

CULTURAL REVOLUTION

Thoroughly Reckon with Hou Wai-lu for His Crime of
Advocating the Theory of "Combining Two into One"

by
Shih Hung-ping (史红兵)

(Peking Kuang-ming Jih-pao, March 31, 1967)

The following is a renewed attack on Hou Wai-lu, a noted Chinese historian, for his advocacy of "combining two into one," which is "revisionist" in nature and the very antithesis of the principle of "one dividing into two" advocated by Mao Tse-tung.--SCMP Ed.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "Whoever wants to overthrow political power always has to shape public opinion and undertake work in the ideological field. Revolutionary classes do so and so do counter-revolutionary classes."

Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, reactionary bourgeois academic "authorities" are precisely engaged in shaping public opinion in preparation for a capitalist restoration. Therefore, it is necessary to expose these people and thoroughly criticize and repudiate them.

Hou Wai-lu (侯外庐), a reactionary bourgeois academic "authority," is a past master in opposing communism and opposing the people. Under the guise of conducting "academic" research, he has for a long time carried out rabid attacks against the Party, against socialism and against the thought of Mao Tse-tung. One of his heinous crimes is his advocacy of the reactionary concept of "combining two into one" by quoting extensively from Fang I-chih's book, The Equilibrium of Things (东西均).

Since 1961 Hou Wai-lu has done his utmost to applaud Fang I-chih, the character who resented revolutionary peasant wars in the last years of the Ming Dynasty, and his philosophical ideas in such big poisonous weeds as The Philosophical Ideas Embodied in Fang I-chih's Book, "The Equilibrium of Things and Preface to "The Equilibrium of Things.

Using ancient things to satirize the contemporary, Hou Wai-lu on the one hand regarded himself as Fang I-chih, invoking Fang's spirit to serve his own political aims. He said, for instance: "In social struggles in the later part of the Ming Dynasty and in resist-Ch'ing struggles in the early part of the Ch'ing Dynasty, Fang I-chih was a powerful leader of a political faction. Similarly, when academic ideas flourished in the transition period from Ming to Ch'ing, Fang I-chih was also a stalwart of the school of thought which was characterized by an alliance between natural sciences and philosophy. His philosophical thought and that of Wang Ch'uan-shan were big banners of the same epoch, an important aspect of the spirit of the times in China during the 17th century." Here, Hou Wai-lou cited Fang I-chih's struggle in the 17th century for the restoration of the Ming court in allusion to himself who would strive to restore capitalism in the 20th century. Hou was thus bent on being the "leader of a political faction" against the Party, against socialism and against Mao Tse-tung's thought, the "mainstay of academic factions and the "big banner of the times." Moreover, Hou had the ambition of emulating Fang I-chih and became one who "claimed that he would carry a sword and rally ambitious followers to transform the dark world."

On the other hand, Hou Wai-lu with ulterior motives misinterpreted Fang I-chih's metaphysical concept of "combining two into one" as "quite brilliant" "materialistic and purely dialectical viewpoint." He did so to attack Chairman Mao's scientific and revolutionary dialectics of "one divides into two." Hou's advocacy of Fang I-chih's theory of "combining two into one" provided a historical "basis" for Yang Hsien-chen's fallacy of "combining two into one" and furnished a reactionary theory for capitalist restoration.

What follows shows how Hou Wai-lu has used the concept of "combining two into one" to hurl frenzied attacks on the great thought of Mao Tse-tung.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The principle of contradictions between things, that is, the law of unity of opposites, is the fundamental rule of materialistic dialectics." "The law of unity of opposites is the fundamental law of the universe."

Chairman Mao's teachings show that all things follow the law of "one divides into two," that is the law of unity of opposites.

Contrary to Chairman Mao's scientific thesis, Hou Wai-lu pointed asserted that things tended to "combine two into one" and that the "combination of two into one" constituted "dialectics." Using this principle to "explain the laws of all things in the universe," Hou Wai-lu claimed that what Fang I-chih brought up in his book, such as existence and non-existence, the abstract and the concrete, motion and stillness, the negative and positive principles in nature, life and death and so on, were "all the two sides of contradictions, splitting one into two and the combination of two into one." He then quoted Fang I-chih's words to confirm the "combination of two into one." He also advocated Fang I-chih's "attempt to use this principle to explain the laws of all things in the universe."

