

September 11, 1964

No. 3296

* NATIONAL *

COMMUNIST THEORY

Anti-Dialectical Substance of the "Uniting Two into One"
Theory

by

Hsiao Shu (萧述)

(Peking Jen-min Jih-pao Aug. 14, 1964)

This article is a commentary on Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory of "uniting two into one." Comrade Yang has published a series of articles on the question of the law of unity of opposites. Some of his articles have been introduced to the readers of the Jen-min Jih-pao, whose attention has naturally been aroused, since the question of dividing one into two or "uniting two into one" obviously does not concern a dispute about phraseology but involves the comprehension of the core of dialectics - the law of unity of opposites. In other words, it is a question of what constitutes Marxist-Leninist dialectics. The discussions now going on deal with many problems of theoretical principle, all having a close bearing on the realities of present-day life.

This article is limited to the discussion of a single problem: What constitutes unity of opposites? Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has given emphasis to explaining his view on this problem. He says:

-- "What is called unity of opposites? China has an old saying: 'uniting two into one,' meaning that a thing is a union of two [parts] into one. It has the same meaning as 'dividing one into two.'"

-- "Whatever a thing may be, it is always a case of 'union of two into one.' Hence, when a problem is surveyed, it is necessary to 'divide one into two.'"

-- "'Unity' has the meaning of 'indivisibility.' 'Unity of opposites' means that two opposite things are by nature inseparably connected."

-- "The idea of unity of opposites refers only to the indivisible connection between two sides of a contradiction."

-- "What is called unity means precisely the state of being indivisibly connected. When an indivisibly connected thing is forcibly separated so that only one of the two sides is grasped, that will be artificiality and violation of the nature of the thing."

-- "Dialectics is precisely a study of how to identify (unify) opposites - to seek common ground while letting differences remain."

-- "This imposes a demand to study how opposites can be made identical. Here, 'identity' denotes a common demand."

-- "To study dialectics is to acquire the ability to connect two opposite ideas together."

The above is the theory of "uniting two into one" as advanced by Comrade Yang Hsien-chen. Comrade Yang regards this theory as the law of unity of opposites. In our eyes, however, it is completely opposed to Marxist-Leninist dialectics and presents a direct challenge to the revolutionary, dialectical viewpoint of dividing one into two.

According to Marxist-Leninist Philosophy, anything in the world is in itself a case of dividing one into two, i.e., dividing a whole into two mutually opposing parts, both of which form a unity and yet struggle against each other. Lenin defined "unity of opposites" very concisely as follows: It is "recognition (discovery) of the contradictory, mutually exclusive, opposite tendencies in all phenomena and processes of nature (including mind and society)." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXVIII, People's Publishing House, p. 408).

It is also the view of Marxist-Leninist philosophy on the unity and struggle of opposites that unity is relative, temporary and conditional while struggle is absolute and unconditional. The struggle between opposites is the source of the "self-movement" of things, setting things in motion and developing them. Under any circumstance a contradiction between two opposites is beyond conciliation. As a result of the struggle, the whole inevitably disintegrates and splits and one opposite overcomes the other, thereby causing a basic change in things with the substitution of the new for the old.

Dividing one into two represents the nature and original face of objective things. It is the fundamental law governing the development of things. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said: "In human society as well as in nature, a whole can always be separated into different parts. It is only under different concrete conditions that the content and form may be different." (Mao Tse-tung: "A Talk at the National CCP Conference on Propaganda Work") "The interdependence of the contradictory aspects of a thing and the struggle between them determine the life and promote the development of that thing. There is nothing that does not contain contradiction; without contradiction there would be no world." ("On Contradiction, Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, People's Publishing House, 2nd edition, 1952, p. 293)

