struggle of opposites. And its so-called unity also refers only to unity without struggle. It is fundamentally not the unity of opposites as referred in materialistic dialectics. He has thus castrated the integral law of the unity of opposites.

(2) According to the generalization of Chairman Mao in "On Contradiction," the unity of opposites, that is the unity of contradictions, originally has two meanings: One means to say that the two aspects of a contradiction are interdependent and exist together in an entity. The other says that the two aspects of a contradiction transform into each other under given conditions. Chairman Mao says: "The matter does not end with dependence of the two aspects of the contradiction on each other; what is more important is the transformation of contradictory things into each other."

When Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory discusses the unity of opposites, it forsakes precisely this "more important" mutual transformation. It talks about only the interdependence of the two aspects of a contradiction and their co-existence in a single entity, but does not talk about the transformation of the two aspects of the contradiction into each other under given conditions. He has thus also castrated the most important half from the integral theory of the unity of opposites. He looks upon the unity of things as an iron plate that is free from any struggle and would never change.

(3) Materialistic dialectics holds that the co-existence of the two opposites of a contradiction in a single entity is transitory, relative and conditional, while the struggle of the two aspects of the contradiction is absolute, unconditional, and perpetual. Unity, association, reconciliation, equilibrium, etc., are but features manifested in the quantitative change of things. The features manifested in the qualitative change of things stand for the dissolution of entities and the destruction of the states of association, reconciliation and equilibrium.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory describes the tie between opposites as "the inseparable connection of the two aspects of a contradiction," and "unity" as "inseparability". He thus disavows that things are "divided from one into two." He disavows the qualitative change of things, acknowledging only the [different] states manifested by things in quantitative changes. He looks upon such states as solitary, unconditional and absolute.

(4) Materialistic dialectics holds that in the state of quantitative change, a thing gives superficial manifestation to the states of unity, association, reconciliation and equilibrium, but that actually the struggle of contradictions is still going on within the thing even though it is not apparent. At that time, although the entity has not dissolved, yet it is also not like an iron plate. There is a tendency for the various parts, factors and aspects to disassociate. Consequently, not only the qualitative change of things, but also the quantitative change of things is based on "one divides into two." Such a condition is not present in Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's so-called "combining two into one."

Summing up the above, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory widely publicizes that "everything is 'combined from two into one.'" It widely publicizes "the inseparable connection" of opposites and the "inseparability" of things. It widely publicizes that the task of studying the unity of opposites lies only in seeking "the common demand" and in seeking the identity and preserving the difference. Thus, according to his "combine two into one" theory, both the contradictions within things and the struggle of opposites within things have disappeared. One aspect of the contradiction is bound to overcome the other. The result of the struggle leads to splitting the old entity and the birth of a new entity, the replacement of old things by new things, and also the disappearance of the transformation of contradictions. He has thus fundamentally rejected the law of the unity of opposites and negated the materialistic dialectics of Marxism.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory is of course extremely wrong. If his mistaken viewpoint is used to observe things, grave mistakes will necessarily be made in practical work.

The "combine two into one" theory talks only about the unity of opposites, but forsakes the struggle of opposites. This kind of theory on reconciliation of contradictions inevitably leads to the theory of class reconciliation. All right opportunists, revisionists and reformists exclude the struggle of opposites in places where the unity and struggle of contradictions exist. They emphasize reconciliation, combination and merger of opposites.

When Lenin criticized the revisionists of the Second International, he had this to point out: The petty-bourgeoisie and the democratic factions basically abhor the class struggle and strive to ease, reconcile and blunt it. Lenin said: "Therefore, these democratic factions either fundamentally refuse to acknowledge the whole historical stage of transition from capitalism to communism, or think that their own task is to find ways to reconcile the struggle of these two forces, but not to lead one of these forces to carry out the struggle." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. XXX, page 88) This is what the "combine two into one" theory is like.

The "combine two into one" theory only acknowledges the mutual connection of opposites. But it rejects the fact that the unity of opposites is transitory, relative and conditional and that the opposites will transform into each other under given conditions. The observation and analysis of things according to this viewpoint inevitably reject qualitative change in things. In the political field, this inevitably leads to rejection of the revolutionary, qualitative leap and negation of the revolution. It leads to the defense of the old system and old things.

