JPRS: 3929

CSO: 3502-D/25

TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNG-CH'I (RED FLAG) (Peiping, No. 15, 1 August 1960)

This report is a full translation of all articles in the above publication.

Table	of Contents	Page
I.	Intensify the Socialist-Communist Education Campaign in the Rural Areas	1
II.	Further Develop the "Two-Participation, One- Innovation and Three-Union" System and Raise the Managerial Standard in All Enterprises	10
III.	Fully Utilize the Wild Fibers	30
IV.	Expedite the Reform of Agricultural Techniques, Intensify the Farm Tool Innovation Novement	41
٧.	Mass Line in Educational Work	52
VI.	On the Unity of Opposites	62

Pages 33-41 Kuang Feng

Unity-Conflict Is Fundamentally the Law of Unity of Opposites.

According to Marxist dialectics, the conflict between opposites is unconditional and absolute; and the unity of opposites, conditional and relative. The conflicting nature and unifying nature of the 2 contradictory aspects, i.e., which are at once unified and conflicting, constitute the nucleus of materialistic dialectics—the fundamental essence of the law of unity of opposites. We say that the law of unity of opposites is a general law that applies to all fields; of course, it applies to the conflicting nature and unifying nature of opposites, the two inseparable aspects.

All things are unified bodies made of contradictory opposites, which are at once conflicting and unified. We must grasp unity in conflict and grasp conflict in unity. If one is to dismiss either aspect, he would necessarily metaphysically misinterpret the other. If he is to dismiss the conflicting nature of opposites, the unifying nature as he understands it would necessarily be without contradictions or opposites, a dead unity. If he is to dismiss the unifying natura of opposites, the conflicting nature as he understands it would necessarily mean that as a result of the conflict neither can turn in the direction opposite to its own, thereby denying the qualitative change in the development of things or events. In other words, if the conflicting nature and the unifying nature of the opposites are to be separated, then such conflicting nature and unifying nature could not be the conflicting nature and unifying nature in dialectics. It is very apparent that to deny either the conflicting nature of opposites or the unifying nature of opposites is the substitution of metaphysics for dialectics.

Some comrades do admit the general nature of the law of unity of opposites but they deny that this or that kind of opposites is unifying in nature, i.e., denying the general nature of the unifying nature of opposites. For instance, in the discussion of the question concerning the relationship between thinking and being, they deny that the "unifying nature of contradictions" is applicable to the relationship between thinking and being. Besides, there are comrades who deny that such opposites as war and peace, the proletariat and the bourgeoisis, and life and death, are unifying in nature. When these comrades reach the conclusion denying the unifying nature of this or that set of opposites, they do not consider such a conclusion of theirs self-contradictory to their admission of the general nature of the law of unity of opposites. Why cannot they realize the self-contradiction here? For in their opinion, the conflicting nature of opposites is general in nature and is the

fundamental essence of the law of unity of opposites, whereas the unifying nature of opposites is not general in nature nor the fundamental essence of the law of unity of opposites. Such a viewpoint is not correct. In effect, such a viewpoint is to separate the conflicting nature and the unifying nature of opposites.

ter dans after all clifford was a tighter between the

What Is the Unifying Nature of Contradictions

According to Comrade Mao Tse-tung: The unifying nature of contradiction "refers to the following two cases: First, both side a of every contradiction in the development of things and events regard the other as the premise for its own existence and both exist in a unified body; second, both sides of the contradiction, in accordance with certain conditions, move toward its opposite direction. These are what is the so-called unifying nature." See Note 17 "And the conflicting nature lies in the unifying nature." See Note 27 There is no unifying nature that does not contain the conflicting nature; similarly, there is neither the conflicting nature that is isolated from the unifying nature. For instance, there is no unifying nature between war and stone. They cannot depend on each other for existence under certain conditions; nor can they under certain conditions turn toward each other. Accordingly, there is not much conflicting nature between them. In other words, war and stone could not constitute a contradiction. (Note 1: "On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung: The People's Publishing Co., 1952. Vol. II, p. 793. Note 2: Ibid., p. 800.)

