

Persist in the Class Origin of Marxist Philosophy,
Oppose the Theory of Class Reconciliation

- Refuting the theory of "combining two into one" -

Sai Fu-ting* (Saifudin ^{by} 赛福鼎), Chia K'u-lin (賈庫林),
Hsia-erh-hsi-pieh-k'o (夏尔西别克) and T'ien Hsi-pao (田希宝)

(Peking Jen-min Jih-pao, Sept. 20, 1964)

Comrades Ai Heng-wu and Lin Ch'ing-shan's article, "Dividing One into Two' and 'Combining Two into One," (see Kuang-ming Jih-pao's Philosophy Supplement, May 29) digs up the theory of "combining two into one" of Fang Yi-chih, an ancient Chinese philosopher who lived three centuries ago, and stands it against the glorious Marxist idea of "dividing one into two." Although the concept of "combining two into one" was advanced by Fang Yi-chih, yet the advocates of "combination of two into one" today have given this concept their own specific meaning. Under the name of dialectical materialism, this article by Ai and Lin publicizes a set of most erroneous, and hence also most harmful, metaphysical idealistic viewpoints. By generalization, they distort the Marxist classics, and stealthily peddle the theory of class reconciliation. We hold that this is a poisonous plant in the garden of philosophy, and must be criticized and uprooted.

Comrades Ai and Lin describe the objective things in a way that is fundamentally wrong. They say that "from all kinds of natural phenomena to human society, thinking, etc., there is nothing which is not a case of combining two into one." They say that "'combining two into one' indicates precisely the most fundamental law of dialectics - the law of the unity of opposites." They say that "an objective thing is 'combined from two into one,' and it is 'divided from one into two' only when it is known." They fantastically state that "when lines, guidelines, policies and measures are formulated, it is necessary to connect together and integrate the two opposite aspects," and when policies are implemented, "it is also necessary to connect together the opposite aspects, thus combining two into one' according to the dialectical method. And so on and so forth. As a matter of fact, the publication of this article is not isolated and accidental. Back in November, 1963, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen put forward the viewpoint of "combining two into one. Beginning in April, this year, he again publicized the idea in a big way and spread it everywhere (see Jen-min Jih-pao's Academic Research, July 17 for his points of argument which are not repeated here). On May 14, Comrade Li Ming shouted at the top of his voice in the classroom of the Party School and said: "Now more people are talking about 'dividing one into two,' and few people are talking about 'combining two into one,' but 'combining two into one' may also be discussed. He also urged people to "write more articles in this connection." (See Kuang-ming Jih-pao, July 10.)

It is very clear that the conformity of the words and deeds of the four comrades, Yang, Li, Ai and Lin is never a matter of coincidence, but is coordinated action with a purpose. They speak a common language - "combining two into one." Their thinking is identical in essence - class reconciliation.

We are beginners in philosophy. This polemic gives us a good chance to learn philosophy. In accordance with our understanding in study, we publish some crude views on "combining two into one" to discuss things with Comrades Yang, Li, Ai and Lin.

I

What is the fundamental law governing the development of objective things? Our answer is that it is the law of the unity of opposites, that is, "dividing one into two."

*Governor, Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region Government. It is noteworthy that according to the account given by Hung-ch'i's correspondent (Hung-ch'i 1964, No. 16), Yang Hsien-chen further developed his "combine two into one" thesis, making it more "systematic," and more "complete," in an April, 1964 lecture to the class of Sinkiang students at the Higher Party School. - CB Ed.

The answer of Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades is that it is "combining two into one." These two answers are fundamentally opposed to each other.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says that "anything is 'combined from two into one.'" Therefore, when problems are observed, "it is necessary to adopt the method of 'dividing one into two.'" He also describes "two into one" as "the brilliant idea of ancient China regarding the unity of opposites." Comrades Ai and Lin are even more straightforward in saying that "'combining two into one' gives precisely an expression to the most basic law of dialectics - the law of the unity of opposites." We hold that this is completely wrong, runs counter to dialectics, and does not hold water both in theory and in practice.