As he sees it, such old things and old systems as capitalist exploitation, capitalist competition, and individualism in the capitalist society will last forever and never change.

This runs counter to dialectics. As the materialistic dialectics of Marxism views it, the new superseding the old is a universal law which is forever irresistible in the universe. Chairman Mao says: "The transformation of one thing into another, through leaps of different forms in accordance with its essence and external conditions--this is the process of the new superseding the old. In each thing there is contradiction between its new and its old aspects. This gives rise to a series of struggles with many twists and turns. As a result of these struggles, the new aspect changes from being minor to being major and rises to predominance, while the old aspect changes from being major to being minor and gradually dies out." ("On Contradiction")

\* \* \*

#### PART IV

(Canton Nan-fang Jih-pao, January 15, 1965)

#### Question:

Why is the basic law of objective things "one divides into" and not "combine two into one?"

#### Answer:

Everything in the world is "one divides into two." Chairman Mao says: "The law of the unity of opposites is the basic law of the universe. This law universally exists in nature, in human society and in human thought."

First, let us look at the phenomena of nature. All things in nature are "one divided into two." For example, there are action and reaction in mechanics, positive and negative electricity in physics, combination and dissociation in chemistry, and so on and so forth.

The two aspects of these contradictions are inherent in things themselves. The two aspects of a contradiction are linked with each other, dependent on each other, antithetic to each other, and also struggle against each other. This is to say, the two aspects of the contradiction unite with and struggle against each other, hence impelling the development of things. Without contradictions, nothing would exist, including the development and transformation of things.

Taking water for illustration, it is also "one divided into two." It is not formed by mixing hydrogen with oxygen as the "combine two into one" theorist claims. Water is formed through the dynamic process of explosion. The process of combining hydrogen and oxygen into water is one in which the two elements of hydrogen and oxygen, through the struggle of opposites, are more quickly combined to form water under a high temperature. Even after combining hydrogen and oxygen into water, the interior of the substance is still full of contradiction.

Next, let us look at human society. The several-thousand-year-old history of civilization is one of class struggle. Chairman Mao says: "In class struggle, some classes triumph, and some classes are destroyed. This is history--the several-thousand-year-old history of civilization." In a class society of whatever shape, there exist two major opponent classes and class struggle--for example the slaveowners and slaves in a slave society, the landlord class and peasants in feudal society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the capitalist society.

As a result of class struggle, one kind of society is transformed into another. Speaking of the old China under the rule of the Kuomintang, it was also "one divided into two." It contained the two major counterrevolutionary and revolutionary class forces which were opposed to each other--imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat-capitalism represented by the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique, and the masses of the people led by the proletariat. Because the Party and Chairman Mao led the broad masses of the people to carry out a protracted and arduous struggle, overthrew the reactionary rule of the Kuomintang and established a regime based upon the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transformation of the semi-feudal, semi-colonial old China into the socialist new China was realized.

Even in the socialist society, society continues to be 'one divides into two.' Throughout the socialist period, there is at all times the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and between the capitalist and socialist roads. This struggle must be carried through to the end before the socialist society can be built and gradual transition to the communist society can be accomplished.

Next again, let us look at the thinking of man. The thinking of man is also "one divides into two." When reflected in the subjective view of people, the contradictions of the objective world give shape to contradictions in thought, and impel the development of thought. Every correct idea owes its development to overcoming the mistaken idea in the struggle against the mistaken idea. The struggle between the correct idea and the mistaken idea is ever going on in the minds of people. When a problem of ideological recognition is resolved, a new problem appears. Another struggle is called for to resolve the problem, and the cycle is repeated. Whenever a problem is resolved, the ideological recognition of the people moves up another rung.

This applies to the individual as well as to the historical development of the Party. "Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end." ("On Contradiction") The development of our Party is made possible just because it continuously triumphs and overcomes various kinds of mistaken ideas.

It can be seen that everything in the world is "one divides into two." Only the use of the "one divides into two" viewpoint can reveal the true identity of a thing.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says that "everything is 'combined from two into one'" and that "things inseparably link together the two aspects of a contradiction." He talks only about unity, connection and "inseparability," but makes no mention of contradiction, of the struggle of opposites, and of transformation. Moreover, he describes unity as an iron plate free from any struggle, and connection as the reconciliation, fusion and co-existence of opposites.