Here, Hou Wai-lu asserted that the contradictory aspects of things tended to "split one into two" but would eventually resolve into "combination of two into one." Claiming that the contradictory aspects of all things in the world, past or present, would "transform" one another, Hou held that all things tended to "combine two into one" and that they would be "either one of the two," that is the combination of two into one. Thus Hou negated the basic law of the universe that all things conform to the "division" of one into two."

Since Hou Wai-lu worked in collusion with Yang Hsien-chen, a counter-revolutionary element, the counter-revolutionary theories espoused by both are identical. Didn't Yang Hsien-chen make similar remarks? For instance, Yang said: "All things tend to 'combine two into one.'" "What is called unity of opposites? An old Chinese saying goes, 'Combining two into one.' This means that all things tend to combine two into one, in the same sense as one divides into two." Clearly, Yang Hsien-chen found from Hou Wai-lu the historical "basis" of "combining two into one" before further developing this counter-revolutionary theory.

What in the main, then, is embodied in what Hou Wai-lu described as "brilliant" "dialectical" viewpoint of "combining two into one"?

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The unity of opposites is conditional, temporary and relative while the struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute." "Yet struggle is inherent in identity and without struggle there can be no identity."

Hou Wai-lu's "combination of two into one" is diametrically opposed to the brilliant thought of Mao Tse-tung. Since Hou recognizes the "identity" of opposites but not the struggle of opposites, therefore, his "identity" becomes one without contradictions and without "struggle." This is metaphysical "identity" which has nothing in common with revolutionary dialectics. What Fang I-chih called "mingling of two into one," "joining of two ends," "intermingling of two ends," "union of two ends," "unity of contradictions" and so forth refer to the intermingling or combination of opposites resulting in the "combination of two into one, without

mutually exclusive struggle. This is identical to Yang Hsien-chen's view that the "unity of contradictions merely refers to the inseparable joining together of the two aspects of a contradiction."

Hou Wai-lu's fallacy became more pronounced in his interpretation of the formula of "submission, extinction and unity" as given in Fang I-chih's book, The Equilibrium of Things, Hou said, for instance: "In the sense 'submission' is implied in Fang I-chih's book, it is sometimes analogous to 'existence' which means affirmation or correspondence to the right subject. In its original sense, 'extinction' means the end which is placed in opposition to 'existence' in Fang I-chih's book. For instance, the saying that 'having is not having and existence means extinction' implies negation or antithesis. 'Unity' synthesizes 'submission' and 'extinction' into 'submission' of 'a further stage,' which Fang I-chih sometimes called 'transcendence,' this being analogous to negation of negation or synthesis."

As a matter of fact, "submission, extinction and unity" conform to the idealistic principles of Buddhism. However, Hou Wai-lu has arbitrarily interpreted "submission" and "extinction" as the two opposites synthesized and embodied in either "unity" or "transcendence." Wasn't Hou trying to propagate by insinuation the fallacy that between opposites in things there was only "unity" and no struggle? Hou even misinterpreted as "dialectics" this basic metaphysical principle with "synthesis" of opposites but without struggle. For instance, he said that the concepts of "submission," "extinction" and "unity" related to his methodology of dialectics. He added: "Fang I-chih's simple dialectics has observed in form the law governing the negation of negation, a great discovery transcending what others before him have discovered." This is indeed an outrageous attack against revolutionary dialectics.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The fundamental cause of the development of things lies in the inside and not outside things, in the internal contradictions of things." "The combination of conditional, relative identity and unconditional, absolute struggle constitutes the movement of opposites in all things."

Hou Wai-lu's interpretation of the movement, transformation and development of things is also opposed to the brilliant thought of Mao Tse-tung. He held that the word "equality" as cited in Fang I-chih's book "implies unity and movement of two ends." He said that the title of Fang I-chih's book suggested inclusion of answers to questions, indicating that the purpose of this book was to discuss the internal contradictions of matter and the movement arising from the unity of contradictions." He also held that the "interlocking of two ends constitutes natural motion." What nonsense! In other words, Hou Wai-lu repudiated Chairman Mao's teaching that "Unity and struggle of contradictory opposites propel the movement and transformation of things," claiming that the "unity of two ends" "unity of contradictions" and "interlocking of two ends," that is the combination of opposites, constituted the movement of things.