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has put forward a contrary view. According to him, "the idea of unity of opposites refers only to the indivisible connection between two sides of a contradiction." Is his view in any way dialectical? No, basically it is not. Dialectics recognizes the existence of an interconnection between two sides of a contradiction under certain conditions. But it does not recognize that this interconnection is fixed or inseparable or that the whole of a contradiction is so strong as to be unbreakable. Just as Engels said, unity of opposites "exists only within their separation and the interconnection between them exists only within their opposition." (Engels: Dialectics of Nature, People's Publishing House, 1955 edition, p. 48) This interconnection is a connection of opposition and also one of struggle. It is not a connection without struggle. In the eyes of the Marxist-Leninist, the interconnection between two opposites means in effect the desire of one side to overcome the other. In society what the new and old influences develop into through their connection is the state of their mutual negation and mutual struggle.

the new wants the old to decrease in size and strength until extinction so that the new can grow in size and strength until complete victory is won. On the other hand, the old tries hard to resist these changes. The process of struggle is tortuous but, in the end, the new will succeed in overcoming the old and in bringing about the disintegration and splitting of the old. Then new things will emerge. Marx said: Dialectics "regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence." (Marx: Capital, Vol. I, "Postscript to the Second German Edition," People's Publishing House, 2nd edition, 1963) In the comprehension of any concrete thing or any connected form, "to take into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence" is precisely revolutionary dialectics and precisely the Marxist-Leninist theory of development.

If the unity of opposites is spoken of "only as the indivisible connection between two sides of a contradiction," how can this be called dialectics? If, in a capitalist society, the unity of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as opposites is spoken of "only as" the indivisible connection" between these two classes, can this be dialectics? If the unity of imperialism and the oppressed nationalities as opposites is spoken of "only as" their interconnection without emphasizing the relationship of their life-and-death struggle, can this be dialectics? If the unity of the socialist camp and the imperialist camp as opposites is spoken of "only as" the state of their being indivisibly connected without emphatically pointing out their relationship of antagonism beyond conciliation, can this be dialectics? The "uniting two into one" theorists make absolute the interconnection between two sides of a contradiction in the belief that the two sides are inseparable. This is in no way dialectics; it is precisely anti-dialectics. What can be drawn therefrom is not revolutionary conclusions but counter-revolutionary conclusions aimed at nullifying revolution.

Lenin said: "Dialectics in the proper sense is the study of contradiction in the very essence of objects." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 278) He added: "The chief attention of dialectics is directed precisely to knowledge of the source of 'self'-movement." (*ibid*, p. 408) If, as Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says, a thing in itself is a case of "uniting two into one," there being only connection without contradiction and only unity without struggle; then, what can be the source of the "self-movement" of a thing?

Comrade Yang says: "Whatever a thing may be, it is a case of 'uniting two into one.' Hence, when a problem is surveyed, it is necessary to 'divide one into two.'" His way of saying it is pure sophistry. Marxism-Leninism holds that a thing must be, and can only be, understood on the basis of its proper appearance. The Marxist-Leninist world outlook is entirely consistent with methodology. But, according to Comrade Yang, a thing is a case of "uniting two into one" and "uniting two into one" is a law inherent in the thing itself. This being so, then, will not the use of the method of dividing one into two for the survey of problems be "against the nature of things"? In reality, when Comrade Yang says in this regard that dividing one into two is a cognitional method, he employs deceptive tactics as a screen for his "uniting two into one" theory. In his mind the world view and methodology form a unity, too, both being cases of "uniting two into one." This is also what he has repeatedly said; he wants "to connect two opposite ideas together."

Naturally these views have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

According to Marxism-Leninism, a thing is by nature a case of dividing one into two. Anything is a unity of opposites. Therefore, all things are analyzable, can be analyzed and should be analyzed. When observing a thing, the Marxist-Leninist finds it necessary first of all to resolve it in a realistic manner. What is called analysis is precisely to make a minute examination, on the basis of the proper appearance of a thing as a case of dividing one into two, of the concrete conditions in, and the mutual relationship between, the two sides of the thing to see which side occupies the dominant position and which comes under its domination, what practical relationship exists between their unity and struggle and what form these take, what the prospects are for their development, and under what conditions one side will be

able to overcome the other and the new to replace the old. This is the way we have to understand things and to find methods of solving problems. In face of anything, which may be as big as the international communist movement or as small as a daily struggle, we must use this analytical method of dividing one into two to understand the law of the development of things. Only thus can we formulate correct policies to lead our struggles to victory.