These viewpoints completely distort the nature of things. If the socialist society were viewed with Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's viewpoints, then the bourgeoisie and the proletariat would be "combined from two into one." There would be fundamentally no class struggle to speak of and the enforcement of proletarian dictatorship would prove to be superfluous.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen also tries to make things vague by saying: "Everything is 'combined from two into one.' Therefore when problems are observed...it is also necessary to adopt the 'one divides into two' method." This means to say that things are "combined from two into one, and there is neither contradiction nor struggle of opposites. 'One divides into two,' contradiction and the struggle of opposites arise only at the time of observing problems."

This view also does not hold water. Marxism holds that world outlook and methodology are unified, and hence we hold that things are "divided from one into two", and it is also "one divides into two" when things are observed. Since Yang Hsien-chen holds that things are "combined from two into one," how can there be "one divides into two" at the time of observing things? This argument of his means nothing more than to say that the struggle of opposites is not inherent in things, but is artificial. What else can this be if it is not a distortion of the nature of objective things?

Question:

Yang Hsien-chen says that the object of studying dialectics "is to learn the ability to link together two opposite ideas." Why is it said that this is incorrect?

Answer:

What is the object of studying dialectics? Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "Dialectics is a type of theory that studies how there can be identity in opposites. Since this identity is a thing in common, how is the thing in common to be found in opposites." He also says: "Dialectics is a type of theory that studies how there can be identity in opposites. This is what we call seeking the identity and preserving the difference, or the search of a point in common from the opposites." He emphasizes again and again that the object of studying dialectics "is to learn the ability to link together opposite ideas." These statements fundamentally run counter to what Chairman Mao has taught us.

In "On Contradiction" Chairman Mao has this to say: "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." He also says: "The task of a communist is to expose the mistaken ideas of the reactionaries and metaphysics, publicize the original dialectics of things, promote the transformation of things, and attain the goal of revolution."

This means to say that our object of studying dialectics is to learn to make use of the "one divides into two" viewpoint and method to analyze contradictions to understand the various profiles of contradictions and their mutual relationship and--according to the law of "one divides into two"--to push forward the struggle of the two aspects of a contradiction, to promote the transformation of opposites in a direction favorable to the revolutionary cause, and to attain the goal of revolution.

In the socialist society, our task is to use revolutionary dialectics to expose inherent contradictions in capitalism. Our task is to mobilize and inspire the masses with Marxist-Leninist theories of class struggle and social revolution so as to overthrow the reactionary rule of the bourgeoisie and establish the socialist institution.

In the socialist society there are also classes, class contradictions and class struggles. We study revolutionary dialectics in order to draw a clear line of demarcation between classes, to expose class contradictions, to grasp the law of class struggle under the new situation, and to carry through the class struggle and the socialist revolution to the end.

However, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen holds that the object of studying dialectics "is to learn the ability to link together two opposite ideas." He holds that "it is always necessary to remember that the two profiles of a thing are inseparably connected," and that it is necessary to look for "the common demand" of the two opposites and "to seek the identity and to preserve the difference."

As Comrade Yang Hsien-chen sees it: The unity of opposites is a point in common to the two opposites. It is necessary to look for points in common to the two opposites. It is necessary to let the two opposites give up struggle "to seek identity" and "preserve" the things which are different. Thus, the absolute struggle of the two opposites and the need for the two opposites to depend on and to transform themselves into each other under given conditions disappear. The two opposites are reconciled. The new and the old aspects, and the revolutionary and reactionary aspects are "combined from two into one." There is neither struggle nor transformation.

We can therefore clearly see from this that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory and his object in studying dialectics are attempts to castrate the militant character of the revolutionary dialectics. They attempt to lure people into forsaking the struggle and reconciling contradictions and distort the revolutionary dialectics as a charm for safeguarding the old system. He calls on us to learn the ability to link together opposite things, that is, the ability to reconcile and merge contradictions--the ability to implement class reconciliation when dealing with social problems, and the ability to give up the struggle for principles to make way for harmony in ideological work.

