

ON
CONTRADICTION

Mao Tse-tung



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1953, BY
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.



PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Editor's Note

This philosophical essay was written in August 1937, and was originally delivered as a lecture at the Anti-Japanese Military and Political College in Yen-an. Like *On Practice*, written in the same year, this work was directed against dogmatism in the Chinese Communist Party.

On its inclusion in the *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, published in Peking in 1952, the author made certain additions, deletions, and revisions. The present translation is from the new Chinese text.

Contents

1. The Two World Outlooks	10
2. The Universality of Contradiction	15
3. The Particularity of Contradiction	20
4. The Principal Contradiction and the Principal Aspect of a Contradiction	34
5. The Identity and Struggle of the Aspects of a Contradiction	42
6. The Role of Antagonism in Contradiction	50
7. Conclusion	53
<i>Explanatory and Reference Notes</i>	57

On Contradiction

THE LAW OF CONTRADICTION IN THINGS, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the most basic law in materialist dialectics. Lenin said: "In its proper meaning, dialectics is the study of the contradiction within the very essence of things."¹ Lenin often called this law the essence of dialectics; he also called it the kernel of dialectics.² Therefore, in studying this law, we cannot but touch upon a wide range of subjects, upon a great number of problems of philosophy. If we can clear up all these problems, we shall arrive at a basic understanding of materialist dialectics. These problems are: the two world outlooks; the universality of contradiction; the particularity of contradiction; the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of a contradiction; the identity and the struggle of the aspects of a contradiction; the role of antagonism in contradiction.

In recent years, philosophical circles in the Soviet Union have subjected the idealism of the Deborin school to criticism. This has aroused great interest among us. Deborin's idealism has exerted a very bad influence in the Chinese Communist Party, and it cannot be said that dogmatic ways of thought in our Party have nothing to do with the style of work of this school. Thus our present study of philosophy should have as its principal objective the eradication of dogmatic ways of thought.

I. The Two World Outlooks

In the history of human knowledge, there have always been two views on the laws of development of the world: The metaphysical view and the dialectical view, which form two mutually opposed world outlooks. Lenin said: "The two basic (or two possible? or two historically observable?) conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the division of the one into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal relation)."³ Lenin was referring to these two different world outlooks.

For a very long period of history, in China as well as in Europe, metaphysics formed part of the idealist world outlook and occupied a dominant position in human thought. In the early days of the bourgeoisie in Europe, materialism was also metaphysical. The Marxist materialist-dialectical world outlook emerged because the social economy of many European countries had entered the stage of highly-developed capitalism; because the productive forces, the class struggle, and the sciences all developed to a level unprecedented in history; and because the industrial proletariat had become the greatest motive force in historical development. Then, besides an openly avowed, extremely barefaced, reactionary idealism, vulgar evolutionism also emerged from the bourgeoisie to oppose materialist dialectics.

The so-called metaphysical world outlook or the world outlook of vulgar evolutionism means looking at the world from an isolated, static, and one-sided point of view. It regards all things in the world, their forms and their species, as forever isolated from one another and forever changeless. If any change is admitted, it is merely an increase or decrease in quantity or a

transfer in space. Moreover, the cause of such an increase or decrease or transfer does not lie inside things, but outside them, that is, through propulsion by external forces. Metaphysicians hold that all varieties of things in the world, as well as their characteristics, have remained the same since the moment they came into being. Any subsequent change is a mere quantitative expansion or contraction. They hold that a thing can only be repeatedly reproduced as the self-same thing forever and cannot change into something of a different kind. In their eyes, capitalist exploitation, capitalist competition, the ideology of individualism in capitalist society, and so on, can all be found in the slave society of antiquity, or even in primitive society, and will continue to exist forever without any change.

As to the causes of social development, they find the explanation in conditions external to society like geography and climate. They naively seek outside the things themselves for the cause of their development, and repudiate the theory advanced by materialist dialectics that it is the contradictions inside things that cause their development. Therefore, they cannot explain the multiplicity of the quantities of things; nor can they explain the phenomenon of one quality changing into another. In Europe, this mode of thought existed as mechanistic materialism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and as vulgar evolutionism at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. In China, the metaphysical mode of thought that "Heaven changes not, and the Way too changes not,"⁴ was for a long time supported by the decadent feudal ruling classes. Imported from Europe in the last hundred years, mechanistic materialism and vulgar evolutionism have been supported by the bourgeoisie.

Contrary to the metaphysical world outlook, the materialist-dialectical world outlook advocates the study of the development of things from the inside, from the relationship of a thing to other things. The development of things should be regarded as their internal and necessary self-movement, a thing in its movement and the things around it should be regarded as interconnected and interacting upon each other. The basic cause of

the development of things does not lie outside but inside them, in their internal contradictions. The movement and development of things arise because of the presence of such contradictions inside all things. This contradiction within a thing is the basic cause of its development, while the interconnection of a thing with, and its interaction upon, other things are the secondary causes of its development. Thus materialist dialectics forcefully combats the theory of external causes of propulsion advanced by metaphysical mechanistic materialism and vulgar evolutionism. It is evident that purely external causes can only lead to the mechanical motion of things, that is, to changes in size and quantity, but cannot explain why things are qualitatively different in a thousand and one ways and why things change into one another. As a matter of fact, even a mechanical motion of things propelled by some external force is also brought about through their internal contradictions. Mere growth in plants and animals and their quantitative development are also chiefly caused by their internal contradictions.

Similarly, social development is chiefly due not to external, but to internal causes. Many countries exist under almost the same geographical and climatic conditions, yet the difference and unevenness in their development are extremely great. Tremendous social changes take place even in one and the same country, while its geography and climate have not changed. Imperialist Russia changed into the Socialist Soviet Union, and feudal, insulated Japan changed into imperialist Japan, although the geography and climate of these two countries have not changed. China, for long dominated by feudalism, has undergone great changes in the last hundred years and is now changing in the direction of a new China, liberated and free; yet her geography and climate have not changed. The geography and climate of the earth as a whole and of every part of it are also changing, but these changes obviously appear very small when compared with changes in society. In the former the changes manifest themselves in terms of tens of thousands or millions of years, while in the latter they manifest themselves in mere thousands, hundreds, tens, or even a few years or even months

(as in times of revolution). According to the viewpoint of materialist dialectics, changes in nature are chiefly due to the development of the internal contradictions in nature. Social changes are chiefly due to the internal contradictions in society, namely, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the contradiction between the classes, and the contradiction between the old and the new. It is the development of these contradictions that impels society forward and starts the process of the superseding of the old society by a new one.

Does materialist dialectics leave external causes out of account? Not at all. Materialist dialectics considers external causes as the condition of change and internal causes as the basis of change, external causes becoming operative through internal causes. In a suitable temperature an egg changes into a chicken, but no temperature can change a stone into a chicken because the fundamentals of the two things are different. There is a constant, interacting influence between the peoples of different countries. In the era of capitalism, especially in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, interacting influences and stimulation — political, economic and cultural—between various countries have been extremely great.

The Socialist October Revolution ushered in a new epoch not only in Russian history but also in world history, exerting an influence on the internal changes in all countries of the world and, in a similar and yet particularly profound way, on the internal changes in China. Such changes, however, arose according to an inner necessity in those countries as well as in China. Two armies engage in battle; one is victorious and the other is defeated: Both victory and defeat are determined by internal causes. One is victorious either because of its strength or because of its correct command; the other is defeated either because of its weakness or because of its incompetent command: It is through internal causes that external causes become operative. In 1927 the Chinese big bourgeoisie defeated the proletariat, operating through the opportunism existing within the Chinese proletariat itself (within the Chinese Communist Party). When we liqui-

dated this opportunism, the Chinese revolution resumed its advance. Later, the Chinese revolution again suffered severe blows from the enemy, because adventurism appeared within our party. When we liquidated this adventurism, our cause once more resumed its advance. Thus, if a political party is to lead the revolution to victory, it must rely upon the correctness of its own political line and the consolidation of its own organization.