. Those comrades who deny there is the unifying nature in this or that set of opposites apparently have misinterpreted the sphere of unifying nature in the dialectics, as stated above, mistaking the scope of unifying nature in the dialectics for the unifying nature in metaphysics. For instance, those comrades who deny the unifying nature of thinking and being are first to misinterpret the unifying nature of thinking and being as the equivalent sameness in metaphysics, i.e., the sameness without difference or the unity that does not contain opposites, and then object to the same. Their arguments are correct in terms of the theory of equivalent sameness in metaphysics but are completely incorrect as arguments against the contradictor; unity between thinking and being. They say: "thinking and being are after all different." Yes, thinking and being are different: but it is exactly because they are different that they can constitute a contradiction, the unifying nature and conflicting nature of contradiction; if they were in no way different and they were equivalent-same, then there would not be a contradiction between them and accordingly there would not be the so-called unifying nature and conflicting nature of the contradiction. The unifying nature, as a term in dialectics, implies that the 2 sides are different from and opposite to each other. How could the statement that "thinking

and being are after all different" be cited as the argument denying the unifying nature between thinking and being? It only reveals that they have adopted the metaphysical interpretation of the sphere of unifying nature in dialectics.

Those comrades who deny that there is a unifying nature in such sets of opposites as war and peace, proletariat and bourgeoisie and life and death, also misinterpret the unifying nature in dialectics as the unity in metaphysics. They say that the principles of the unifying nature of Marxist dialectics could not be applicable to these phenomena, for they are "fundamentally opposite and against each other." Such an argument also betrays their metaphysical viewpoint. According to their "fundamentally opposite and conflicting phenomenon," it would not be possible to have such a viewpoint as the unifying nature nor could the two sides of any contradiction be described as in any way unifying in nature, for both sides of any contradiction are always conflicting with each other." ("Conflicting with each other," as a sphere in philosophy, pertains to the conflicting nature of both sides of the contradiction; this problem is to be discussed more in detail later.) In this way, where are they going to find the unifying nature? In this way, is it not true that they have completely dismissed the unifying nature in dialectics?

The Unifying Nature of the So-called "Fundamentally Opposite Phenomenon.

Lenin said: "dialectics is a theory, which studies how the opposites can be unified, how they become unified -- under what conditions they are unified, or how they turn toward each other --why the human brain should not regard these opposites as dead, frozen things, but should regard them as live, conditional, active and moving toward each other." See Note 17 He further said: "All boundaries in the world of Nature and in society are conditional and changeable and there is no phenomenon that could not, under certain conditions, turn into the very opposite." See Note 27 In discussing the dialectics of thinking, Lenin also said: "The mutual dependence of concepts, the mutual dependence of all concepts without exception." |See Note 37 Please note: what Lemin said was that both sides of all contradictions without exception are unifying in nature. Of course, the so-called "fundamentally opposite phenomena" and the scientific concepts that correctly reflect these phenomena may not be exceptions. Here, the question is not whether there is the unifying nature but how unity is achieved. (Note 1: Lenin: Notes on Philosophy. The People's Publishing Co., 1956. p. 86. Note 2: "On Yu-ne-ssu-wa's Little Book," Collected Works of Lenin. The People's Publishing Co., 1958. Vol. XXII, p. 302. Note 3: Lenin: Notes on Philosophy. p. 182.)

achieve by teams of an affait or Of course, no we can include a support of contain to a support of contain to

As regards the unifying nature of the so-called "fundamentally opposite phenomena," "how they can be unified," and "how they are unified," we should study them in the light of dialectics and on the basis of reality and should not look at them at a distance and immediately negate them when they appear too difficult to understand.

the state of Mar

nere are the seeds war in the seeds

As regards the unifying nature of thinking and being, it has already been widely discussed and it is not to be further repeated here. Let us discuss briefly the unifying nature of war and peace, of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and of life and death, etc.