This is of course fundamentally wrong. Let us ask: Is there after all any "demand in common" or "point in common" between the oppressed nations and imperialism, the workers and the capitalists, the peasants and the landlords, Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism--the social forces which can never exist together? And how can they "be linked together?" If in accordance with Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory we arbitrarily look for "the demand in common" to them, "seek the identity and preserve the difference," and arbitrarily "link them together," then these two hostile forces must preserve their differences, "co-exist peacefully," and give up their struggle--thus allowing the reactionary classes to exist forever and the revolutionary people to be enslaved forever.

Chairman Mao has this to point out: "It is only the reactionary ruling classes of the past and present and the metaphysicians in their service who regard opposites not as living, conditional, mobile and transforming themselves into one another, but as dead and rigid, and they propagate this fallacy everywhere to delude the masses of the people, thus seeking to perpetuate their rule." ("On Contradiction") Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory serves the reactionary classes precisely in this way.

\* \* \*

#### PART V

(Canton Nan-fang Jih-pao, January 18, 1965)

#### Question:

The advocates of the "combine two into one" theory say that the theoretical foundation of the lines, guidelines and policies of the Party is "combine two into one" and not "one divides into two." Where is the mistake?

#### Answer:

With what world outlook and theoretical principles should the lines, guidelines and policies of the Party be formulated? This involves the basic question of political principle. On the question of basic principle, the Marxist-Leninists and the advocates of the "combine two into one" theory are basically opposed to each other.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen and his followers hold that "combine two into one" constitutes the theoretical foundation of the lines, guidelines and policies of our Party. They say that after "using the method of 'one divides into two' to analyze things and learning that 'combine two into one' is the law governing the development of things," then "when lines, guidelines, policies and measures are formulated, the two opposites must be linked together and combined." "When they are implemented," they say, "it is also necessary to link together the opposites by 'combining two into one' in accordance with the dialectical method."

The Marxist-Leninists hold that everything is "one divides into two." Consequently, 'one divides into two' constitutes the theoretical foundation of the lines, guidelines and policies formulated by our Party.

In the document "Resolutions on Some Questions in the History of Our Party," our Party Central Committee has this to point out: "The correctness or error in a political, military or organizational line fundamentally depends on whether it starts ideologically from the Marxist-Leninist theory of dialectical materialism and historical materialism and from the objective realities of the Chinese revolution and the objective needs of the Chinese people." (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. III)

It goes without saying that only the Party's lines, guidelines and policies which start from the Marxist-Leninist theory of dialectical materialism and historical materialism--formulated in accordance with the scientific viewpoint of "one divides into two"--are in conformity with objective realities and the objective needs of the people. Only they can guide the revolutionary struggle to victory.

Therefore, dialectical materialism and historical materialism are revolutionary sciences. The application of the "one divides into two" viewpoint and method can correctly analyze the contradictions among the various classes at various revolutionary stages. Only the correct lines, guidelines and policies formulated on this foundation can guide us to carry out the class struggle, promote the transformation of contradictions, win victories in the revolution, and push society forward.

The "combine two into one" theory is a theory of reconciliation of contradictions because it talks only about the unity of opposites but not the struggle of opposites. It acknowledges only the connection of opposites, but rejects the transformation of opposites under given conditions. Therefore, the application of this viewpoint in revolutionary practice necessarily rejects the class struggle, leads to the reconciliation and merger of classes, upholds the old systems and things, and rejects the revolutionary leap. Lines, guidelines and policies formulated according to this viewpoint are necessarily the things of right opportunism and reformism, and can only result in the failure of the revolution.

Let us see how Comrade Yang Hsien-chen applies the "combine two into one" theory in the matter of lines, guidelines and policies.

First, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "We hold that in a capitalist country, there is identity between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and there is something which links them together...The capitalists own means of production, but have no labor power. While the workers have labor power, but no means of production. Therefore, means of production link the bourgeoisie and the proletariat together."

Obviously, as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen sees it, the identity of these two contradictory classes--the proletariat and the bourgeoisie--in the capitalist country does not represent the interdependence and mutual conditioning of the two aspects of a contradiction under given conditions, but is "a thing"--means of production--between the two classes. In this connection, there is not the slightest smell of dialectics.