The dialectical world outlook had already emerged in ancient times in both China and Europe. But ancient dialectics has something spontaneous and naive about it. Being based upon the social and historical conditions of those times, it could not fully explain the world, and was later supplanted by metaphysics. The famous German philosopher Hegel, who lived from the latter part of the eighteenth century to the early part of the nineteenth, made very important contributions to dialectics, but his is idealist dialectics. It was not until the great men of action of the proletarian movement, Marx and Engels, made a synthesis of the positive achievements in the history of human knowledge and, in particular, critically absorbed the rational elements of Hegelian dialectics, and created the great theory of dialectical materialism and historical materialism, that a great, unprecedented revolution took place in the history of human knowledge. Subsequently, this great theory has been further developed by Lenin and Stalin. As soon as it was introduced into China, this theory brought about tremendous changes in the sphere of Chinese thought.

This dialectical world outlook chiefly teaches man how to be good at observing and analyzing the movement in opposites of various things and, on the basis of such analyses, to point out the methods of resolving the contradictions. Consequently, it is of paramount importance for us to understand concretely the law of contradiction in things.

II. The Universality of Contradiction

For convenience in exposition, I shall deal here first with the universality of contradiction, and then with the particularity of contradiction. Because the great creators and continuers of Marxism—Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin—established the materialist-dialectical world outlook, applied materialist dialectics with very great success to many aspects of the analysis of human history and natural history, to many aspects of changes in society and nature (as in the Soviet Union), and because the universality of contradiction is admitted by a great number of people, only a few words need be said to clarify this problem. But there are still many comrades, especially the dogmatists, who are not clear about the problem of the particularity of contradiction. They do not understand that the universality of contradiction resides precisely in the particularity of contradiction. Nor do they understand the great significance which the study of the particularity of contradiction in the concrete things confronting us has for our guidance in the development of revolutionary practice. Therefore, the problem of the particularity of contradiction should be studied with special attention and explained at sufficient length. For this reason, when we analyze the law of contradiction in things, we should first analyze the problem of the universality of contradiction, then analyze with special attention the problem of the particularity of contradiction, and finally return to the problem of the universality of contradiction.

The problem of the universality or absoluteness of contradiction has a twofold meaning. One is that contradiction exists in the process of development of all things; the other is that in the process of development of each thing a movement in opposites exists from beginning to end.

Engels said: "Motion itself is a contradiction."⁵ Lenin defines the law of the unity of opposites as "the recognition (discovery) of the contradictory, *mutually exclusive*, opposite tendencies in *all* phenomena and processes of nature (*including* mind and society)."⁶ Are these views correct? Yes, they are. The mutual dependence and mutual struggle of the aspects of contradiction contained in all things determine the life of all things and impel their development. There is nothing that does not contain contradiction; without contradiction there would be no world.

Contradiction is the basis of simple forms of motion (*e.g.*, mechanical motion) and still more the basis of complex forms of motion.

Engels explained the universality of contradiction in these terms: "If simple mechanical change of place contains a contradiction, this is even more true of the higher forms of motion of matter, and especially of organic life and its development. . . . Life consists just precisely in this—that a living thing is at each moment itself and yet something else. Life is therefore also a contradiction which is present in things and processes themselves, and which constantly asserts and solves itself; and as soon as the contradiction ceases, life too comes to an end, and death steps in. We likewise saw that also in the sphere of thought we could not avoid contradiction, and that, for example, the contradiction between man's inherently unlimited faculty of knowledge and its actual realization in men who are limited by their external conditions and limited also in their intellectual faculties finds its solution in what is, for us at least, and from a practical standpoint, an endless succession of generations, in infinite progress. . . ."

"One of the basic principles of higher mathematics is the contradiction. . . . But even lower mathematics teems with contradictions."⁷

Lenin likewise explained the universality of contradiction as follows:

"In mathematics: $+$ and $-$; differential and integral.

"In mechanics: action and reaction.

"In physics: positive and negative electricity.

"In chemistry: the combination and dissociation of atoms.

"In social science: the class struggle."⁸

In war, offense and defense, advance and retreat, victory and defeat are all contradictory phenomena. Without the one, the other cannot exist. These two aspects struggle and also unite with each other, constituting the totality of the war, impelling the war's development, and solving the war's problems.

Every difference in man's concepts should be regarded as the reflection of objective contradictions. Objective contradictions are reflected in subjective thought, constituting the movement in opposites of concepts, impelling the development of thought, and ceaselessly solving the problems that arise in man's thinking.

Within the party, opposition and struggle between different ideologies occur constantly; they are the reflection in the party of the class contradictions and the contradictions between the old and the new things in society. If in the party there were neither contradictions nor ideological struggles to solve contradictions, the party's life would come to an end.

Thus the point is already clear: Whether in simple or complex forms of motion, whether in objective or ideological phenomena, contradiction exists universally, exists in all processes. But does contradiction also exist at the initial stage of every process? Is there a movement in opposites in the process of development of everything from beginning to end?

From the writings of Soviet philosophical circles in criticism of the Deborin school, it can be seen that this school holds the view that contradiction does not appear at the very beginning of a process, but only at a certain stage of its development. Consequently, up to that moment, the development of the process is due not to internal causes, but to external ones. In this way, Deborin returns to the metaphysical theory of external causes and of mechanism. Applying such a view in the analysis of concrete problems, his school sees that under conditions in the Soviet Union there are only differences but no contradictions between the kulaks and the peasants in general, thus agreeing entirely with Bukharin's view. In analyzing the French Revolution, it holds that before the revolution there were only differ-

ences but no contradictions in the Third Estate composed of the workers, the peasants, and the bourgeoisie.

These views of the Deborin school are anti-Marxist. This school does not understand that every difference in the world already contains a contradiction, that difference is contradiction. There has been contradiction between labor and capital ever since they came into being—only at first it was not yet intensified. There is a difference between the workers and the peasants even under the social conditions of the Soviet Union, and the difference between them is contradiction—but, unlike that between labor and capital, this contradiction will not become intensified into antagonism and will not assume the form of class struggle. In the course of socialist construction the workers and the peasants have formed a firm alliance and will gradually resolve this contradiction in the process of development from socialism to communism. This is a question of difference in the character of contradictions, not a matter of the presence or absence of contradictions. Contradiction is universal, absolute, existing in all processes of the development of things and running through all processes from beginning to end.

What is the emergence of a new process? It occurs when the old unity and its constituent opposites yield place to a new unity and its constituent opposites, and the new process then emerges in place of the old. The old process is completed, and the new one emerges. The new process in its turn contains a new contradiction, and the history of the development of its own contradiction begins.

Lenin pointed out that Marx in his *Capital* gave a model analysis of the movement in opposites which runs through the process of development of things from beginning to end. This is the method that must be applied in studying the process of development of all things. Lenin himself also correctly applied it and adhered to it in all his writings.

"In his *Capital*, Marx first analyzes the simplest, most ordinary, fundamental, most common and everyday *relation* of bourgeois (commodity) society, a relation that is encountered billions of times, *viz.*, the exchange of commodities. In this very

simple phenomenon (in this 'cell' of bourgeois society) analysis reveals *all* the contradictions (or the germs of *all* the contradictions) of modern society. The subsequent exposition shows us the development (*both growth and movement*) of these contradictions and of this society in the \sum [sum total] of its individual parts, from its beginning to its end."

Having said this, Lenin continued: "Such must also be the method of exposition (or study) of dialectics in general."⁹

Chinese Communists must master this method before they can correctly analyze the history and the present conditions of the Chinese revolution, as well as define its perspectives.

III. The Particularity of Contradiction

Contradiction exists in the process of development of all things, and contradiction runs through the process of development of each thing from beginning to end: This is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction which we have discussed above. Now we shall speak of the particularity and relativity of contradiction.

This problem should be studied from several angles. First, the contradiction in each form of motion of matter has its particularity. Man's knowledge of matter is a knowledge of the forms of motion of matter, because there is nothing in the world apart from matter in motion and the motion of matter must assume certain forms. In considering each form of motion of matter, we must take into account the points which each has in common with various other forms of motion. But it is especially important, and it constitutes the basis of our knowledge of things, to take into account the particular points of the motion of matter, namely, the qualitative difference between it and other forms of motion. Only when we have taken this into account can we distinguish between things.