Intel War is a product of class society, the continuation of political and the continuation of class policy. In other words, war is a special form of class struggle (This is a form - the sharpest form in which force is demonstrated.) The seed of modern wars is the capitalist imperialist system. What stands opposite to war is peace, which is another form of class struggle. At a certain stage, imperialism would employ the means of "peaceful" struggle to deceive. oppress and exploit the people; the proletariat and the people of various countries, on the other hand, would expose the "peaceful" deceit of imperialism, prevent imperialism from launching wars and strive for genuine peace, democracy and the triumph of socialism. As for the so-called "social peace," which advocates "class cooperation," it is empty words of deceit coined by the modern bourgeoisie and revisionists and in fact there is no "social peace," nor can it be achieved. Both war and peace are forms - different forms of class struggle and accordingly they share the unifying nature. In the class society, war and peace, as two fundamentally opposite phenomena or concepts, are mutually dependent. Is it not true that when the imperialist system and the capitalist system are abolished; when class distinction is really obliterated and when lasting world peace really emerges, there will be no more "wars"? Yes; however, this does not prove that in the class society, war and peace are not mutually dependent but on the contrary that they are The future "lasting peace" under discussion does not mean the concer. of "peace" as a form of class struggle in the class society. When the imperialist system and the capitalist system are abolished, when class distinction is really obliterated, and when lasting peace thus really emerges, the contradiction between war and peace as is under our present discussion would have passed away.

In the history of class society, war and peace are both the special forms of class struggle and under certain conditions they may also move in the direction opposite to their own. When peacoful struggle between the revolutionary class and the reactionary class and between two hostile political camps reaches a feverish degree, then uneer certain conditions they may adopt the form of armed struggle, to achieve by means of war the policy objectives that could not be achieved by means of peaceful struggle. Of course, no war is to go on indefinitely; invariably one party is to emerge victorious and another vanquished or pending the emergence of certain balance of

power the state of war is to turn into a state of peace. Inasmuch as there are the seeds of war in the class society, the state of peace may under certain conditions again turn into war and lasting peace is thus ever beyond reach. In the history of class society. peace and war have always been moving in a continuous cycle. Examples are too numerous to list. For instance, the First World War turned into post-war peace; this post-war peace in turn turned into the Second World War: and the Second World War again turned into postwar peace. As the Moscow Declaration pointed out, "Now, the forcer of peace have grown considerably and the prevention of war is already a practical possibility." The same declaration, however, further pointed out: "As long as imperialism remains, there is ground for the outbreak of aggressive wars." In other words, as long as imperialism remains, peace may under certain conditions turn into war, It is in the face of this possibility that the socialist camp headed by the USSR, the international proletariat and the people's of the world must wage a relentless struggle to prevent imperialism from launching another war and thus to preserve world peace.

In the capitalist society, the bourgeoisie and the proletaria: are also mutually dependent. "If there is no bourgeoisie, there will be no proletariat; if there is no proletariat, there will be no bourgeoisie." See Note 17 Let us ask: If there is no exploited proletariat, how can there be the bourgeoisie who are to exploit the surplus value? If there is no bourgeoisie, can there be any proletamist? We all realize: that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat were born at the same time, for without one, the other could not emerge; that after the bourgeoisie is eliminated in the course of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletariat would turn into a working class sharing all the means of production with the people and no longer be penniless proletarians. This consent of working class (in this connection, it is to be distinguished from the concept of proletariat) is one relative to the other remaining classes in the country and to the bourgeosie in the international arena, When class distrinction is obliterated completely in the world, there will no longer be any "working class." "The governed proletariat is to emerge from the revolution as the ruler and the previously ruling bourgeoisie is to emerge as the governed." Following the socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie, who previously owned large quantities of means of production, is to lose such means of production: as they may own and the previously penniless proletariat is to share with all the people the ownership of all the means of production. Is it not that they "move in a direction opposite to their own" and that they "turn toward the position occupied by the opposite side?" "Let us ask: How can such a change take place, if they are not connected under certain conditions and they are not unifying in nature? See Note 27 (Note 1: "On Contradictions," : Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, p. 794. Note 2: Ibid., p. 795.) the house the high ruth is not arrow any from interest to your the sphere.