According to this viewpoint of Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's, the capitalists have means of production but no labor power. In order to carry out exploitation and make money, they have to hire workers. On the other hand, the workers have labor power but not means of production. In order to feed themselves, they have to sell their labor power to and be exploited by the capitalists. Hence there is identity, and, as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen puts it, "a feature or demand in common" to the two contradictory classes. Thus, on the basis of this "common feature" or "common demand," the

relationship of the exploiter and the exploited between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is entirely covered up. What is left is harmony of the labor and capital interests. The cooperation of labor and capital can be enforced.

As to the point of difference in that the bourgeoisie is the exploiter and the proletariat the exploited, it can be "preserved" in accordance with Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory of "seeking the identity and preserving the difference." The struggle of contradictions is thus rejected, and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the rule and exploitation of the bourgeoisie is abolished. Similarly, according to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's viewpoint, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are tied together and "inseparably linked up" by such "a thing" as means of production. There is no need for the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie, and such an entity of opposites as the capitalist society will never crack up and transform itself into socialism.

If this is the case what else can it be if not the abolition of the proletarian revolution? What then are the lines, guidelines and policies formulated according to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory if not those of right opportunism or reformism? And what else are they if not the lines, guidelines and policies of "class reconciliation" and cooperation of labor and capital? Consequently, it is even more apparent that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory meets entirely the taste of the bourgeoisie, and serves to consolidate the capitalist system for the bourgeoisie.

It is true we must maintain the united front with the national bourgeoisie. However, the united front policy of our Party is based upon the "one divides into two" theory, and it does not hold that the identity of opposites, within it, means "search for identity and preservation of difference" as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen claims. This is a serious distortion of the united front policy of our Party.

We hold that the united front is an entity of opposites, in which two opposites--the proletariat and the bourgeoisie--are united with and struggle against each other. The struggle is absolute, and the unity is relative. Therefore, the united front policy of our Party calls for both unity and struggle, and achieves unity through struggle. Within the united front, the struggle for leadership and the masses is going on in full blast. This kind of struggle is absolute and beyond reconciliation. There is no, nor can there be, "search for identity and preservation of difference."

In some places, we also seek the identity and preserve the difference in our united front work, but we cannot say because of this that our united front policy means search for identity and preservation of difference. This is because: First, solidarity against imperialism and feudalism is a prerequisite to our search for identity and preservation of difference. Second, we must uphold the political, ideological and organizational independence of the Party in our united front work. Third, we persist in combining the struggle for leadership with the struggle for the masses. Fourth, search for identity and preservation of difference is itself also a struggle.

"Search for identity" calls for struggle, because in order to set the bourgeoisie against imperialism and feudalism, it is necessary to fight against its compromising and wavering character, and not merely to seek "the common features." "Preservation of difference" also calls for struggle on the ground that the bourgeoisie always devises all ways and means to disassociate us and to oppose the "preservation of difference" by the political party of the proletariat.

On the hypothesis that the united front policy is summed up as "search for identity and preservation of difference," as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says, then our policy toward the bourgeoisie can only be based on combination, but not on struggle. This is the united front policy of right opportunism. History has come to the conclusion that it is wrong to the extreme. There is no need to say anything more in this connection.

relationship of the exploiter and the exploited between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is entirely covered up. What is left is harmony of the labor and capital interests. The cooperation of labor and capital can be enforced.

As to the point of difference in that the bourgeoisie is the exploiter and the proletariat the exploited, it can be "preserved" in accordance with Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory of "seeking the identity and preserving the difference." The struggle of contradictions is thus rejected, and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the rule and exploitation of the bourgeoisie is abolished. Similarly, according to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's viewpoint, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are tied together and "inseparably linked up" by such "a thing" as means of production. There is no need for the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie, and such an entity of opposites as the capitalist society will never crack up and transform itself into socialism.

If this is the case what else can it be if not the abolition of the proletarian revolution? What then are the lines, guidelines and policies formulated according to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory if not those of right opportunism or reformism? And what else are they if not the lines, guidelines and policies of "class reconciliation" and cooperation of labor and capital? Consequently, it is even more apparent that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory meets entirely the taste of the bourgeoisie, and serves to consolidate the capitalist system for the bourgeoisie.