Any form of motion contains within itself its own particular contradiction. This particular contradiction constitutes the particular quality which distinguishes one thing from all others. This is the internal cause or, as it may be called, the basis of the fact that things in the world are different from one another in a thousand and one ways. Many forms of motion exist in nature: Mechanical motion, sound, light, heat, electricity, decomposition, combination, and so on. All these forms of motion of matter are dependent upon one another as well as qualitatively different from one another. The particular quality possessed by

each form of motion of matter is determined by its own particular contradiction. Such a condition exists not only in nature but also in social and ideological phenomena. Every form of society, every mode of thought has its particular contradiction and particular quality.

The classification of scientific studies is based precisely upon the particular contradictions inherent in their objects. Thus a certain kind of contradiction peculiar to a certain field of phenomena constitutes the object of study of a certain branch of science. For example, positive numbers and negative numbers in mathematics; action and reaction in mechanics; positive and negative electricity in physics; decomposition and combination in chemistry; productive forces and relations of production, classes and the struggle between the classes in social science; offense and defense in military science; idealism and materialism, the metaphysical outlook and the dialectical outlook in philosophy, and so on. It is because each possesses a particular contradiction and a particular quality that they become the objects of different scientific studies. Of course, if we do not recognize the universality of contradiction, we can in no way discover the universal cause or universal basis of the development of the motion of things; however, if we do not study the particularity of contradiction, we can in no way determine the particular quality of a thing that differs from that of other things, discover the particular cause or particular basis of the development of the motion of things, or distinguish between things, and mark out the fields of scientific study.

According to the sequence in man's process of knowing, there is always a gradual extension from a knowledge of the individual thing to a knowledge of things in general. It is always the case that man can proceed to generalizations and know the common qualities of various things only after he has known the particular qualities of many different things. When man already knows such common qualities, he uses this knowledge as a guide and goes on studying various concrete things which have not yet been studied or have not yet been thoroughly studied, so as to find out their particular qualities. Only thus can he supplement, enrich,

and develop his knowledge of the common qualities and prevent it from becoming withered and petrified.

These are the two processes of knowing: One is from the particular to the general, and the other is from the general to the particular. Man's knowledge always proceeds in this cyclical, recurrent manner, and the turn of each cycle (if it conforms strictly to scientific method) can raise man's knowledge to a higher level and continuously deepen it. The mistake of our dogmatists on this question is: On the one hand, they do not understand that we must study the particularity of contradiction and know the particular qualities of individual things before we can know adequately the universality of contradiction and the common qualities of various things; and, on the other hand, they do not understand that after we have known the common qualities of things, we must go on studying those concrete things that have not yet been thoroughly studied or have newly emerged. Our dogmatists are lazybones; they refuse to make any painstaking study of concrete things, but regard general truths as something emerging out of the void, and turn them into purely abstract formulas which people cannot grasp, thereby completely denying, as well as reversing, the normal sequence in which man comes to know truth. Nor do they understand the interconnection of the two processes in man's knowing, from the particular to the general and from the general to the particular; they do not understand the Marxist theory of knowledge at all.

It is necessary not only to study the particular contradiction and the quality determined thereby in every great system of forms of motion of matter, but also to study the particular contradiction and the quality of every form of motion of matter at each stage of its long course of development. In all forms of motion, each process of development that is real and not imagined is qualitatively different. Our study must lay emphasis on this point and must start from it.

Qualitatively different contradictions can only be resolved by qualitatively different methods. For example: The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is resolved by the method of socialist revolution; the contradiction between the

great masses of the people and the feudal system is resolved by the method of democratic revolution; the contradiction between colonies and imperialism is resolved by the method of national revolutionary war; the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry in socialist society is resolved by the method of collectivization and mechanization of agriculture; the contradiction within the Communist Party is resolved by the method of criticism and self-criticism; the contradiction between society and nature is resolved by the method of developing the productive forces.

Processes change, old processes and old contradictions disappear, new processes and new contradictions emerge, and the methods of resolving contradictions differ accordingly. In Russia the contradictions resolved by the February Revolution and the October Revolution, respectively, as well as the methods used to resolve them were basically different. The use of different methods to resolve different contradictions is a principle which Marxist-Leninists must strictly observe. The dogmatists do not observe this principle. They do not understand the difference between the various revolutionary situations, and consequently do not understand that different methods should be used to resolve different contradictions; instead they uniformly adopt a formula which they fancy to be unalterable and inflexibly apply it everywhere. This can only bring setbacks to the revolution or make a great mess of what originally could have been done well.

In order to reveal the particularity of contradictions in their totality as well as their interconnection in the process of development of things, that is, to reveal the quality of the process of development of things, we must reveal the particularity of each aspect of the contradiction in the process; otherwise it is impossible to reveal the quality of the process. This is also a matter to which we must pay the utmost attention in our study.

In the process of its development, a great thing or event contains many contradictions. For instance, in the process of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution there are the contradiction between the various oppressed classes in Chinese society and

imperialism, the contradiction between the great masses of the people and feudalism, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the contradiction between the peasantry together with the urban petty bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie on the other, the contradiction between various reactionary ruling blocs, etc. The situation is exceedingly complex. Not only does each of these contradictions have its own particularity, and they cannot be treated uniformly, but each of the two aspects of every contradiction also has its own characteristics, and they cannot be treated uniformly. We who work for the Chinese revolution should understand not only the particularity of each of the contradictions in the light of their totality, that is, from the interconnection of those contradictions, but also the totality of the contradictions by undertaking a study of their aspects. To understand each aspect of a contradiction is to understand the definite position each aspect occupies, the concrete form in which it comes into the relation of mutual dependence and contradiction with its opposite, and the concrete means by which it struggles with its opposite when the two are mutually dependent and yet contradictory, as well as when the mutual dependence breaks up. The study of these problems is a matter of the utmost importance. Lenin was expressing this very idea when he said that the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.¹⁰ Our dogmatists, contrary to Lenin's teaching, never use their brains to analyze anything concretely; in their writings and speeches they always strike the keynote of the "eight-legged essay" which is void of any content, and have brought about a very bad style of work in our party.

In studying a problem, we must guard against subjectivity, one-sidedness, and superficiality. What is called subjectivity consists of not looking at a problem objectively, that is, not looking at it from the materialist viewpoint; this I have discussed in my essay *On Practice*.¹¹ What is called one-sidedness consists of not looking at a problem as a whole. For example, understanding only China but not Japan; understanding only the Communist Party but not the Kuomintang, understanding only the pro-

letariat but not the bourgeoisie, understanding only the peasants but not the landlords, understanding only the favorable conditions but not the adverse conditions, understanding only the past but not the future, understanding only the unit but not the totality, understanding only the defects but not the achievements, understanding only the plaintiff but not the defendant, understanding only revolutionary work underground but not revolutionary work in the open, and so on. In a word, not understanding the characteristics of each aspect of a contradiction. This is called looking at a problem one-sidedly. Or it may be called seeing only the part but not the whole, seeing only the trees but not the woods. As a result of this, it is impossible to find the methods for resolving contradictions; it is impossible to accomplish the tasks of the revolution; it is impossible to do the assigned work well; and it is impossible to develop correctly the ideological struggle in the party.

Discussing military science, Sun Tzu said: "Know the enemy and know yourself, and you can fight a hundred battles without disaster";¹² he was referring to the two sides in a battle. Wei Cheng of the T'ang dynasty said: "To hear both sides makes you enlightened, and to hear only one side makes you benighted";¹³ he also understood that one-sidedness is wrong. Yet our comrades often tend to be one-sided when they look at problems; such people will often run up against snags. In *Water Margin*,¹⁴ Sung Chiang launched three attacks on Chu village and was twice defeated because he had no clear knowledge of the conditions and applied the wrong methods. Later he changed his methods and started by investigating the situation. Thus he learned about the intertwining roads; disrupted the alliance between the Li, Hu, and Chu villages; and using a stratagem similar to that of the Trojan Horse in foreign legends, secretly infiltrated his own soldiers in disguise into the enemy's camp and won victory on the third occasion. There are numerous examples of materialist dialectics in *Water Margin*, and the episode of the three attacks on Chu village can be considered the best.