In this connection we wish to bring up a case. In their book The Holy Family, Marx and Engels criticized the young Hegelian school of that time for having "united into one the two facts" of the poverty and wealth of capitalist society, turned these two opposite things into "an entity" and "asked this entity what the prerequisite for its existence was." This was absolutely wrong. Marx and Engels pointed out: "The whole opposition between the rich and the poor is precisely the movement between these two opposite sides. The prerequisite for the existence of the entity is precisely embodied in the nature of the two sides." But the brothers of the holy family "shunned the study of the true movement which brought the entity into being." They "stood high over the two opposites," recognizing only the "entity" of poverty and wealth as a case of "uniting two into one." Therefore, it was basically impossible for them to understand capitalist society.

After expressing the above views, Marx and Engels said: "Both the two opposites of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are products of the world of private ownership. The question lies in what fixed position each of the two opposites occupies in the opposition. It is insufficient to announce only that they are the two sides of an entity."

In this book Marx and Engels made capitalist society a case of "dividing one into two." They studied what position each of the two opposites of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie occupied in the opposition. They pointed out: "The private owner represents the conservative side and the proletarian, the destructive side. From the former comes the action of preserving the opposition and from the latter, the action of destroying the opposition. (vide Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, People's Publishing House, pp. 42-44) This study enabled Marx and Engels to form in the book "their view on the revolutionary role of the proletariat." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXVIII, People's Publishing House, p. 9)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has applied the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint on the unity of opposites and the viewpoint on class analysis to the study of Chinese society, the Chinese revolution and the world revolution, thereby expounding and developing the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has taught us: "Not only should we who work for the Chinese revolution understand the particularity of each of the contradictions in the light of their totality, that is, from the interconnection of those contradictions, but we can understand the totality of the contradictions only by a study of each of their aspects. To understand each of the aspects of a contradiction is to understand the definite position each aspect occupies, the concrete form in which it comes into interdependence as well as conflict with its opposite, and the concrete means by which it struggles with its opposite when the two are interdependent and yet contradictory, as well as when the interdependence breaks up. The study of these problems is a matter of the utmost importance." ("On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 300)

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen happens to have forgotten this "matter of the utmost importance." He basically declines to study the various aspects of a contradiction, to try to understand the definite position each aspect occupies, or to find out about the conditions of the struggle in which two opposites are engaged. He is keen on quoting Hegel. In reality, like a member of the young Hegelian school criticized by Marx and Engels, he is keen on "uniting" two opposites "into one." This is completely contrary to Marxism-Leninism and to the thought of Mao Tse-tung. What is his intention in passing off as Marxist-Leninist dialectics the ultra-platitudinous ideas long criticized by Marx and Engels? Does it not deserve our thinking about it?

Now, we can look into the matter further. Comrade Yang speaks of the unity of opposites "only as the indivisible connection between two sides of a contradiction." What is the substance of his saying?

It is necessary to point out that in the modern history of philosophy there has been no scarcity of people like Comrade Yang who look upon the interconnection of things as a kind of "connection" which excludes the struggle of opposites and who distort the unity and struggle of opposites as "the combination of opposites." Plekhanov was one of these people; he spoke of the law of unity of opposites as the "principle of the combination of opposites." This also was the viewpoint of the Deborin school which came under the attack of Russian philosophers in the 1930s.