According to what they say, we have tabulated on their behalf these questions and answers:

What is an objective thing? "A combination of two into one."

What is the most basic law governing the development of objective things? "Combining two into one."

What is the unity of opposites? "It only indicates that the two aspects of a contradiction are inseparably connected" - "combining two into one."

How is motion constituted? "Combining two into one."

What is the object of studying dialectics? "The study of dialectics is aimed at learning the ability to connect together two opposite ideas" - "combining two into one."

How are lines, guidelines, policies and measures formulated? "It is necessary to connect together and integrate the two opposite aspects" - "combining two into one."

How are lines, guidelines and policies implemented? "When we implement them, we must also connect together the opposite aspects, thus 'combining two into one' according to the dialectical method.

....

Look, all things in the world are "combined from two into one," and apart from "combining two into one," it is still "combining two into one."

However, all these answers are wrong and should be so marked. This is because, as the criticisms in many articles indicate, "combining two into one" talks only about the unconditional connection of opposites, excludes the struggle of opposites, rejects the transformation of opposites, and is fundamentally opposed to the law of the unity of opposites.

There is only one correct answer, namely "division of one into two."

Anything in the world, no matter what it is, is always divided from one into two.

Lenin points out clearly at the beginning of "On the Question of Dialectics: "The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its contradictory parts... is the essence of dialectics"(1). Chairman Mao used the expression "dividing one into two" which is simple and easy to understand to generalize this dialectical thought of Lenin, and in accordance with this materialist dialectical law, guided revolution and construction in China to go continuously from victories to even greater victories.

(1) Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 38, page 407.

In the international struggle against imperialism and revisionism, Chairman Mao has also made outstanding use of this dialectical method of analysis, namely "division of one into two." This vivid and popular expression is also of extremely great significance toward enabling philosophy and the philosophers to liberate themselves from the classroom and march in big strides amidst the masses. Therefore, "division of one into two" is a great contribution to the Marxist philosophy.

The idea of "dividing one into two" does not drop from the sky, nor is it bred subjectively. It is a correct reflection of the objective law. As a consequence, it possesses strong vitality. Marx said: "Once theory is grasped by the masses, it will be turned into a material force."⁽²⁾ "Division of one into two" is precisely such a correct theory. It has been or is being grasped and employed by the broad cadres and masses of our country, and is giving a vigorous impetus to the three great revolutionary movements, namely the class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiments.

With the viewpoint and method of "dividing one into two," we can dissect the intricate social phenomena, "...find out the inter-relationships between the different classes, make a correct class evaluation and after that map out our correct fighting tactics, thus determining what classes constitute the main forces in the revolutionary struggle, what classes we should win over as allies, and what classes must be overthrown."⁽³⁾ We can thus distinguish between friend and foe of the revolution, and formulate correct lines, guidelines and policies. Also, it is only through persisting in the viewpoint and method of "dividing one into two" that the lines, guidelines and policies of the Party can be satisfactorily implemented.

With the viewpoint of "dividing one into two," we can see difficulties at the time of victory. We shall not grow arrogant because of victory, but shall be even more modest and prudent and continuously march forward. We can also see hope at the time of defeat. We shall not be discouraged because of defeat, but shall be full of confidence and turn the defeat into a victory.

With the viewpoint of "dividing one into two," we shall not be scared out of the wits when we are confronted by a powerful enemy, but shall be able to stay cool-headed, and see that although the enemy is strategically a paper tiger, yet tactically it also can be a real tiger. We can thus slight the enemy strategically and take him seriously tactically.

In short, with the viewpoint of "dividing one into two," we can think with a clear head, take the correct direction, be full of confidence, and fight with resolve. ✓
The broad masses of the people know and accept this principle.