It is true we must maintain the united front with the national bourgeoisie. However, the united front policy of our Party is based upon the "one divides into two" theory, and it does not hold that the identity of opposites, within it, means "search for identity and preservation of difference" as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen claims. This is a serious distortion of the united front policy of our Party.

We hold that the united front is an entity of opposites, in which two opposites--the proletariat and the bourgeoisie--are united with and struggle against each other. The struggle is absolute, and the unity is relative. Therefore, the united front policy of our Party calls for both unity and struggle, and achieves unity through struggle. Within the united front, the struggle for leadership and the masses is going on in full blast. This kind of struggle is absolute and beyond reconciliation. There is no, nor can there be, "search for identity and preservation of difference."

In some places, we also seek the identity and preserve the difference in our united front work, but we cannot say because of this that our united front policy means search for identity and preservation of difference. This is because: First, solidarity against imperialism and feudalism is a prerequisite to our search for identity and preservation of difference. Second, we must uphold the political, ideological and organizational independence of the Party in our united front work. Third, we persist in combining the struggle for leadership with the struggle for the masses. Fourth, search for identity and preservation of difference is itself also a struggle.

"Search for identity" calls for struggle, because in order to set the bourgeoisie against imperialism and feudalism, it is necessary to fight against its compromising and wavering character, and not merely to seek "the common features." "Preservation of difference" also calls for struggle on the ground that the bourgeoisie always devises all ways and means to disassociate us and to oppose the "preservation of difference" by the political party of the proletariat.

On the hypothesis that the united front policy is summed up as "search for identity and preservation of difference," as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says, then our policy toward the bourgeoisie can only be based on combination, but not on struggle. This is the united front policy of right opportunism. History has come to the conclusion that it is wrong to the extreme. There is no need to say anything more in this connection.

Second, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "What is diplomacy? It seeks to find a point in common between two countries." He says, "Our foreign policy is to seek the identity and to preserve the difference." In this connection, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen once again distorts the foreign policy of the Party with his "combine two into one" theory.

Let us ask: Is there any point in common between the socialist countries and the imperialist countries? How can the socialist countries "seek identity and preserve difference" with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys? If our foreign policy is summed up as a "search for identity and preservation of difference," as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says, then it means to say that in diplomacy, all policies are based upon a "search for identity and preservation of difference"--which is everything. The "common features" are sought, and the "differences" are "preserved." Then there is no struggle to speak of in diplomacy. In our foreign policy, there is no longer any need to persist in "opposing the imperialist policies of war and aggression," and in "supporting the revolutionary struggle of all oppressed peoples and nations."

Let us ask: What difference is there between this theory of Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's and the modern revisionists' description of "peaceful co-existence" as the general line of the foreign policy of socialist countries?

It is true that in our diplomatic work, under given conditions, it is possible "to seek identity and preserve difference" in respect to specific issues. However, this is fundamentally quite different from Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's viewpoint. We cannot, because of this, sum up our foreign policy as a "search for identity and preservation of difference." We socialist countries "seek identity and preserve difference" with the nationalist countries in order to form a united front against imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism.

Moreover, in order "to seek identity and preserve difference," it is also necessary to wage an inner struggle.

This is to say, our "search for identity and preservation of difference" is a prerequisite to the struggle against imperialism and to drawing a line of distinction between the enemy and ourselves. It has its conditions and a struggle to wage. The object of such "search for identity and preservation of difference" is to unite against the enemy.

If this problem were dealt with according to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's viewpoint, the boundary between the enemy and ourselves would be obliterated. There would be neither conditions nor struggles. Again, among socialist countries, on the foundation of Marxist-Leninism, some "differences" of the fraternal countries may also be "preserved." But this must be implemented by means of struggle and consultation.

However, the "differences" of modern revisionism contravene the "differences" of Marxism-Leninism. The contention is over right and wrong on issues of major importance. There is fundamentally no "identity" which can be sought. This kind of "difference" can never be "preserved." It must be overcome by means of struggle.

Third, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "(Apart from identity in difference,) there is also difference in identity. Now both socialist countries and imperialism look for contradiction here. Are there different things? Yugoslavia also believes in socialism, and calls itself a socialist country. Modern revisionism also flies the Marxist banner. What kind of a thing is it that Marxism talks about? Differences can be found here. This is what Hegel called identity in difference and difference in identity."