Hou Wai-lu's reactionary fallacy finds concentrated expression in his interpretation of Fang I-chih's formula of "interlocking" "rotation" and "fulfillment." Hou, for instance, said: "Interlocking" refers to the union of opposites in what Fang I-chih called the 'combination of two into one,' or the relationship between 'contrary causes' or 'interlocking of what is superficial and what is concrete.' 'rotation' means motion and transformation in what Fang I-chih called the 'linking of the head with the tail,' 'stopping motion' and 'continuation of what goes before and what comes after.' 'chi' (止) means the attainment of a higher stage in incessant motion. What Fang I-chih said referred to what he called 'Ceaseless endeavor instead of stopping motion' and 'The reason why diligence can prevent stopping of motion is that ceaseless labor is applied to the extreme.'"

As a matter of fact, what Fang I-chih meant by "intermingling," "rotation" and "fulfillment" may be likened to idealistic deductions in mathematics. However, Hou Wai-lu went out of his way to say that the movement of things as implied in Fang I-chih's book was motivated by the "intermingling" of opposites--that is the "combination of two into one"--rather than by the struggle of opposites or the contradictions inherent in things. Hou asserted that this "movement" merely constituted a recurring cycle such as the "linking of the head with the tail" but without the quality of revolutionary flying leap.

Highly evaluating Fang I-chih's formula of "interlocking," "rotation" and "fulfillment," Hou Wai-lu regarded it as analogous in form to the law governing the transformation of contradictions. Since Fang I-chih brought up a host of "sobering" subjects, he basically negated the scientific revolutionary thesis that the law of unity of opposites provides the fundamental motive force for the struggle of opposites in the development of things.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "When we said that two opposite things can coexist in a single entity and can transform themselves into each other because there is identity between them, we were speaking of conditionality, that is to say, in given conditions two contradictory things can be united and can transform themselves into each other, but in the absence of these conditions, they cannot constitute a contradiction, cannot coexist in the same entity and cannot transform themselves into one another. It is because the identity of opposites obtains only in given conditions that we have said identity is conditional and relative. We may add that the struggle between opposites permeates a process from beginning to end and makes one process transform itself into another, that it is ubiquitous, and that struggle is therefore unconditional and absolute."

Chairman Mao has creatively and comprehensively expounded the theory concerning the law of unity of opposites, thereby elevating to the peak materialistic dialectics of Marxism-Leninism. This is Chairman Mao's greatest contribution to Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought.

However, in doing his utmost to advocate the reactionary philosophy of "combining two into one" which rejects and negates the struggle of opposites, Hou Wai-lu has precisely run counter to the great thought of Mao Tse-tung on the fundamental thesis of materialistic dialectics in respect to the law of unity of opposites. Hou has thus betrayed his counter-revolutionary nature of cherishing deep-seated hatred for the great thought of Mao Tse-tung.

By cleverly disguising Fang I-chih's fallacy of "combining two into one" with the garland of materialistic dialectics, Hou Wai-lu had the objective of purposely obliterating the essential difference between the great thought of Mao Tse-tung and Fang I-chih's fallacy of "combining two into one." He did so to continue hawking his reactionary theory that "Mao Tse-tung's thought is a union of Marxism and fine Chinese traditions," vainly hoping to repudiate and overthrow the philosophical basis of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought by way of tampering with the fundamental law of nature and society, that is the law of unity of opposites.

Materialistic dialectics is the militant philosophy of the revolution, the proletarian world outlook and the combat weapon of the revolutionary people. "Of all principles of Marxism, they may be summed up in the last analysis in one sentence: 'To rebel is justified.'" This constitutes proletarian philosophy.

On the other hand, the concept of "combining two into one" is one which rejects the philosophical view of the struggle of opposites. When this idea is applied to society, it negates class contradictions and class struggle, negates the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It embodies the theory of class conciliation and that of extinction of class struggle. The concept of "combining two

into one" constitutes the philosophical basis of the theory of class conciliation and that of extinction of class struggle. It is precisely a theoretical weapon with which the bourgeoisie and revisionists attack the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. From Proudhon, Dühring, Bernstein, Kautsky, Bukharin, Deborin to modern revisionism, these people always wave the tattered black banner when frenziedly attacking Marxism-Leninism. As apologists of the bourgeoisie, they raise the cry of promoting "class conciliation" and "extinction of class struggle" while in reality permitting only the bourgeoisie to exploit and oppress the proletariat and attack them but prohibiting the proletariat from rebelling against and counter-attacking the bourgeoisie. Thus, the philosophy of all exploiting classes and all reactionaries is embodied in the idea that "to exploit and oppress others is justified but to rebel is unjustified."