If "combining two into one" is used to know things, we are bound to come to the wrong conclusion. The use of such a conclusion to guide work is bound to cause mistakes. The use of such a conclusion to guide struggle is bound to result in failure. The use of such a conclusion to formulate policies is bound to result in a set of revisionist policies. In short, "the use of it to discipline oneself will harm oneself, the use of it to teach other people will harm other people, and the use of it to guide the revolution will harm the revolution."

The masses see things clearly. Why is it that "dividing one into two" was warmly received by the broad cadres and masses as soon as it was put forward? Why is it "combining two into one" was strongly opposed as soon as it reared its head? Does not this show precisely that "dividing one into two" is a truth, while "combining two into one" is a fallacy?

We cannot help from asking Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades:

(2) Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, page 460.

(3) Selected Readings from Mao Tse-tung's Works, Book A, Vol. I, page 22.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin had long ago explicitly explained the law of the unity of opposites, and Chairman Mao has also creatively developed it and properly generalized it with "division of one into two." Why is it that you want to put up "combining two into one" to oppose "dividing of one into two?"

Marx said: "The extent to which a theory is realized in a country is determined by the extent to which this theory is able to meet the needs of the country." (4) It is precisely this theory of "dividing one into two" that arms the broad masses of cadres and people of our country and meets the needs of the cause of socialist revolution and socialist construction in China to the maximum extent. Why is it that Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades want to advance "combining two into one" to depreciate and replace "dividing one into two?"

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen attempts to replace "dividing one into two" with "combining two into one," and Ai and Lin describe "combining two into one" as the "basic law, and depreciate "division of one into two" as a method. In essence, this is also to reject "division of one into two." In their mind, there is no standing for "division of one into two." They attempt to remove "division of one into two" from the Marxist philosophy.

Some of them are also so over-simple and crude as to compare "division of one into two" with the cutting of a melon into two equal parts. This is a distortion of and an attack on the rich method of dialectical analysis, namely "division of one into two."

We persist in "dividing one into two," and are opposed to "combining two into one." "Dividing one into two" is the essence and core of Marxist dialectics, while "combining two into one" is a metaphysical theory based on the reconciliation of contradictions. The latter is wrong in theory, preposterous in logic and politically harmful. We oppose the use of "combining two into one" to replace or supplement "dividing one into two."

II

What is the unity of opposites? This is one of the focal points of the contention between Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades and us.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "The idea of the unity of opposites only indicates that the two aspects of a contradiction are inseparably connected." He also says: "The unity of opposites only means to say that the two aspects of a contradiction are inseparably connected." This is an outright distortion and revision of the idea of the unity of opposites, and is contrary to the Marxist philosophy.

In his lectures, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen very seldom talked about the struggle of opposites and the irreconcilability of contradictions. He also seldom talked about the revolutionary transformation of opposites. He stressed all the time the indivisibility of opposites and the indivisible connection of opposites. This cannot be considered merely as one-sidedness, but is wrong to the extreme.

The article by Comrades Ai and Lin talks a lot about "unity," "connection," and "integration," but fundamentally makes no mention of struggle and revolutionary transformation. Comrades Ai and Lin have quoted in their article the following passage from Lenin dealing with the identity and struggle of opposites: "The identity of opposites... is the recognition (discovery) of the contradictory, mutually exclusive, opposite tendencies in all phenomena and processes of nature (including mind and society).

(4) Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, page 462.

The condition for the knowledge of all processes of the world in their 'self-movement,' in their spontaneous development, in their real life, is the knowledge of them as a unity of opposites." (5) As a matter of fact, the focal point of these words of Lenin lies precisely in explaining the opposite tendencies of the opposites within an entity and the "division of one into two" in things. Ai and Lin distort Lenin's original meaning, and never mention Lenin's "Development is the 'struggle' of opposites." It is to be feared that this is not due to temporary negligence on the part of the authors.