youd the sphere

he phenomena of life and death are likewise opposite and unified at the same time. Between them, there is also the unity of contradiction. Life is not death and death is not life; however, without the passing of old cells, there will be no growth of new cells; and without assimilation of the new and excretion of the old, there will be no life. "s Engels said: "It is no. longer considered as scientific not to regard death as an important element of life or not to understand the physiological fact that the negation of life is actually contained in life itself; accordingly, life is always considered in connection with its inevitable end, i.e., death (death, in its embryonic form, is always contained in life). The dialectical view of life is nothing but this." See Note The cycle of life - assimilation and katabolism -- also means that the organic body is on the one hand to absorb various nutritive elements into itself and turn them into live cells and on the other hand to excrete what is decaying from itself and turn them into something dead. In other words, it also reflects mutation of life and death. Moreover, life . emerges from the lifeless and every life inevitably ends in death. How can we say that there is no unifying nature between life and death? (Note: Engels: The Dialectics of Nature. The People's Publishing Co., 1955, p. 250.)

Unity is not merely found in such "fundamentally opposite phenomenon" as war and peace, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat or life and death; it is found in all "fundamentally opposite phenomena." It cannot be otherwise. Is there anything in the universe that does not rely on its opposite for its existence? Is there anything that never changes and that may never turn into what is its opposite? No. Such opposite extremes as difficulty and success, strength and weakness, victory and defeat, good things and bad things, the advanced and the backward, truth and mistake, etc. invariably rely on each other under certain condition. and at the same time change into each other in accordance with certain conditions. If there is no difficulty, would there be success? If there is no success, would there be difficulty? If difficulty cannot turn into success under certain conditions, difficulty shall always remain to be difficulty. How can we talk about "overcoming difficulty"? If success cannot turn into difficulty under conditions, success shall always remain to be success. The, do we still have to wage struggles by developing our subjective initiative? The facts are: that once the difficulty is overcome, difficulty is to turn into success and that in case we relax our subjective effort or changes occur in the objective conditions, success may also turn into difficulty. It is relative to error that truth exists. It is in its struggle with error that truth advances. Nor can error be completely eliminated from the knowledge of mankind. Of course truth is not error, but it may turn into error if we should go beyond the sphere of its

application. Of course error is not truth, but it may turn into truth if we should deal with it correctly by learning the lessons of experience. This is the very reason why Comrade Mao Tse-tung said that "error is often the guide of truth." /See Note/ Even in the case of capitalism and socialism, these "fundamentally opposite phenomena" may likewise turn into each other under certain conditions. Capitalism has given birth to its "grave-differ," the proletariat and created the material premise of socialism large-scale production; following the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, capitalism may turn into socialism and private property into public property. Under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, we have already succeeded in achieving this transformation in the socialist states, with 1/3 of the world population. We must continue to strive for such a transformation throughout the world, which is indeed inevitable. According to the objective law, socialism inevitably turns into Communism. Our task is to actively create the necessary conditions so that such a transformation may be achieved at the earliest possible time. However, at the socialist stage, the 2-road contradiction between socialism and capitalism will always remain to be the major contradiction. That is why under certain conditions - e.g., if we fail to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, fail to bring the proletarian revolution to its ultimate consummation, cease to guard against and struggle with the reactionary classes within and the foreign imperialism, and let the reactionary elements succeed in their subversive plot — socialism may suffer temporary reverses, thus lending to the revival of capitalism. (Note: "Reform Our Learning," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung. Vol. III, p. 823.)

In Summary, if we are to admit that the movement and development of our material world are absolute, that there is no such thing as constant phenomenon and that the nature of things and events change in the course of their development, then we must logically admit that any "fundamentally opposite phenomenon" may under certain conditions turn in a direction opposite to its own.

To Negate the Unity of Opposites Is to Negate the Revolutionary Dialectics.

ce, der

don the

LONG AT

To negate the conflicting nature of opposites is to negate the revolutionary dialectics; similarly, to negate the unifying nature of opposites is also to negate the revolutionary dialectics.