Deborin's viewpoint was a philosophical manifestation of the then Menshevik right-opportunist thinking. Deborin verbally accepted the law of unity of opposites but actually opposed it. He took the stand of "the pure combination of opposites." When advocating the combination of opposites, he practically excluded struggle or the absolute character of struggle. His "combination of opposites" was also entirely eclectic. He did not seek to understand what different concrete positions two opposites occupied or to distinguish between the principal aspect and the secondary aspect of a contradiction. He recognized only the interplay of opposites but not the fact that one of the two opposites invariably occupied the leading position and played the leading role. This was bound to lead to the "conciliation of things in opposition." Deborin himself had said thus: "Thesis and antithesis are not mutually-exclusive opposites but are mutually-conciliatory opposites." (Deborin: "On Kantian Dialectics," vide Marx-Engels Library, Vol. I; U.S.S.R. State Publishing House, Russian edition, 1924, p. 64)

When examining his mistakes, Deborin admitted that his advocacy of the "conciliation of things in opposition" was a "most serious mistake." "It goes without saying that politically this would amount to falling for the theory of harmonizing the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat." (Quoted from Ideological Methodology of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, People's Publishing House, 5th edition, 1953, p. 372)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out that the views of the Deborin school are anti-Marxist-Leninist, adding that Deborin's idealism has exerted a very bad influence within the Chinese Communist Party. Comrade Mao has exhorted us to pay attention to the removal of this influence.

It seems that this task is still laid before us today.

Although Comrade Yang has declared that he is against "distorting the 'unity of opposites' as the 'conciliation of things in opposition,'" yet, when speaking on the unity and connection of opposites, he in effect has the intention of avoiding or obliterating struggle and the absolute character of struggle. He says that dialectics is only a study of the "common demand" of opposites "to seek common ground while letting differences remain." There is practically no difference between this saying of his and Deborin's idea of the "conciliation of opposites."

Does the identity of contradiction really as Comrade Yang says refer solely to the "common demand" of opposites "to seek common ground while letting differences remain"?

Materialistic dialectics is the study of how two opposites can become an identity (a unity). The study covers not only how and under what conditions the opposites will coexist in an entity but also how and under what conditions they will transform themselves into each other. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said: "All contradictory things are interconnected, and they not only coexist in an entity under certain conditions - this is the whole meaning of the identity of contradictions. This is exactly what Lenin meant when he discussed, "... how they become identical (how they change and become identical) - under what conditions they transform themselves into each other and become identical...." ("On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 318)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has also specially pointed out: "The matter does not end with the interdependence of the two contradictory aspects for their existence. What is more important is the transformation of the contradictory things into each other." ("On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 316)

Regardless of whether the study concerns the interconnection of opposites or their transformation into each other, it cannot be detached from the struggle of contradiction. The identity referred to in Marxist-Leninist dialectics is not an identity in other senses but one of mutually discriminating, contradicting and struggling opposites. Identity cannot be spoken of in isolation from struggle. Struggle resides precisely in identity. Without struggle there can be no identity.

The transformation of contradictory opposites into each other must go through struggle. No change or transformation of things or processes can take place in this world without struggle. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said: "Given specific conditions, the two aspects of a contradiction invariably turn into their respective opposites as a result of the struggle between them. (On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People, People's Publishing House, 1957 edition, p. 35) The proletariat and the bourgeoisie, standing in opposition to each other, have the possibility of transforming themselves into each other. But can we say that this transformation will be able to take place without going through the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat? Any state of a thing, whether the state of a quantitative change or that of a qualitative change, is invariably the result of the struggle of opposites. A quantitative change prepares the ground for the transformation of things to take place. A fundamental qualitative change signifies that the transformation has taken place. A change, quantitative or qualitative, must go through struggle. Hence, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has further said: "The struggle within a contradiction runs throughout a process from beginning to end and causes one process to transform itself into another, and as the struggle within the contradiction is present everywhere, we say the struggle within the contradiction is unconditional, absolute." ("On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 321)