We have also found that Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has quoted in the article "What Do 'Yes - Yes, No - No; 'Yes - No, No - Yes' Mean" these words of Lenin: "In brief, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This embodies the essence of dialectics...." (6) This passage was written by Lenin after the 16 ingredients of dialectics, but in quoting it, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has deleted the last clause: "but it requires explanation and development." We hold that this clause cannot be deleted.

Lenin very clearly stated: "But it requires explanation and development." Lenin had no time to make such "explanation and development," but Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the contemporary great Marxist-Leninist, has made an all-round inquiry into the various aspects of the law of the unity of opposites in his philosophical work "On Contradiction," and given the most explicit explanations and development to Lenin's dialectical thought.

Concerning the unity of opposites and dialectical identity, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has the following elucidation to make in "On Contradiction:" "Identity, unity, coincidence, interpenetration, interpermeation, interdependence (or mutual dependence for existence), interconnection or mutual cooperation - all these different terms mean the same thing and refer to the following two points: first, the existence of each of the two aspects of a contradiction in the process of the development of a thing presupposes the existence of the other aspect, and both aspects coexist in a single entity; second, in given conditions, each of the two contradictory aspects transforms itself into its opposite. This is the meaning of identity." (7) The theory of "combining two into one" of Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades talks only about the unconditional connection of opposites, excludes the struggle of opposites, and rejects the transformation of opposites. What has this in common with dialectical identity?

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has very clearly explained the unity and struggle of opposites.

Mao Tse-tung said: "The interdependence of the contradictory aspects of a thing and the struggle between them determine the life and impel the development of that thing. There is nothing that does not contain contradiction; without contradiction there would be no world." (8)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung also said: "All contradictory things are interconnected, and they not only coexist in an entity under certain conditions, but also transform themselves into each other under certain conditions - this is the whole meaning of the identity of contradiction." (9)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung also said: "Opposites in contradiction unite as well as struggle with each other, and thus impel all things to move and change... In an given phenomenon or thing, the unity of opposites is conditional, temporary and transitory, and hence relative; whereas struggle between opposites is absolute." (10)

From these quotations, we can see very clearly that on the question of unity and struggle of opposites, we should pay attention to the following points:

- (5) Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 38, pages 407-408.
- (6) Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 38, page 240.
- (7) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, page 315.
- (8) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, page 293.
- (9) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, page 293.
- (10) Mao Tse-tung: On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.

First, it is necessary to recognize the identity of opposites, and it is even more necessary to recognize the struggle of opposites. The identity of opposites is relative, whereas the struggle of opposites is absolute. "...struggle resides precisely in identity; without struggle there can be no identity."

Second, when we talk about the unity of opposites, we must see that the opposites depend on each other for existence and provide conditions for the existence of each other according to certain conditions. It is especially necessary to see that the contradictory aspects are transformed into each other under certain conditions.

Third, it is necessary to recognize that "opposites in contradiction unite as well as struggle with each other, and thus impel all things to move and change."

In this connection, the interdependence of opposites for existence is conditional and relative, but not unconditional, whereas the struggle of opposites is absolute, and the object of struggle is to attain a higher stage of development through transformation.

Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades one-sidedly and erroneously suggest that the lively, rich and revolutionary law of the unity of opposites be replaced by the unconditional "inseparable connection" of opposites. This is extremely wrong.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "...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. That is to say, each of the two contradictory aspects within a thing, because of certain conditions, tends to transform itself into the other, to transform itself into the opposite position. This is the second meaning of the identity of contradiction." (Underlines are ours.)(11) The unity of opposites is lively and vivid because it incorporates the important content of "transformation." Divorced from transformation, unity or identity can only be "a dead and rigid thing" as Lenin described it.