Why do we say that to negate the unifying nature of opposites is to negate the revolutionary dialectics?

First, to negate that opposites may under certain conditions turn into each other is to negate revolutionary mutation.

have negated the basis for the Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "The unity or oneness of the various aspects of contradictions in objective things or events is by nature not dead or frozen but live, conditional, changeable, temporary and relative and all contradictions may under certain conditions turn in directions opposite to their own. Such a situation, reflected in our thinking, has resulted in the Marxist, materialist-dialectical theory of the universe. Only the temporary and previous reactionary ruling class and metaphysics, which serves their interests, do not regard opposite things and events as live, conditional, changeable and capable of turning into the opposite but regard them as dead and frozen. Moreover, they propagate these erroneous views everywhere, with the view of deceiving the masses and thus to perpetuate their rule. The tasks of the Communists are to expose the erroneous ideas of the reactionary elements and metaphysics and to propagate the natural dialectics of things and events, so as to facilitate the mutation of things and events and thus to reach the goals of revolution." See Note These words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung have profoundly clarified the revolutionary nature of the unity of opposites as a Marxist-Leninist phiolosophical principle. (Note: "On Contradictions" op. cit. p. 797.)

To negate that opposites may under certain conditions turn into each other is to regard them as dead and frozen, as unchangeable and as incapable of moving in a direction opposite to their own. If we are to observe the practical life and guide our actions in accordance with this viewpoint, how could we act as promoters of the revolution, "facilitating the transformation of things and events"? It is exactly because the capitalist system must inevitably move toward its opposite extreme and the bourgecisie and the proletariat in the capitalist society must inevitably, under certain conditions, change their positions, that we are supremely confidently engaged in the proletarian revolution with the view of facilitating this transformation. If we are of the opinion that the capitalist system may no move toward its opposition extreme, that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat cannot reverse their positions, and that the existing system of ownership of property will remain unchanged, then is it not that we have negated the inevitable triumph of the proletarian revolution. is exactly because peace may under certain conditions turn into war - so long as there are the imperialist system, the capitalist system and class conflict in the world - that we must intensify our vigilance, develop our subjective initiative, prevent the imperialists from launching aggressive wars and thus to preserve world peace: And as the imperialists may venture to launch aggressive wards, we must anhieve peace by launching revolutionary wars

against counter-revolutionary wars. Similarly, the socialist system is also changeable. With the emergence of certain conditions, it will inevitably turn into communism. If we regard the socialist system as dead, frozen and unchangeable, would it not be true that we have negated the basis for the realization of communism?

The Communists must make use of this objective dialectics in their effort to create conditions and thus to facilitate the revolutionary transformation. They must do so in the revolutionary effort to seize power and to obliterate capitalism; they must do so in the course of socialist construction. The record of our great leap forward in the past several years has conclusively confirmed the pattern of the mutation of opposites under certain conditions and the great significance of developing our subjective initiative in accordance with this pattern. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has eminently and thoroughly applied the dialectics to the socialist society and confirmed that the things and events in the socialist society are also changeable and transformable. Armed with this ideological weapon, the people have boldly played their roles as reformists and promoters, thereby achieving the great leap forward. As time goes on, this idea is better understood by the people.

Very obviously, to negate the interchangeability of the positions of all opposites under certain conditions is in effect to negate the fundamental qualitative change and to regard such change as "quiet" evolution. Thus we would be contented with the substitution of ordinary theory of evolution for the revolutionary dialectics.

If we negate the interchangeability of the positions of opposites under certain conditions, can we correctly maintain the conflicting nature of contradictions in the dialectics? Of course, we cannot. According to Markist dialectics: the struggle between the opposites in a contradiction must inevitably lead to the reverse of their positions, the qualitative change, the passing of old things and events and the emergence of new things and events. To negate the interchangeability of the positions of opposites under certain conditions would be to negate that the "struggle" must inevitably lead to the passing of old things and events and the emergence of new things and events. The so-called "conflicting (struggling) nature" in this connection is of course totally unrelated to dialectics.