Look, how mystical he sounds. But in the core, this is nothing more than asking us Marxist-Leninists to adopt the policy of "finding the common features," and to "search for identity and preservation of difference" toward revisionism.

We all know that the contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is an antagonistic one.

One is firmly revolutionary, the other counterrevolutionary.

One persists in fighting against U.S. imperialism, the other capitulates to imperialism.

One is a proletarian revolutionary, the other a renegade to the proletarian revolution.

There is no "common feature" for the two.

On what basis does Comrade Yang Hsien-chen say that the two represent "difference identity;" and, ergo, it is possible "to seek the identity and preserve the difference?" To be honest, if we do things according to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory and accept his policy, we are bound to confuse the line of demarcation between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. We are bound to abolish the struggle against modern revisionism and allow bourgeois way of thinking corrode the revolutionary will of the working class, revisionism to wreck the international communist movement, and capitalism to stage a comeback in the socialist country--thus forsaking the revolutionary fruit already won.

Fourth, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "This is also the same at home (referring to search for 'common features' and 'preservation of differences'). We say that it is necessary to unite with more than 95 per cent of the people. Among the basic-level cadres, it is also necessary to unite with more than 95 per cent of them. It is necessary to find their common features and study how can there be identity in opposites. Dialectics studies this question."

In this connection, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen again uses his "combine two into one" theory to distort the socialist education movement which our Party is presently carrying out in the cities and the countryside.

It is true that among the laboring people, there is of course a common feature. This is the struggle for the building of a socialist society. We pay very great attention to this, because it is the foundation on which contradictions among the people are stipulated.

However, the object of the socialist education movement is to solve further the contradiction between socialism and capitalism and attain a new solidarity on the new foundation. Therefore, the socialist education movement seeks not to look for "common features" but to expose contradictions. It seeks not to "find out the identity and preserve the difference," but to overcome the "difference"--in other words, the use of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought to overcome the capitalist thought, the vestiges of feudal thought, and the revisionist thought.

In this connection, there are contradictions between the enemy and ourselves as well as the contradictions among the people. The handling of contradictions between the enemy and ourselves cannot be based upon a "search for identity and preservation of difference." This is known to everybody. Even the resolution of the large number of contradictions among the people can only be based upon the formula of "unity-criticism-unity" as taught by Chairman Mao--the process of proceeding from the desire for unity to attain a new unity on a new foundation through making criticism or waging the necessary struggle. In this process, it is necessary to expose thoroughly the contradictions, and through making criticism, waging the necessary struggles, to correctly solve the contradictions.

According to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's interpretation, the socialist education movement only looks for "common features," "seeks the identity and preserves the difference, but does not call for criticism and struggle. It seeks only to cover up and reconcile contradictions, but not to expose and resolve contradictions.

This entirely runs counter to the formula taught by Chairman Mao. It calls for unity--looking for common features and preserving differences--unity. [sic]

When things are done according to this "formula" of Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's, it is necessary "to preserve" the contradiction between the bourgeois and proletarian thoughts and the contradiction between the capitalist and socialist roads. Let us ask: How can we unite more than 95 per cent of the masses on a new foundation, unite more than 95 per cent of the basic-level cadres against the class enemy, and resolve the contradiction between the enemy and ourselves in this way?

It can be seen from this that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's application of his "combine two into one" theory in the revolutionary struggle and practical work is right opportunism which calls for the abolition of the revolutionary struggle and the reconciliation of the class struggle.

The object of his saying that "combine two into one" is the theoretical foundation of the Party's lines, guidelines and policies is to distort them with right opportunism, and call on us to lay down our arms in the international and domestic class struggle.

This is precisely what the Hung-ch'i correspondent has pointed out: "Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's propagation of the 'combine two into one' theory at such a time is precisely and deliberately designed to meet the needs of modern revisionism; to aid the modern revisionists in their propagation of class peace and class cooperation, and also the theory of reconciliation of contradictions. It is at the same time deliberately designed to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie and the remnant feudal forces at home by providing them with so-called theoretical weapons for resisting the socialist education movement."

\* \* \*

END