Lenin said: "In order really to know an object we must embrace, study, all its sides, all connections and 'mediations.' We

shall never achieve this completely, but the demand for all-sidedness is a safeguard against mistakes and rigidity.⁷¹⁵ We should remember his words. Superficiality means to consider neither the characteristics of the contradiction as a whole nor the characteristics of each of its aspects, to deny the necessity of penetrating into things to study minutely the characteristics of the contradiction, but to take a glance from a distance and, having roughly noticed some features of the contradiction, wish to start resolving it (answering questions, settling differences, handling work, directing military operations). Such a way of doing things never leads to anything but trouble. The reason why our comrades suffering from dogmatism and empiricism have made mistakes is precisely because their way of looking at things is subjective, one-sided, and superficial. One-sidedness and superficiality are also subjectivity, because while all objective things are in reality interrelated and have an inner necessity, some people do not mirror these conditions as they are but only look at things one-sidedly or superficially, knowing neither their interrelationship nor their inner necessity. Such a method is therefore subjective.

Not only must we pay attention to the specific characteristics arising from the interconnection and the conditions of the various aspects of the movement in opposites of the whole process of the development of things, but we must also pay attention to the specific characteristics of every stage in the process of development.

The basic contradiction in the process of development of things, and the quality of the process determined by this basic contradiction, will not disappear until the process is completed; but the conditions of each stage in the long process of development of things often differ from those of another stage. The reason for this is that, while the nature of the basic contradiction in the development of things and the quality of the process have not changed, yet at the various stages in the long process of development, the basic contradiction assumes an increasingly intensified form. Besides, among the numerous big and small contradictions determined or influenced by the basic contradiction,

some become intensified, some are temporarily or partially resolved or mitigated, and some emerge anew; consequently the process reveals itself as consisting of different stages. If people do not pay attention to the stages in the process of development of a thing, they cannot deal properly with its contradictions.

For example: At the time when capitalism of the era of free competition developed into imperialism, there was no change in the character of the two classes in fundamental contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, or in the capitalist nature of such a society. However, the contradiction between these two classes became intensified, the contradiction between monopoly capital and non-monopoly capital emerged, the contradiction between metropolitan countries and colonies became intensified, and the contradiction between the capitalist countries, that is, the contradiction caused by the unevenness of their development, manifested itself in a particularly acute way, thus bringing about the special stage of capitalism, the stage of imperialism. The reason why Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution is that Lenin and Stalin have correctly explained these contradictions and correctly formulated the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution for resolving them.

An examination of the process of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China, which began with the Revolution of 1911,¹⁶ also reveals several special stages. In particular, the revolution in the period of its bourgeois leadership and the revolution in the period of its proletarian leadership are marked off from each other as two vastly different historical stages. That is, the leadership of the proletariat has basically changed the physiognomy of the revolution, and led to a readjustment in class relations, a tremendous stirring of the peasant revolution, a thoroughness in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, the possibility of the transition from democratic revolution to Socialist revolution, and so on. All this could not possibly happen in the period when the revolution was under bourgeois leadership. Although there was no change in the nature of the basic contradiction of the whole process — in the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic-revolutionary nature of the process (with the semi-colonial, semi-

feudal nature as the other aspect) — yet in this long period of some twenty years it has gone through several stages of development. Such great events as the failure of the Revolution of 1911 and the establishment of the regime of the Northern warlords, the establishment of the first national united front and the Revolution of 1924-27,¹⁷ the breaking up of the united front and the passing of the bourgeoisie into the counter-revolutionary camp, the wars between the new warlords, the agrarian revolutionary war, the establishment of the second national united front and the Anti-Japanese War.¹⁸ These stages contain such specific conditions as the intensification of some contradictions (for example, the agrarian revolutionary war and the Japanese invasion of the four Northeastern provinces); the partial or temporary solution of other contradictions (for example, the liquidation of the Northern warlords and our confiscation of the land of the landlords); and the fresh emergence of still other contradictions (for example, the struggle between the new warlords, the landlords' recovery of their land after our loss of the revolutionary bases in the south).

To study the particularity of the contradictions at every stage in the process of development of things, we must not only observe them in their interconnection and their totality, but we must consider each aspect of the contradiction at each stage of its development.

Take the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, for instance. As to the Kuomintang: In the period of the first united front it was revolutionary and vigorous and represented an alliance of various classes in the democratic revolution, because it carried out Sun Yat-sen's¹⁹ three cardinal policies of alliance with Russia, co-operation with the Communists, and assistance to the workers and peasants. After 1927, the Kuomintang turned in the opposite direction and became the reactionary bloc of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie. After the Sian Incident²⁰ in December, 1936, it made another turn and began to move in the direction of cessation of the civil war and alliance with the Communist Party in joint opposition to Japanese imperialism. Such are the characteristics of the Kuomintang in its three stages. The formation

of these characteristics is, of course, due to various causes.

As to the Chinese Communist Party in the period of the first united front, it was a party in its childhood and courageously led the Revolution of 1924-27, but it revealed itself as immature in the understanding of the nature, tasks, and methods of the revolution. Consequently, *Ch'en Tuhsuism*,²¹ which appeared in the last period of this revolution, was able to have its effect and caused the defeat of this revolution. After 1927, the Communist Party again courageously led the agrarian revolutionary war and created the revolutionary army and revolutionary bases; however it also made mistakes of adventurism which brought serious losses to both the army and the bases. Since 1935, it has rectified these mistakes and led the new anti-Japanese united front; this great struggle is now developing. At the present stage the Communist Party is a party that has gone through the test of two revolutions and has acquired a rich store of experience. Such are the characteristics of the Chinese Communist Party in its three stages.

The formation of these characteristics is also due to various causes. Without studying these characteristics, we cannot understand the specific interrelations of the two parties at the various stages of their development: The establishment of the united front, the breaking up of the united front, and the establishment of another united front. But in order to study the various characteristics of the two parties, we must—this is even more fundamental—study the class basis of the two parties, the resultant contradictions between the two parties and other forces during different periods. For example, in the period of its first alliance with the Communist Party, the Kuomintang on the one hand stood in contradiction to foreign imperialism and therefore opposed imperialism; while on the other hand it stood in contradiction to the great masses of the people at home, and, though it verbally promised to give many benefits to the toiling people, in reality it gave them very few or even none at all. In the period when it carried on the anti-Communist war, it collaborated with imperialism and feudalism to oppose the great masses of the people, writing off all the benefits which the great masses of the peo-

ple had won in the revolution and thus intensifying its own contradiction with the great masses of the people. In the present period of the Anti-Japanese War, the Kuomintang, standing in contradiction to Japanese imperialism, wants on the one hand to ally itself with the Communist Party, while on the other it does not slacken its struggle against, and its oppression of, the Communist Party and the Chinese people.

As to the Communist Party, no matter in which period, it always sides with the great masses of the people to oppose imperialism and feudalism; in the present period of the Anti-Japanese War, because the Kuomintang shows itself in favor of resisting Japan, the Communist Party has adopted a mild policy toward it and toward the domestic feudal forces. Because of these conditions, an alliance of the two parties is brought about at one time, and a struggle at another; and even during the period of the alliance between the two parties, there also exists a complicated state of affairs in which alliance and struggle take place at the same time. If we do not study the characteristics of these aspects of the contradiction, we shall not only fail to understand the relation between each of the two parties and other forces, but also fail to understand the interrelation of the two parties.

From this it can be seen that in studying the specific nature of any kind of contradiction—contradiction in various forms of motion of matter, contradiction in various forms of motion in every process of development, each aspect of the contradiction in every process of development, contradiction at the various stages of every process of development, and each aspect of the contradiction at the various stages of development—in studying the specific nature of all these contradictions, we must be free from any taint of subjective arbitrariness and must make a concrete analysis of them. Apart from a concrete analysis there can be no knowledge of the specific nature of any contradiction. We must at all times bear in mind Lenin's words: the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.

Marx and Engels were the first to supply us with an excellent model of such concrete analysis.

When Marx and Engels applied the law of contradiction in

things to the study of the process of social history, they saw the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production; they saw the contradiction between the exploiting class and the exploited class, as well as the contradiction produced thereby between the economic basis and its superstructures such as politics and ideology; and they saw how these contradictions inevitably lead to different social revolutions in different class societies.