Secondly, to negate the unity of opposites may under certain conditions lead us to negate contradiction or the conflicting nature of opposites.

As we said before, the unity as is recognized by those who maintain that there is no unity between the "fundamentally opposite and mutually exclusive phenomena" is actually the unity in metaphysics, i.e., the equivalent-sameness of the two phenomena,

without the characteristic of being "fundamentally opposite" or "mutually exclusive." According to this viewpoint, when they recognize the presence of unity, they may twist the unity and negate contradiction or the conflicting nature of "mutual exclusiveness."

be positive elec

ry galet, Allaba L

Some people do not admit that there are contradictions in the socialist society. This viewpoint is related to the viewpoint that negates the unity in "mutually exclusive phenomena." They offer a metaphysical interpretation of the unity of dialectics. Accordingly, if they recognize the conflicting nature, they would fail to recognize the unifying nature and if they recognize the unifying nature they would fail to recognize the conflicting nature. In accordance with the metaphysical viewpoint, they on the one hand maintain that there is no unity between the "mutually exclusive phenomena" and on the other hand only recognize the unity but negate the "mutual exclusiveness" in the socialist society. In this way, they also have negated the contradictions in the socialist society.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "the various aspects of the contradiction in all processes are originally mutually exclusive." /See Note 1/ If they are not "mutually exclusive," they would not constitute the contradiction. Comrade Mao Tse-tung further said: "We Chinese often say: 'opposition supports.' In other words, there is unity in opposites. This statement is based on dialectics and not on metaphysics. 'Opposition' means that the mutual exclusiveness of or struggle between the two contradictory aspects. 'Supports' means that under certain conditions the 2 contradictory aspects are coordinated, thereby achieving unity." See Note 2/ "Mutual exclusiveness," as a philosophical sphere, pertains to the conflicting nature of opposites, i.e., contradiction. We should not interpret it in too narrow a sence. If we do so -e.g., to evaluate the relationship among the working people in the light of the mutual exclusiveness between the two parties in a war or between to hostile classes - or course there is no mutual exclusiveness. However, such an interpretation would not be the original sense of "mutual exclusiveness" as a philosophical sphere. For its meaning is much broader. In his article entitled, "Discourse on Dialectics," Lenin placed the word "struggle" in quotation marks when he wrote: "development is the !struggle! between opposites. " This indicates that "struggle" was used as a philosophical sphere in the broad sense, including not only class struggle but also the + and - in mathematics, the function and counter-function in differential calculus and integral calculus, the positive and negative electricity in physics, the compounding and dissolution in chemistry, etc. All opposites are "struggling" (conflicting) with each other, but their "struggles" are all of a different nature. If "struggle" is interpreted in too narrow a sense, how can we say, for instance, the + and - or

for that matter the positive electricity and negative electricity are engaged in struggle? (Note 1: "On Contradictions," op. cit., p. 794. Underline added. Note 2: <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 800. Underline added.)

In terms of social phenomena, the philosophical sphere mutual exclusiveness includes not only such mutual exclusiveness as between hostile classes but also such mutual exclusiveness as between the different opinions and arguments among the people and between the advanced and the backward. Such contradictions as between the working people in a socialist society, between national interests, collective interests and personal interests, between democracy and concentration, between those who lead and those who are led, etc. are based on the fundamental agreement on the interests of the people. Philosophically speaking, the various aspects in these contradictions are also mutually exclusive (of course, such mutual exclusiveness is different from that between hostile classes in nature) and do not suggest the unity, equivalent-semeness. in metaphysics. It is exactly for this reason that they constitute contradictions and these contradictions must be dealt with correctly. For instance, national interests, collective interests and personal interests are of course different (opposite, mutually exclusive or conflicting with one another, in terms of philosophy) and not equivalent-same. If there were equivalentsame, would it not be that there are no contradictions and that there is no need to reconcile them? Accordingly, the contradictions based on the fundamental agreement on the people's interests only define the specific nature of such contradictory struggle or mutual. exclusiveness. However, those who define unity in the metaphysical sense would fail to recognize the struggle or mutual exclusiveness in these cases; and to negate the struggle between opposites, or their exclusiveness, would mean the negation of contradiction. This is the inevitable conclusion of the logical development of the viewpoint that negates the unity between mutually exclusiveness phenomena. Inasmuch as those who adopt this viewpoint maintain that there is no unity between the mutually exclusive phenomena, there would not of course be any mutual exclusiveness in such phenomena as they may recognize to be of the unifying nature.