Whatever the nature of contradiction, unity is always relative and struggle absolute. To negate this point is equivalent to negating the law of the unity of opposites, i.e., dialectics. A revolutionary, facing the reality of contradiction and when talking about "the conditions under which opposites will transform themselves into each other and become identical," should first place the focus on struggle. That is to say, he should first consider the kind of struggle to be gone through in order to prepare the ground for the transformation of things and "to hasten this transformation and attain the aim of the revolution." ("On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 318)

Metaphysicians do not see problems in this light. When talking about the identity of contradictions, they always emphasize unity and disregard struggle. Marx, when speaking of Mill, wrote: "Where economic relations - together with the categories they manifest - include opposition and where the unity of one contradiction and another exists, Mill invariably emphasizes the unity of opposites but negates opposition. He turns the unity of opposites into a direct identity of opposites." (Marx: History of the Theory of Surplus Value, Vol. III, San Lien Book Store, 1949 edition, p. 99, with revised translation)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said: "Only the reactionary ruling classes, past as well as present, and metaphysicians who are in their service, do not regard opposites as living, conditional, changeable things that transform themselves into each other, but as dead, rigid things, and propagate this erroneous view everywhere to delude the masses of the people, and thereby attain the aim of perpetuating their rule." ("On Contradiction," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 318)

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory of "uniting two into one" one-sidedly sums up the whole relationship between two contradictory sides of a thing into these words: a common demand to seek common ground and let differences remain. This is extremely pernicious metaphysics; it is not dialectics.

When talking about our Party dealing with the relationships between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie during the period of the democratic revolution, Comrade Yang superficially praises the Party's united front policy, saying that this is the Party's successful application of the law of the unity of opposites to practical work. In particular, he has time and again referred to our Party's opposition to "leftist" closed-doorism and to the revolutionary impetuosity and strategy of forming an anti-Japanese united front with the national bourgeoisie and the anti-Japanese elements of the Kuomintang at the end of the Second Revolutionary Civil War. It must be pointed out that in connection with the history of the united front and with the Party's policy on the united front, Comrade Yang has not made any all-round analysis or comments but has only used one-sided predication to "prove" his so-called view of "a common demand to seek common ground while letting differences remain," which disregards class contradictions and class struggle, and to "prove" his theory of "uniting two into one."

As everybody knows, in order to strive to set up a united front against Japan, our Party led the people throughout the country to oppose the Kuomintang government's policy of waging a counter-revolutionary civil war, practicing feudal, compradore and Fascist dictatorship and offering no resistance to Japanese imperialism. Within itself the Party opposed the erroneous "leftist" policy of "talking only about struggle and not about joining forces." The reason for the successful formation of the anti-Japanese united front was that the Party had waged these struggles inside and outside itself. It was not, as Comrade Yang says, the result of what is called "seeking common ground and letting differences remain."

When speaking of the anti-Japanese united front, Comrade Yang one-sidedly stresses the "common demand" of all classes and keeps silent about the different policies of various classes on anti-Japanese problems and about the conflict of interests among these classes.

Comrade Yang has failed to see the different stands of different classes on anti-Japanese problems. The anti-Japanese demand of the proletariat and its party represented the interests of the whole Chinese nationality in striving for liberation. It advocated giving rein to the mobilization of the masses, building up the forces of the people, defeating the Japanese aggressor and founding a new China of the people. The anti-Japanese demand of the Kuomintang merely represented the interests of the pro-British and pro-U.S. factions among the big landlords and leading members of the bourgeoisie. At the beginning, the Kuomintang carried out the policy of partially resisting the Japanese but actively opposing the communists. It continued to oppress the people. Subsequently, it sat atop the Omei Mountains to watch the fighting with folded arms. It was ready at any time to stab the anti-Japanese people in the back and to steal from them the fruits of the war of resistance. Working in collusion with the enemy and the puppets, it propagated the stinking, preposterous theory of "saving the country by a curved line." Its aim was to continue to uphold its feudal, compradore and Fascist dictatorship, to preserve the semi-colonial and semi-feudal old China and to make preparations for turning China into a full colony of U.S. imperialism.