When Marx applied this law to the study of the economic structure of capitalist society, he saw that the basic contradiction of this society is the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of ownership. This contradiction manifests itself in the contradiction between the organized character of production in individual enterprises and the unorganized character of production in society as a whole. The class manifestation of this contradiction is the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Because of the vastness of the scope of things and the limitlessness of their development, what is universality in one case is in another changed into particularity. On the other hand, what in one case is particularity is in another changed into universality. The contradiction contained in the capitalist system between the socialization of production and the private ownership of the means of production is common to all countries where capitalism exists and develops; as far as capitalism is concerned, this constitutes the universality of contradiction. However, this contradiction in capitalism is something pertaining to a certain historical stage in the development of class society in general; as far as the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production in class society in general is concerned, this constitutes the particularity of contradiction. But when Marx revealed by analysis the particularity of every contradiction in capitalist society, he simultaneously expounded more profoundly, more adequately, and more completely the universality of the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production in class society in general.

As the particular is connected with the universal, and as not

only the particularity of contradiction but also the universality of contradiction is inherent in everything, universality thus existing in particularity, so, when we study a certain object we ought to try to discover both of these aspects and their interconnection, to discover the two aspects of particularity and universality within the object as well as their interconnection, and to discover the interconnection of this object with the many objects outside it. When Stalin explained the historical roots of Leninism in his famous work, *Foundations of Leninism*,²² he analyzed the international situation in which Leninism was born, and the various contradictions in capitalism which had reached their extreme under the conditions of imperialism. He analyzed how these contradiction made the proletarian revolution a question of immediate practice, and created favorable conditions for a direct onslaught upon capitalism. In addition, he analyzed the reasons why Russia became the home of Leninism, how tsarist Russia represented the focus of all the contradictions of imperialism, and why the Russian proletariat could become the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat. In this way, Stalin analyzed the universality of the contradiction in imperialism, showing how Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, and analyzed the particularity of the imperialism of tsarist Russia in the contradiction in general, showing how Russia became the birthplace of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution and how in such a particularity is contained the universality of contradiction. This kind of analysis by Stalin serves as a model in understanding the particularity and the universality of contradiction and their interconnection.

On the question of applying dialectics to the study of objective phenomena, Marx and Engels, and likewise Lenin and Stalin, have always taught people that they should not be tainted with any subjective arbitrariness and must discover, from the concrete conditions inherent in the objective actual movements, the concrete contradictions in those phenomena, the concrete role of each of the aspects of the contradictions, and the concrete interrelation of the contradictions. Because they have not taken such an attitude in study, our dogmatists can never be in the right.

We must take warning from the failure of dogmatism, and learn to acquire such an attitude in study—there is no other method.

The relation between the universality of contradiction and the particularity of contradiction is the relation between the common character and the individual character of contradictions. By common character we mean that contradiction exists in all processes and runs through all processes from beginning to end. Contradictions are movements, are things, are processes, are thoughts. To deny the contradiction in things is to deny all. This is a universal principle which admits of no exceptions, in either ancient or modern times, in China or foreign countries. Hence the common character or absoluteness. But this common character is contained in all individual characters; without individual character there can be no common character. If all individual characters were removed, what common character would remain? Because each of the contradictions is particular, their individual characters are formed. All individual characters exist conditionally and temporarily, hence they are relative.

This principle of common character and individual character, of absoluteness and relativity, is the quintessence of the problem of the contradiction in things; not to understand it is equivalent to abandoning dialectics.

IV. The Principal Contradiction and the Principal Aspect of a Contradiction

As regards the problem of the particularity of contradiction, there are still two sides which must be specially singled out for analysis, that is, the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of a contradiction.

In the process of development of a complex thing, many contradictions exist; among these, one is necessarily the principal contradiction the existence and development of which determine or influence the existence and development of other contradictions.

For example, in capitalist society, the two opposing forces in contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction. This principal contradiction determines and influences the other contradictions—for example, the contradiction between the remnant feudal class and the bourgeoisie, between the rural petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie, between the proletariat and the rural petty bourgeoisie, between the liberal bourgeoisie and the monopolistic bourgeoisie, between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism, between the capitalist countries themselves, between imperialism and the colonies, etc.

In semi-colonial countries like China, the relationship between the principal contradiction and non-principal contradictions presents a complicated situation.

When imperialism wages a war of aggression against such a country, the various classes in that country, apart from the traitors, can temporarily unite to wage a national war against imperialism. At such a time, the contradiction between imperialism and that country becomes the principal contradiction,

while all the contradictions among the various classes within that country (including the principal contradiction between the feudal system and the great masses of the people) are relegated temporarily to a secondary or subordinate position. Such was the case in China in the Opium War of 1840,²³ the Sino-Japanese War of 1894,²⁴ the Boxer War of 1900,²⁵ and it is the case in the present Sino-Japanese War.

But in another situation, the relative positions of contradictions undergo a change. When imperialism does not apply the pressure of war, but adopts comparatively mild forms—political, economic, cultural, etc.—to carry on its oppression, the ruling classes in the semi-colonial countries will capitulate to imperialism; the two will form an alliance for the joint oppression of the great masses of the people. At such a time, the great masses of the people often adopt the form of civil war to oppose the alliance of imperialism and the feudal class, while imperialism often adopts indirect methods in helping the reactionaries in the semi-colonial countries to oppress the people without taking direct action. This reveals the special sharpness of the internal contradiction. Such has been the case in China in the revolutionary war of 1911, the revolutionary war of 1924-27, and the ten years' agrarian revolutionary war since 1927. Furthermore, the civil wars between the various reactionary ruling blocs in the semi-colonial countries, *e.g.*, the wars between the warlords in China, also belong to this category.

When a revolutionary civil war reaches the point of fundamentally threatening the existence of imperialism and its jackals—the domestic reactionaries—imperialism will often adopt methods other than those mentioned above in an endeavor to maintain its rule. It either tries to split up the revolutionary front from within or sends armed forces directly to help the domestic reactionaries. At such times, foreign imperialism and the domestic reactionaries stand completely in the open at one pole while the great masses of the people stand at another, thus forming the principal contradiction which determines or influences the development of other contradictions. The aid given by various capitalist countries to the Russian reactionaries after the October

Revolution is a case of armed intervention. Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal in 1927²⁶ is a case of disintegrating the revolutionary front.

But whatever happens, there is no doubt at all that at every stage in the process of development, only one principal contradiction plays the leading role.

From this it can be seen that if in any process a number of contradictions exist, only one of them is the principal contradiction, playing the leading and decisive role, while the rest occupy a secondary or subordinate position. Thus, in studying any process—if it is a complicated process in which more than two contradictions exist—we must devote our whole energy to discovering its principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is grasped, any problem can be solved readily. This is the method Marx taught us when he studied capitalist society. When Lenin and Stalin studied imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism, and when they studied Soviet economy, they also taught us this method. Thousands of scholars and practical workers do not understand this method, with the result that, bewildered as if lost in a sea of mist, they cannot find the crux of a problem and naturally cannot find the method of resolving contradictions.

As we said above, we cannot treat all the contradictions in a process as equal, but must distinguish between the principal and the secondary contradictions, and pay particular attention to grasping the principal one. But, in any contradiction, whether principal or secondary, can we treat the two contradictory aspects as equal?

No, we cannot. In any contradiction, at any time, the development of the contradictory aspects is uneven. Sometimes there seems to be a balance of forces, but that is only a temporary and relative state; the basic state is unevenness. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be the principal and the other secondary. The principal aspect is the one which plays the leading role in the contradiction. The quality of a thing is mainly determined by the principal aspect of the contradiction that has taken the dominant position.

But this state is not fixed; the principal and the non-principal aspects of a contradiction transform themselves into each other and the quality of a thing changes accordingly. In a certain process or at a certain stage in the development of a contradiction, the principal aspect is A and the non-principal aspect is B; at another stage of development or in another process of development, the roles are reversed—a change determined by the extent of the increase and decrease, respectively, in the intensity of the struggle of the two aspects of the contradiction in the development of a thing.