In the history of our party, some comrades, because they insist on the metaphysical viewpoint, have failed either to recognize, in some instances, the unifying nature between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie or to recognize, in some other instances, the conflicting nature between the two classes. The party has had rich experience in opposing these two types of one-sidedness, these two extremes of the metaphysical approach.

In the history of our revolution, we formed a united front with the national bourgeoisie for a long period. In accordance with the Marxist-Leninist dialectics. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has

here i - he no waity between or.

made a comprehensive analysis of the united front as a unified body of contradictions and accordingly formulated the policy of "at once uniting with and struggling against" the national bourgeoisie, thereby consolidating and expanding the united front. This only correct Marxist-Leninist policy has guaranteed the consolidation and expansion of the united front and the leadership of the proletariat, thereby gradually leading the Chinese revolution to victory. However, the "leftist" and rightist opportunists have isolated themselves from the Marxist-Leninist dialectics, which is at once of the unifying and conflicting nature, and elected to observe problems in accordance with the metaphysical approach. Thus they have failed to appreciate the policy of united front, which was designed to unite as well as to struggle with the national bourgeoisie. The "leftist" opportunists recognized only "struggling" and negated "uniting." The philosophical basis for such a political viewpoint was the recognition of only the conflicting nature of the fundamentally opposing parties and the negation of the unity between them. They were of the opinion that where there is conflict there is no unity and that where there is unity there is no conflict. The rightist opportunists recognized only "uniting" and negated "struggling." Accordingly, they offered the leadership of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie and proceeded toward surrenderism. The philosophical basis for their political viewpoint was the recognition of only the unity of opposites and the negation of their conflict. They regarded the united front not as a body that unified the mutually exclusive contradictions but as the unity or equivalent-sameness as in metaphysics. Thus they reached the conclusion that struggle be abandoned in politics. The philosophical viewpoint of the rightist opportunism and that of the "leftist" opportunism were agreed on one point and that was where there is conflict there is no unity and where there is unity there is no conflict. It was exactly for this reason that "leftist" opportunism and rightist opportunism were interchangeable in their positions under certain conditions. If the "leftist" opportunists had failed to fundamentally revise their world view at that stage, they might under certain conditions commit the error of rightist opportunism at another stage; and vice versa.

Engels said: "The metaphysicists think in terms of absolutely irreconcilable opposites. Their theory is: 'either yes or no; otherwise, duplicity.'" See Note 17 They "regard unity and differentiation as two irreconcilable opposites and not as the two extremes of the same thing, which is true only because they influence each other and differentiation is contained in unity." See Note 27 Those who negate the unity of opposites actually think this way. In their opinion, unity and opposition are divisible, mutually independent and separated by an insurmountable gulf; unity is unity and it cannot contain opposites; opposition is opposition and there can be no unity between opposites; "yes is yes and no no;"

it is impossible to have conflict and unity at the same time. However, the nucleus of dialectics is conflict in unity. It is exactly because the negation of unity between opposites is actually represented by the metaphysical formula "yes....yes, no....no" instead of the dialectical formula "yes....no, no....yes," that those who adopt this viewpoint tend to recognize conflict but not unity at one stage and to recognize unity but not conflict at another stage or at the same stage tend to recognize unity but not conflict in one type of problems and to recognize conflict but not unity in another type of problems. Of course, under whatever circumstances, the conflict or unity which they recognize are based on metaphysics and not on dialectics. (Note 1: Engels: Anti Duhring Theory, The People's Publishing Co., 1956, p. 20. Note 2: Engels: Dialectics of Nature. The People's Publishing Co., 1955, p. 178.)