In his report on "The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan" made in 1937, Comrade Mao Tse-tung analyzed the situation then prevailing at home and abroad and said: "The development of the contradiction between China and Japan has, in terms of political specific gravity, reduced the significance of the contradictions at home between the classes and between political blocs, making them something secondary and subordinate." But those contradictions still exist, and have by no means dwindled or been eliminated. The same is true of the contradictions between China and imperialist powers other than Japan." (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, p. 245)

This means that, after the formation of the anti-Japanese united front, the class boundary, class contradictions and class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie within the country did not disappear. The process of the development of things was still the "division of one into two." Apart from some demands relating to the anti-Japanese problem common to both to a certain extent,

between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie there still existed mutual struggle with a fundamental conflict of interests. During the war of resistance to Japan the Kuomintang whipped up a high tide against the communists on several occasions. Our Party adopted the policy of seeking unity through struggle and resolutely waged the class struggle that had to be waged to foil and smash Chiang Kai-shek's anti-communist intrigues.

After the formation of the united front there arose within the Party a right-opportunist current of thought, which was to unite into one the programs, policies, ideologies and practices of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in disregard of the differences in principle between the two classes and of the fact that the bourgeoisie (especially the big bourgeoisie) had done its utmost to influence not only the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry but also the proletariat and the Communist Party in an effort to eliminate the ideological, political and organizational independence of the proletariat and the Communist Party, thereby enabling the proletariat and the Party to be absorbed into the big bourgeoisie, the big landlord class and their political parties. Those harboring this right-opportunist thought had a representative in Wang Ming, who put forward the erroneous line of the so-called "the united front is supreme and everything else must be subordinated to it." Wang Ming opposed what Comrade Mao Tse-tung advocated, that in pursuing the united front the policy of independence and autonomy should be adhered to. He also opposed the policy of "developing the progressive forces, striving to win over the middle-of-the-road forces and isolating the inveterate forces." In order to court the favor of the Kuomintang, he even spread propaganda that after winning the war against Japan, China could only still be a kingdom for the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and could not be a country of the people's democracy under the leadership of the Communist Party. Our Party, led by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, waged a determined struggle against this right-opportunism, or it may be said, new capitulationism, thus insuring that after the surrender of Japan the revolutionary cause in China would score great victories within a short time.

How should all this be evaluated after all? Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has avoided to talk about it. Why does this self-styled "all-round" comrade basically make no all-round comment on the Party's experience gained from pursuing its anti-Japanese united front policy?

After our break with the Kuomintang over the question of the united front when our union with the Chiang Kai-shek controlled Kuomintang no longer existed, the two opposing sides had nothing that could be called "common demand." Chiang Kai-shek, in an attempt to rob all the fruits of the war of resistance, started a full-scale counter-revolutionary civil war. Our Party led the whole population in using the revolutionary war to oppose the counter-revolutionary war of the Kuomintang reactionaries. The reactionaries were ultimately wiped out. Why is it that Comrade Yang has also avoided talking about this part of history?

After the complete, open break of the old united front, i.e., the anti-Japanese united front with the Kuomintang, our Party, in accordance with the new changes in the situation at home and abroad as well as in class relationships, organized a more extensive people's democratic united front against the U.S. and Chiang Kai-shek. Within this new united front there also existed struggle as well as unity between different classes. Why is it that Comrade Yang has likewise avoided talking about this part of history?