During the period before and after 1961, why then did Yang Hsien-chen, Hou Wai-lu and the like raise the black banner? This was a product of the situation of class struggle in China and on an international scale. In the international scene at the time, modern revisionists of the Khrushchev clique were launching rabid attacks on Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought, assailing in particular Marxist-Leninist theories of class struggle, proletarian dictatorship and revolutionary dialectics. These people put forward such modern revisionist slogans and programs as "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful transition" and "peaceful competition" and "a State for the whole people" and "a party for the whole people." In China at the time, the national economy suffered temporary difficulties, gusts of ill wind for a capitalist restoration were stirred up everywhere, demons and monsters appeared in large numbers, and counter-revolutionary revisionist elements put forward such counter-revolutionary revisionist programs as "three-conciliation and one-reduction" and "three-freedom and one-guarantee," with the object of restoring capitalism. It was precisely in this situation of class struggle and with a view to meeting the pressing political needs of class enemies both at home and abroad and providing demons and monsters with a philosophical and theoretical basis that Yang Hsien-chen, Hou Wai-lu and the like lost no time in letting out the fallacy of "combining two into one." They did so to prepare public opinion for a counter-revolutionary restoration.

The fallacy of "combining two into one" and the theory of class conciliation and that of extinction of class struggle, advocated by Hou Wai-lu, a counter-revolutionary revisionist element and a reactionary bourgeois academic "authority," and the like, work like charms in protecting the bourgeoisie and are poisoned arrows shot at the proletariat. These people were well aware that class contradictions in no way could be resolved through class conciliation and that only through class struggle could they be resolved. They were also aware that in a class society class struggle in no way could be extinguished. The real purpose why Yang Hsien-chen, Hou Wai-lu and the like advocated the theory of class conciliation and that of extinction of class struggle is that they sought to use these revisionist theories to benumb the proletariat in a futile attempt to make the revolutionary slacken their vigilance against the bourgeoisie, abandon the struggle against them, and create favorable conditions for the bourgeoisie to attack the proletariat wantonly and indiscriminately.

Hou Wai-lu himself precisely did so. When China was experiencing temporary economic difficulties, he released big poisonous weeds such as On T'ang Hsien-tsu's Four Plays, A General History of Chinese Thought (volume 4), Utopian Ideals in Chinese Dynasties, The Ideological Traditions of Not Fearing Ghosts and Gods in Ancient Times in China, Some Questions on "Brothers" and Other Historical Plays, On Liu Chih-chi's Philosophical and Historical Ideas, Fu Shan's Manuscripts on Notes on Hsu Tzu. In a vicious tone, Hou said: "If the world cannot be slashed by the sword, it can be cut open by the pen." Thus Hou Wai-lu who advocated the fallacy of "combining two into one," the theory of class conciliation and that of extinction of class struggle serves as the advance guard of the campaign against the Party, against socialism and against Mao Tse-tung's thought.

The great thought of Mao Tse-tung is the acme and the most creative development of Marxism-Leninism in the contemporary epoch. Like a mad dog barking at the sun, the enemy's opposition in no way can impair the brilliance of Mao Tse-tung's thought. Instead, it all the more proves the incomparable greatness of Mao Tse-tung's thought. The revolutionary people who are armed with the great thought of Mao Tse-tung "can go up to the skies to touch the moon or dive into the depths of the ocean to catch turtles." Whoever opposes the great thought of Mao Tse-tung will knock his head against the wall until it bleeds. This is what is in store for Hou Wai-lu and all monsters and demons.

All quotations pertaining to the concept of "combining two into one" as advocated by Hou Wai-lu are attributed to Hou's article entitled The Philosophical Ideas Embodied in Fang I-chih's Book "The Equilibrium of Things" (carried in Jen-min Jih-pao, August 6, 1961 and Preface to "The Equilibrium of Things" (published in 1962 by Chung Hua Book Store). Their sources are therefore omitted.--KNJP Ed.

* * *