We often speak of “the superseding of the old by the new.” The superseding of the old by the new is the universal, forever inviolable law of the world. A thing transforms itself into something else according to its nature and the conditions under which it finds itself and through different forms of leap; that is the process of the superseding of the old by the new. Everything contains a contradiction between its new aspect and its old aspect, which constitutes a series of intricate struggles. As a result of these struggles, the new aspect grows and rises to become the thing that dominates, while the old aspect dwindles and becomes the thing that gradually approaches extinction. And the moment the new aspect has won the dominant position over the old aspect, the quality of the old thing changes into the quality of the new thing. From this it can be seen that the quality of a thing is mainly determined by the principal aspect of the contradiction that has won the dominant position. When the principal aspect of the contradiction that has won the dominant position undergoes a change, the quality of a thing changes accordingly.

In capitalist society, capitalism transformed itself from a force which occupied a subordinate position in the old era of feudal society into one that has won the dominant position, and the nature of society has also changed from feudal to capitalist. In the new era of capitalist society, feudal forces have been transformed from forces originally in the dominant position into subordinate forces, and then they gradually approached extinction; such is the case, for example, in Britain and France. With the development of the productive forces, the bourgeoisie has been

transformed from a new class, playing a progressive role, into an old class, playing a reactionary role, until it is finally overthrown by the proletariat and is transformed into a class which is deprived of its private means of production and of its power, and which will then also gradually approach extinction. The proletariat, which is much more numerous than the bourgeoisie, and which grows up simultaneously with the bourgeoisie but is under its rule, is a new force. From its initial position subordinate to the bourgeoisie, it gradually grows stronger and becomes an independent class playing a leading role in history until finally it seizes political power and becomes the ruling class. At such a time, the nature of society changes from that of the old capitalist society into that of the new socialist society. This is the path that the Soviet Union has already traversed and that all other countries inevitably will traverse.

As regards the situation in China, while imperialism occupies the principal position in the contradiction which makes her a semi-colony, and oppresses the Chinese people, China has changed from an independent country into a semi-colony. But this state of affairs inevitably will change. In the struggle between the two sides, the strength of the Chinese people, which grows under the leadership of the proletariat, inevitably will change China from a semi-colony into an independent country, whereas imperialism will be overthrown and the old China will inevitably change into a new China.

The change of the old China into a new China also involves a change in the relation between the old forces of China's feudalism and the new forces of her people. The old feudal landlord class will be overthrown, and from being the ruler it will become the ruled; this class will also gradually approach extinction. Under the leadership of the proletariat the people will, from being the ruled, become the rulers. At the same time, the nature of Chinese society will undergo a change—that is, the old, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society will change into a new, democratic society.

Instances of such mutual transformations are found in our past experience. The Manchu dynasty,²⁷ which had ruled China

for nearly three hundred years, was overthrown during the Revolution of 1911, while the Revolutionary League under Sun Yat-sen's leadership won victory for a time. In the revolutionary war of 1924-27, the revolutionary forces in the South, the alliance between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang, grew from weakness to strength and won victory in the Northern Expedition,²⁸ while the Northern warlords, once all-powerful, were overthrown. In 1927, the people's forces under the leadership of the Communist Party, suffering from the attacks of the Kuomintang reactionary forces, became very weak, but having eliminated opportunism within their ranks they gradually became stronger once more. In the revolutionary bases under the leadership of the Communist Party, the peasants have transformed themselves from being the ruled into the rulers, while the landlords have undergone an opposite transformation. It is always in such a manner that the new displaces the old in the world, that the old is superseded by the new, that the old is eliminated and the new is brought forth, or that the old is thrown off and the new ushered in.

At certain times in the revolutionary struggle, difficulties outweigh advantages; at such times, difficulties constitute the principal aspect of the contradiction and advantages the secondary aspect. But through the efforts of revolutionaries, difficulties can be gradually overcome, an advantageous new situation is created, and the difficult situation yields place to the advantageous one. Such was the case after the failure of the revolution in China in 1927 and during the Long March of the Chinese Red Army.²⁹ In the present Sino-Japanese War, China is again in a difficult position; but we can change this state of affairs and bring about a fundamental change in the situation of both China and Japan. Conversely, advantages can also be transformed into difficulties, if the revolutionaries make mistakes. The victory of the Revolution of 1924-27 turned into a defeat. The revolutionary bases that had grown in the southern provinces after 1927 all suffered defeat in 1934.

Such also is the contradiction in our studies when we pass from ignorance to knowledge. At the very beginning of our study

of Marxism, our ignorance or scanty knowledge of Marxism stands in contradiction to knowledge of Marxism. But as a result of industrious study, ignorance can be transformed into knowledge, scanty knowledge into considerable knowledge, and blindness in the use of Marxism into its masterly application.

Some people think that there are contradictions different from this. For example: In the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the productive forces are the principal aspect; in the contradiction between theory and practice, practice is the principal aspect; in the contradiction between the economic base and its superstructure, the economic base is the principal aspect; and there is no change in their respective positions. This is the view of mechanistic materialism, and not of dialectical materialism. True, the productive forces, practice, and the economic base generally manifest themselves in the principal and decisive role; whoever does not admit this, is not a materialist. But under certain conditions, such aspects as the relations of production, theory, and the superstructure, in turn, manifest themselves in the principal and decisive role; this must also be admitted. When the productive forces cannot be developed unless the relations of production are changed, the change in the relations of production plays the principal and decisive role. When, as Lenin put it, "without a revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement,"²⁰ the creation and advocacy of the revolutionary theory play the principal and decisive role. When certain work (this applies to any work) is to be done but there is as yet no directive, method, plan, or policy, defining the directive, method, plan, or policy is the principal and decisive factor. When the superstructure of politics, culture, and so on hinders the development of the economic base, political and cultural reforms become the principal and decisive factors.

In saying this, are we running counter to materialism? We are not, because we recognize that in the development of history as a whole material things determine spiritual things, social existence determines social consciousness. But at the same time we also recognize and must recognize the reaction of spiritual things

the reaction of social consciousness on social existence, and the reaction of the superstructure on the economic base. This is not running counter to materialism; on the contrary, this is avoiding mechanistic materialism and firmly upholding dialectical materialism.

If, in studying the problem of the particularity of contradiction, we do not study these two conditions—the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradiction in the process, as well as the principal aspect and the non-principal aspect of a contradiction—that is, if we do not study the distinctive character of these two conditions of contradiction, we shall get bogged down in abstract studies and shall not be able concretely to understand the condition of a contradiction, and consequently we shall not be able to find the correct method of solving the contradiction. The distinctive character or particularity of these two conditions of contradiction represents the unevenness of the contradictory forces. There is nothing in the world that is absolutely even in its development, and we must oppose the theory of even development or the theory of equilibrium. At the same time, the concrete conditions of a contradiction and the change in the principal and non-principal aspects of a contradiction in its process of development, show precisely the force of the new things in superseding the old. The study of various conditions of unevenness in the contradiction, the study of the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradiction, of the principal aspect of the contradiction and the non-principal aspect of the contradiction, constitutes one of the important methods by which a revolutionary political party determines correctly its political and military strategic and tactical directives. All Communists should note this.

V. The Identity and Struggle of the Aspects of a Contradiction

Having understood the problem of the universality and particularity of contradiction, we must proceed to study the problem of the identity and struggle of the aspects of a contradiction.

Identity, unity, coincidence, interpermeation, interpenetration, interdependence (or interdependence for existence), interconnection or co-operation—all these different terms mean the same thing and refer to the following two conditions: First, each of the two aspects of every contradiction in the process of development of a thing finds the presupposition of its existence in its opposite aspect, and both coexist in an entity; second, each of the two contradictory aspects, according to given conditions, tends to transform itself into its opposite aspect. This is what is meant by identity.

Lenin said: "Dialectics is such a theory: It studies how the opposites can be identical and how they become identical (how they change and become identical)—under what conditions they transform themselves into each other and become identical—why the human mind should not regard these opposites as dead, rigid things, but as living, conditional, changeable things which transform themselves into each other."³¹

What is the meaning of this passage from Lenin?

The contradictory aspects in every process exclude each other, struggle with each other, and are opposed to each other. Such aspects of a contradictory nature are contained without exception in the processes of all things in the world and in human thought. A simple process has only one pair of opposites; a complex process has more than one pair of opposites. Various pairs of

opposites in turn become opposed to one another. In this way all things in the objective world and human thought are formed and impelled to move.

But if this is so, there is an utter lack of identity or unity. How then can we speak of identity or unity?