Facts have told us: The united front between the proletariat and other classes stemmed from struggle and was maintained by struggle to insure that it would develop in the direction of benefiting the growth of the people's revolutionary forces. At that time the object of the struggle was two-fold: first, to defeat the common enemy with the preservation of the necessary unity and to oppose the intrigues of the opposite side of undermining the solidarity, compromising with and surrendering to the enemy, and restricting or "dissolving" the revolutionary forces; second, to strengthen and increase our own forces as far as possible in order to provide conditions for future struggle and make certain that final victory

would be achieved. In history, the question of which of two basically opposite classes, political parties or blocs winning the final victory often rested on the strategy each side adopted for the united front, together with its outcome. It also rested on the side better adept in developing its own forces and better able to provide conditions for future struggle, i.e., in a state of better preparedness to overcome the other side and not to be overcome by it. Those representing the progressive class, political party or bloc, regardless of how tortuous their road might be, always emerged the ultimate winner. The opportunists did not understand this point; they only liked to "unite two into one." Hence their inevitable defeat, their inevitable knock-out by the enemy. In the international communist movement there has been no lack of lessons in defeats of this kind.

Since the interests of two antagonistic classes basically clash, then, for what common purpose do they unite together? Although, from the standpoint of both sides, such a union is necessary, it cannot be permanent. The reason is that a class and its political party taking a stand against the people is always the first to break the united front. When uniting itself with opposing classes, political parties or blocs, a revolutionary class, political party or bloc must at all times be on the alert and prepared for their subversive intrigues and activities. When unity with them must be maintained, efforts should of course be made to strive for unity and to seek unity through struggle. When a split seems unavoidable, it will call for courage to wage a new struggle and for courage to wrest victory from the opposing side.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen often teaches people that "to do their work they should learn to grasp the law of the unity of opposites and, in the course of practical work, they should respect dialectics." But in connection with all the aforesaid problems, he himself has not touched upon what he calls grasping the law of the unity of opposites or respecting dialectics.

At this juncture, we might bring up, in passing, the discussion held in philosophical circles not long ago about whether thinking and being had any identity. The discussion attracted the attention of a great many people at the time. Although Comrade Yang has not openly published any article in the press, he is the principal initiator of the view that thinking and being have no identity. He firmly believes that there is no identity between thinking and being and therefore identity is out of the question. In his view, whoever talks about identity must be a "subjective idealist," a theorist of the "coordination of principle" or a "Marxist." This is a very curious theory. If, as Comrade Yang says, no identity exists between thinking and being and the relationship between them is not one of the unity of opposites, then, how can being determine consciousness and consciousness reflect being? Is it or is it not that consciousness is detached from and independent of being? If things are like what Comrade Yang says, then, how can matter turn itself into spirit, and vice versa? Is it or is it not that spirit and matter are completely isolated from each other and cannot be transformed into each other? It seems that for this view of his Comrade Yang will have to find proof from his "identity" theory. As stated above, the identity recognized by him is absolute and abstract. Between thinking and being there is naturally no such identity; the only available identity is dialectical and concrete. He has expressed his inability to understand the latter kind of identity, i.e., concrete identity. It is therefore no wonder that he should oppose the viewpoint that there is identity between thinking and being.

To negate the view that there is identity between thinking and being is to negate the dialectical materialistic principle of "interconvertibility between matter and spirit." Obviously no one can say thus: I recognize the principle that "matter can be transformed into spirit and vice versa" but I cannot recognize that there is identity between thinking and being. The reason is that this is plainly a case in which a person intending to deceive people deludes himself instead. No matter what trick is played, no truth can come out of the juggler's hat. It is practically impossible for all those who negate this principle to understand the meaning that revolutionary practice forms the basis for the intertransformation

between thinking and being (or between matter and spirit). In the result, it will inevitably lead to neglecting revolutionary practice, neglecting the subjective conscious activity of the masses of people and neglecting the revolutionary mass movements until it stands in a position directly opposing the revolutionary mass movements. This is necessarily a logical conclusion. Things are just like this with Comrade Yang. His belittling attitude toward revolutionary practice and the attitude he assumes of a bourgeois elder toward the revolutionary mass movements reflect the current sharpening class struggle. At the same time, it cannot be denied that an "indivisible" connection exists between his attitude and his ultra-platitudinous theory of knowledge.