Unqualified Insistence on Revolutionary Dialectics

This article has dwelled on the tendency to negate the unity of opposites and its danger. In no way does this imply that the conflict between opposites is not important. According to Marxist dialectics, the conflict between opposites is absolute and to negate the absoluteness of conflict is to fundamentally abandon the revolutionary dialectics and ro negate to so-called unity of opposites. To discuss unity with disregard for conflict is to discuss unity in metaphysics and thus lead to relativism and sophism.

As Lenin taught us: "Dialectics has more than once -- in the history of Greek philosophy for instance -- acted a bridge to sophism. However, we have always been dialectitians. In our struggle against sophism, our tactics is not to fundamentally negate the possibility of any mutation but to concretely analyze a certain event, its environment and development." See Note 1/ Lenin made this statement while discussing the principle that "in the imperialist stage, the nationalist wars in the colonial and semi-colonial areas are not only possible but inevitable." He pointed out: "Nationalist wars may turn into imperialist wars and imperialist wars may also turn into nationalist wars." He further pointed out: "Only the sophists may try to obliterate the difference between imperialist wars and nationalist wars on the ground that one three may lead to the others." /See Note 27 "To obliterate the difference between imperialist wars and nationalist wars" is purely a revisionist technique and to this we must resolutely object. However, it is also extremely erroneous to negate that imperialist wars may turn into nationalist wars and to this we must also resolutely object. Lenin pointed out: "This error is also extremely harmful in political practice, for the people may thus spread the misleading propaganda for 'disarmament,' remplately on the auditionally

dialectics.

for it seems that there may never be any war other than the reactionary war, and for the people may thus adopt even less justifiable, if not reactionary, attitude of indifference toward nationalist movement." See Note 3 (Note 1: "On Yu-ni-wu-ssu's Pamphlet," Collected Works of Lenin. The People's Publishing Co., 1958, Vol. XXII, pp 302-303. Note 2: Ibid.; p. 302, Note 3: Ibid., p 305.)

The enemies of Marxism-Leninism -- the revisionists -- negate this absoluteness of the struggle between opposites; twist the unity sphere of dialectics into Sophism and Relativism; negate the qualitative regularity of things and events; obliterate the fundamental conflict and qualitative difference between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism, between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, between the righteous wars and unrighteous wars, etc.; and at the same time negate the interchangeability of positions between the opposites under certain conditions, qualitative change and revolutionary change. They use the ordinary theory of evolution to replace the revolutionary dialectics.

There is a clear boundary between Marxist dialectics on the one hand and Sophism and Relativism on the other hand. Marxist dialectics firmly recognize the unity of opposites, the interchangeability of positions between opposites and at the same time the absoluteness of the struggle between opposites and the relativity of their unity. Accordingly, it firmly recognizes the relative stability of events, and their qualitative regularity; it also recognizes that events are unified contradictions and that "the nature of events is chiefly determined by the major aspect of the contradiction that has achieved the ruling position;" $\sqrt{\text{See}}$ Note $1/\sqrt{\text{See}}$ it maintains that the reverse of positions between the opposites represents the result of the struggle between them; it maintains that "the conditions for such reverse of positions are important and in the absence of certain conditions neither party in the struggle is likely to change its position." See Note 2/ boundaries between the Marxist dialectics on the one hand and Sophism and Relativism on the other are thus clearly defined. (Note 1: "On Contradictions," Op. cit., p. 789. Note 2: Mao Tse-tung: On the Question of Correctly Dealing with Internal Contradictions among the People. The People's Publishing Co., 1957, p. 35,

As a Marxist-Leninist, one should never cease to seriously study the materialist dialectics; learn to appreciate its spirit and substance; on the basis of past and contemporary ideological struggles, study how the various extremist views fell prey to metaphysics and betrayed the revolutionary dialectics, thereby gathering experience and learning lessons; arm himself ideologically; and thus even more resolutely and unconditionally follow and propagate the revolutionary

dialectics.