The reason is that the contradictory aspects cannot exist in isolation. Without the other aspect which is opposed to it, each aspect loses the condition of its existence. Just imagine, can any of the aspects of all the contradictory things or of contradictory concepts in the human mind exist independently? Without life, there would be no death; without death, there would also be no life. Without "above," there would be no "below"; without "below," there would also be no "above." Without misfortune, there would be no good fortune; without good fortune, there would also be no misfortune. Without easiness, there would be no difficulty; without difficulty, there would also be no easiness. Without landlords, there would be no tenant-peasants; without tenant-peasants, there would also be no landlords. Without the bourgeoisie, there would be no proletariat; without the proletariat, there would also be no bourgeoisie. Without imperialist oppression of the nations, there would be no colonies and semi-colonies; without colonies and semi-colonies, there would also be no imperialist oppression of the nations.

All opposite elements are like this: Because of certain conditions, they are opposed to each other on the one hand and they are interconnected, interpenetrated, interpermeated, and interdependent on the other hand; this character is identity. All contradictory aspects, because of certain conditions, are characterized by non-identity; hence, they are spoken of as contradictory. But they are also characterized by identity; hence, they are interconnected. When Lenin says that dialectics studies "how the opposites can be identical," he is referring to such a state of affairs. How can they be identical? Because of the condition of mutual sustenance of each other's existence. This is the first meaning of identity.

But is it enough to say merely that the contradictory aspects mutually sustain each other's existence, that there is identity

between them and consequently they can coexist in an entity? No, it is not enough. The matter does not end with the interdependence of the two contradictory aspects on each other for their existence; 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 its opposite, to transfer itself to the opposite position. This is the second meaning of the identity of contradiction.

Why is there also identity? You see, by means of revolution, the proletariat, once the ruled, transforms itself into the ruler, while the bourgeoisie, originally the ruler, is transformed into the ruled, transferred to the position originally occupied by its opposite. This has already taken place in the Soviet Union, and will take place throughout the world. I should like to ask: If there is no interconnection and identity of opposites under certain conditions, can such a change take place?

The Kuomintang, which played a certain positive role at a certain stage in modern Chinese history, has since 1927 transformed itself into a counter-revolutionary party, because of its inherent class nature and the temptations of imperialism (these being the conditions); but, because of the intensification of the contradiction between China and Japan and the policy of the united front of the Communist Party (these being the conditions), it has been compelled to agree to resist Japan. Contradictory things change into one another; in this respect there is a certain identity.

The agrarian revolution we have carried out is already and will be such a process in which the land-owning landlord class is transformed into a class deprived of its land, while the peasants, once deprived of their land, transform themselves into small holders of land. The haves and the have-nots, gain and loss, are interconnected because of certain conditions; there is identity of the two sides. Under socialism, the system of the peasants' private ownership will in turn be transformed into the public ownership of socialist agriculture; this has already taken place in the Soviet Union, and will take place throughout the world.

Between private property and public property there is a bridge leading from the one to the other, which in philosophy is called identity, or transformation into each other, or interpermeation.

To consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat or the people's dictatorship is precisely to prepare the conditions for liquidating such a dictatorship and advancing to the higher stage of abolishing all state systems. To establish and develop the Communist Party is precisely to prepare the condition for abolishing the Communist Party and all party systems. To establish the revolutionary army under the leadership of the Communist Party and to carry on the revolutionary war is precisely to prepare the condition for abolishing war forever. These contradictory things are at the same time complementary.

As everybody knows, war and peace transform themselves into each other. War is transformed into peace: For example, the first World War was transformed into the post-war peace; the civil war in China has now also ceased and internal peace has come about. Peace is transformed into war: For example, the Kuomintang-Communist co-operation of 1927 was transformed into war, and the peaceful world situation today may also be transformed into a second world war. Why? Because in a class society such contradictory things as war and peace are characterized by identity under certain conditions.

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 contradictions. This is exactly what Lenin meant when he said: “. . . how they become identical (how they change and become identical)—under what conditions they transform themselves into each other and become identical. . . .”

Why should the human mind “not regard such opposites as dead, rigid things but as living, conditional, changeable things which transform themselves into each other”? Because that is just what objective things are. The unity or identity of the contradictory aspects in objective things is never dead, rigid, but living, conditional, changeable, temporary, relative; all contradictory

aspects transform themselves, under certain conditions, into their opposites. Such a state of affairs, reflected in human thought, becomes the materialist-dialectical world outlook of Marxism. Only the present-day reactionary ruling classes (like those of the past), as well as metaphysics, which is in their service, regard opposites not as living, conditional, changeable things that transform themselves into each other, but as dead, rigid things. They propagate this erroneous view everywhere to delude the masses of the people, and thereby attain the aim of perpetuating their rule. The task of the Communists is precisely to expose such erroneous reactionary and metaphysical thought, to propagate the dialectics inherent in things, and to hasten the transformation of things, to attain the aim of the revolution.

By the identity of contradiction under certain conditions we mean that the contradictions we are talking about are real contradictions, concrete contradictions, and that the transformation of contradictory aspects into each other is also real, concrete. There are innumerable transformations in mythology, for example, Kuafu's racing with the sun in the *Book of Mountains and Seas*,³² Yi's shooting down of nine suns in *Huai-Nan Tzu*,³³ Monkey's 72 metamorphoses in the *Pilgrimage to the West*,³⁴ the numerous episodes of ghosts and foxes metamorphosed into human beings in *Strange Tales from the Carefree Studio*.³⁵ The transformation of opposites into each other as told in these legends is the sort of childish, imaginary, subjectively fancied transformation that is called forth among men by the innumerable transformations of complicated, real contradictions into each other, and is not a concrete transformation as manifested in concrete contradictions. Marx said: "All mythology masters and dominates and shapes the forces of nature in and through the imagination, hence it disappears as soon as man gains mastery over the forces of nature."³⁶ Although stories of endless metamorphoses in such mythology (and also in nursery tales) can delight people because in them man's conquest of the forces of nature, etc., is imaginatively embodied and, moreover, the best mythology possesses "eternal charm" (Marx), yet mythology is not formed on the basis of certain conditions of concrete con-

traditions and, therefore, is not the scientific reflection of reality. That is to say, in mythology or nursery tales the aspects that constitute contradiction have no concrete identity but only a fancied identity. Marxist dialectics scientifically reflects the identity in changes of reality.

Why can an egg be transformed into a chicken while a stone cannot be transformed into a chicken? Why is there identity between war and peace while there is no identity between war and a stone? Why can human beings give birth to human beings but not to anything else? The reason is none other than that identity of contradiction exists only under certain necessary conditions. Without certain necessary conditions, there can be no identity whatever.

Why is it that in Russia the bourgeois-democratic revolution of March, 1917, was directly linked with the proletarian-socialist revolution of November of the same year, while in France the bourgeois revolution was not linked directly with a socialist revolution, and the Paris Commune of 1871 finally ended in failure? Why is it, on the other hand, that the nomadic system in Mongolia and Central Asia has been linked directly with socialism? Why is it that the Chinese revolution can avoid a capitalist future and can be directly linked with socialism without traversing the old historical path of the western countries, without passing through a period of bourgeois dictatorship? The reason is none other than the concrete conditions of the time. When certain necessary conditions are present, then certain contradictions arise in the process of development of things and, what is more, these contradictions and all contradictions of this kind depend upon each other for existence and transform themselves into each other; otherwise nothing is possible.

Such is the problem of identity. What then is struggle? What is the relation between identity and struggle?

Lenin said: "The unity (coincidence, identity, resultant) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute."³⁷

What does this passage from Lenin mean?

All processes have a beginning and an end; all processes transform themselves into their opposites. The stability of all processes is relative, but the mutability manifested in the transformation of one process into another is absolute.