All things in the world follow the process of genesis, development and extinction. There are mutually exclusive and interdependent opposites in all things. The force that impels a thing to move is within the thing and not outside it. Struggle within the contradiction penetrates the development of a thing from beginning to end. A thing goes through the process of genesis, development and extinction and gives place to a new thing. This is the process of the mutual struggle and continuous transformation of opposites in contradiction within the thing. "...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. And the moment the new aspect gains dominance over the old, the old thing changes qualitatively into a new thing."(12) This kind of transformation is different from a simple shift of position and quantitative change. It is not a monotonous cycle, but is a qualitative leap, and every transformation impels the thing to a higher form. Nature, human society and the movement of thinking all act in this way.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "Marxist philosophy holds that the most important problem does not lie in understanding the laws of the objective world and thus being able to explain it, but in applying the knowledge of these laws actively to change the world."(13) He also said: "The task of communists is to expose the fallacies of the reactionaries and metaphysicians, to propagate the dialectics inherent in things, and so accelerate the transformation of things and achieve the goal of revolution."(14)

- (11) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, pages 316-317.
- (12) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, page 311.
- (13) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, pages 280-281.
- (14) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, page 318.

How are things transformed? Can it be done with the method of "combining," "connecting" and "uniting," that is "combining two into one?" We say: this cannot be done. Can the transformation of opposites be effected by talking only about "the indivisible connection of opposites"? We say: this cannot be done. The determining factor which brings about the transformation of opposites is struggle within the contradiction. Without struggle within the contradiction, there is no transformation. Contradiction exists universally and for ever. Where there is contradiction, there is struggle. Contradictions cannot be reconciled. Contradictions must be solved through struggle.

The struggle against bourgeois nationalism in Sinkiang region also illustrates this problem. The proletarian national outlook and the bourgeois national outlook are too sharply opposed world outlooks and opposites in contradiction. The proletarian national outlook holds that national problem is a class problem, and as Lenin described it, "there are two nations in every modern nation, and there are two kinds of national culture in every kind of national culture." (15) This is "division of one into two." The bourgeois national outlook covers up and obliterates the class content of the national problem, and a handful of recalcitrant nationalists in Sinkiang once raised a hue and cry about "national contradiction," and attempted to sabotage the solidarity of the different nationalities in China and split the unification of the fatherland. The contradiction between us Marxists and them has fundamentally no room for reconciliation. We can only "divide one into two," and fight resolutely, but can never "combining two into one," reconcile the contradiction, and give up the struggle. Under the correct leadership of the Party, the people of different nationalities in Sinkiang have gone through a fierce struggle, repulsed the attack of local nationalism, strengthened the solidarity of nationalities, consolidated the unification of the fatherland, transformed things, and attained the revolutionary goal.

If we act in accordance with Yang Hsien-chen and other comrades' viewpoint of "combining two into one," it only leads to the fusion of contradiction and the reconciliation of struggle, and we will be fundamentally unable to attain the revolutionary goal. This is precisely the viewpoint to which modern revisionism gives wide publicity.

III

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "The study of dialectics seeks to learn the ability to connect together two opposite ideas." He also says: "The study of the law of the unity of opposites seeks to learn the ability to connect together two opposite ideas." This runs counter to Marxism-Leninism.

What is the object of studying dialectics? Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "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 solving contradictions."

Let us ask: Is there anything in common between what Comrade Yang Hsien-chen has said and what Chairman Mao has said?

Right now, we are uniting with more than 90 per cent of the people throughout the world to wage a tit-for-tat and life-and-death struggle against the reactionary forces of the world headed by U.S. imperialism. Can it be said that we should not "divide one into two," draw a line of demarcation, and fight resolutely, but should turn around to "combining two into one," "connect together" the imperialist ideology and the revolutionary ideology, reconcile the struggle, and thus surrender to imperialism like the modern revisionists?

(15) Lenin: On the National Question and the National Colonial Question, page 115.

Right now, in the international communist movement, our Party holds high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and unites with all Marxist revolutionaries throughout the world to wage a fierce struggle against modern revisionism headed by Khrushchev. Can it be said that we should not "divide one into two," clearly draw a line of demarcation, and fight resolutely, but should turn around to "combine two into one," "connect together" the Marxist ideology and the revisionist ideology, blur the line of thinking, abandon the struggle, and bow to the baton of revisionism?

Right now, China is in the course of carrying out the socialist education campaign on a broad front to a great depth and the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between the socialist road and the capitalist road. Can it be said that we should not "divide one into two," clearly draw a line of demarcation, fight resolutely and uproot revisionism, but should turn around to "combine two into one," "connect together" the proletarian ideology and the bourgeois ideology, the socialist ideology and the capitalist ideology, and allow the capitalist ideology to have its way?

There is no way for the advocates of the theory of "combining two into one" to answer these sharp questions.

Comrade Ai and Lin even go so far as to depart from class analysis and class boundary to talk about "it takes love to know ugliness and hate to know beauty," want us to "connect together" unconsciously, through "combining two into one," "love" and "hate," "ugliness" and "beauty," which are ideas and sentiments standing fundamentally in opposition to each other. This is most erroneous and also extremely harmful.

As a matter of fact, the theory of connecting together and combining opposite ideas is nothing new and novel. Looking through Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, we can see that early in the 20th century, a handful of Machists like Bogdanov once openly called for the combination of Marxist materialism with Machism and socialism with religion, and exalted their empirio-criticism which is Machism in a Russian mantle as a "new philosophy" superior to materialism and idealism. Lenin violently attacked them and subjected their so-called "new philosophy" to scathing criticism. What the advocates of the theory of "combining two into one" advocate is precisely the shadow of this "new philosophy" which was scathingly criticized and attacked by Lenin.

In a class society, there will be no philosophical viewpoint which is "above class." Every philosophical viewpoint is the world outlook of a certain class, and reflects the interests and needs of a certain class.

The Marxist philosophy is not a philosophy to fuse contradiction or to reconcile struggle, but is a militant philosophy, a revolutionary philosophy. It openly states that it is the spiritual weapon of the proletariat, persists in proletarian class struggle and proletarian dictatorship, mercilessly opposes all non-proletarian world outlooks, and thoroughly serves the proletarian revolution. This is the firm and unshakable party spirit and principle of the Marxist philosophy. The core of the revolutionary dialectics of Marxism is its theory of the unity of opposites, which is also "division of one into two." All enemies of Marxism fear it, hate it, and oppose it. It is precisely this very essence of the Marxist philosophy that the modern revisionists devise all ways and means to attack and revise. It is also this very essence of the Marxist philosophy that the advocates of the theory of "combining two into one" attempt to remove. Their dream can never be realized.

The contention between "dividing one into two" and "combining two into one" is not ordinary academic contention, but a struggle between the two world outlooks of dialectics and metaphysics.

Chairman Mao said: "The other side of truth, goodness and beauty is falsity, badness and ugliness. Without falsity, badness and ugliness, there will be no truth, goodness and beauty truth and fallacy are opposites. In human society, and in the world of nature, an entity will always disintegrate into different parts which are different in substance and form under different concrete conditions... At all times there will be such opposites as goodness and badness, good and evil, beauty and ugliness. It is the same with fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds. The relationship between them is always one of unity and struggle of opposites. Discrimination is possible only with comparison, development is possible only with discrimination and struggle. Truth is developed in the struggle against error." (Selected Readings from Mao Tse-tung's Works, Book A, Vol. II, Page 513)

The idea of "dividing one into two" is truth. Truth has no fear for controversy. It will develop further in the struggle against the fallacy of "combining two into one," emit greater brilliance, and penetrate deeper into the mind of the people.

Long live "division of one into two"!

July 25, 1964

(Reproduced from Sinkiang Jih-pao, September 9)

* * *

END