The movement of all things assumes two forms: The form of relative rest and the form of conspicuous change. Both forms of the movement are caused by the mutual struggle of the two contradictory factors contained in a thing itself. When the movement of a thing assumes the first form, it undergoes only a quantitative but not a qualitative change, and consequently appears in a state of seeming rest. When the movement of a thing assumes the second form, it has already reached a certain culminating point of the quantitative change of the first form, caused the dissociation of the entity, produced a qualitative change, and consequently appears in a state of conspicuous change. Such unity, solidarity, amalgamation, harmony, balance, stalemate, deadlock, rest, stability, equilibrium, coagulation, attraction, as we see in daily life, are all the appearances of things in the state of quantitative change. On the other hand, the dissociation of the entity, the breakdown of such solidarity, amalgamation, harmony, balance, stalemate, deadlock, rest, stability, equilibrium, coagulation, and attraction, and the change into their opposite states are all the appearances of things in the state of qualitative change during the transformation of one process into another. Things are always transforming themselves ceaselessly from the first into the second form, while the struggle within the contradictions exists in both forms and reaches its solution through the second form. We say, therefore, that the unity of opposites is conditional, temporary, and relative, while the struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute.

When we said above that because there is identity between two opposite things, the two can coexist in an entity and can also be transformed into each other, we were referring to conditionality. That is to say, under certain conditions contradictory things can be united and can also be transformed into each other, but without such conditions, they cannot become contradictory, cannot coexist, and cannot transform themselves

from the one into the other. It is because the identity of contradiction obtains only under certain conditions that we say identity is conditional, relative. Here we add: 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.

Conditional, relative identity, combined with unconditional, absolute struggle, constitutes the movement in opposites in all things.

We Chinese often say: "Things opposed to each other complement each other."³⁸ That is to say, there is identity of opposites. This remark is dialectical, and runs counter to metaphysics. To be "opposed to each other" means the mutual exclusion or struggle of the two contradictory aspects. To "complement each other" means that under certain conditions the two contradictory aspects become united and achieve identity. Struggle resides precisely in identity; without struggle there can be no identity.

In identity there is struggle, in particularity there is universality, in individual character there is common character. To quote Lenin, "there is an absolute even within the relative."³⁹

VI. The Role of Antagonism in Contradiction

Among the questions concerning the struggle within the contradiction, is: What is antagonism? Our answer is: Antagonism is a form of struggle within the contradiction, but not the universal form of struggle within the contradiction.

In human history, antagonism between the classes exists as a particular manifestation of the struggle within the contradiction, the contradiction between the exploiting class and the exploited class. The two mutually contradictory classes coexist for a long time in one society, be it a slave, a feudal, or a capitalist society, and struggle with each other; but it is not until the contradiction between the two classes has developed to a certain stage that the two sides adopt the form of open antagonism which develops into a revolution. In a class society, the transformation of peace into war is also like that.

The time when a bomb has not yet exploded is the time when contradictory things, because of certain conditions, coexist in an entity. It is not until a new condition (ignition) is present that the explosion takes place. An analogous situation exists in all natural phenomena when they finally assume the form of open antagonism to resolve old contradictions and produce new things.

It is very important to know this situation. It enables us to understand that in a class society revolutions and revolutionary wars are inevitable, that apart from them the leap in social development cannot be made, and the reactionary ruling classes cannot be overthrown so that the people will win political power. Communists must expose the deceitful propaganda of the reactionaries that social revolution is unnecessary and impossible, and so on, and firmly uphold the Marxist-Leninist theory of

social revolution, so as to help the people understand that social revolution is not only entirely necessary but also entirely possible, and that the whole history of mankind and the triumph of the Soviet Union all confirm this scientific truth.

However, we must study concretely the conditions of various kinds of struggle within the contradiction and should not inappropriately impose the above-mentioned formula on everything. Contradiction and struggle are universal, absolute, but the methods for resolving contradictions, that is, the forms of struggle, differ according to the differences in the nature of the contradictions. Some contradictions are characterized by open antagonism, some are not. Based on the concrete development of things, some contradictions, originally non-antagonistic, develop and become antagonistic, while some contradictions, originally antagonistic, develop and become non-antagonistic.

The contradiction between correct ideology and erroneous ideologies within the Communist Party is, as we said earlier, the reflection in the party of class contradictions when classes exist. In the beginning, or with regard to particular matters, such a contradiction need not immediately manifest itself as antagonistic. But with the development of the class struggle, it can also develop and become antagonistic. The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union shows us that the contradiction between the correct ideology of Lenin and Stalin and the erroneous ideologies of Trotsky, Bukharin, and others, was in the beginning not yet manifested in an antagonistic form, but subsequently developed into antagonism. A similar case occurred in the history of the Chinese Communist Party. The contradiction between the correct ideology of many of our comrades in the party and the erroneous ideologies of Chen Tu-hsiu, Chang Kuo-tao,⁴⁰ and others was also in the beginning not manifested in an antagonistic form, but subsequently developed into antagonism. At present, the contradiction between the correct ideology and the erroneous ideologies in our party is not manifested in an antagonistic form, and, if comrades who have made mistakes can correct them, it will not develop into antagonism. Therefore, on the one hand the party must carry on a serious

struggle against erroneous ideologies, and on the other it must give the comrades who have made mistakes sufficient opportunity to become aware of them. Under such conditions, struggles pushed to excess are obviously not appropriate. But if those people who have made mistakes persist in them and increase the gravity of their mistakes, then there is the possibility of such contradictions developing into antagonism.

Economically, in capitalist society (where the town under bourgeois rule ruthlessly exploits the countryside) and in the Kuomintang-ruled areas in China (where the town under the rule of foreign imperialism and the native, comprador, big bourgeoisie most savagely exploits the countryside), the contradiction between the town and the countryside is one of extreme antagonism. But in a socialist country and in our revolutionary bases, such an antagonistic contradiction becomes a non-antagonistic contradiction; and it will disappear when a communist society is realized.

Lenin said: "Antagonism and contradiction are utterly different. Under socialism, antagonism disappears, but contradiction exists."⁴¹ That is to say, antagonism is only a form of struggle within the contradiction, but not its universal form; we cannot impose the formula everywhere.

VII. Conclusion

Having reached this point, we can sum up with a few remarks.

The law of the contradiction in things, that is, the law of unity of opposites, is the basic law of nature and society, and, therefore, also the basic law of thought. It is the opposite of the metaphysical world outlook. It means a great revolution in the history of human knowledge. According to the viewpoint of dialectical materialism, contradiction exists in all processes of objective things and subjective thought and runs through all processes from beginning to end—this is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction.

Contradictory things and each of their aspects have respectively their specific features—this is the particularity and relativity of contradiction. Contradictory things, according to certain conditions, are characterized by identity, and consequently can coexist in an entity and transform themselves each into its opposite—this again is the particularity and relativity of contradiction. But the struggle within the contradiction is ceaseless; it exists at the time when the opposites coexist and likewise when they are transforming themselves into each other, and the struggle is especially manifest when they transform themselves into each other—this again is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction.

In studying the particularity and relativity of contradiction, we must note the distinction between what is principal and what is non-principal in contradictions as well as in contradictory aspects. In studying the universality of, and the struggle within, the contradiction, we must note the distinction between various forms of struggle within the contradiction; otherwise we shall make mistakes.

If, after study, we have really understood the essential points mentioned above, we shall be able to smash those dogmatic ideas which violate the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and are detrimental to our revolutionary cause, and our experienced comrades will also be able to systematize their experiences so as to impart to them the character of principle and avoid repeating the mistakes of empiricism. These are a few simple conclusions we have reached in the study of the law of contradiction.

EXPLANATORY AND
REFERENCE NOTES

Explanatory and

Reference Notes

1. V. I. Lenin, *Philosophic Notebooks*, Russian edition; quoted in *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, New York, 1939, p. 109.
2. V. I. Lenin, "On Dialectics": "The division of the one and the cognition of its contradictory parts (see the quotation from Philo on Heraclitus at the beginning of Part III, 'Knowledge,' in Lassalle's book on Heraclitus) is the *essence* (one of the 'essentials,' one of the principal, if not the principal characteristics or features) of dialectics." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, New York, 1943, Vol. 11, p. 81.)
See also Lenin, "Extracts from Hegel's *Logic*": "Dialectics may be summed up as a theory of the unity of opposites. By so doing, the kernel of dialectics is grasped, but it needs explanation and development." (*Philosophic Notebooks*.)
3. Lenin, "On Dialectics," *op. cit.*, p. 82.
4. A remark of Tung Chung-shu (179-104 B.C.), a well-known exponent of the Confucian school during the Han dynasty (208 B.C. - 220 A.D.), in one of his memorials to Emperor Wu.
5. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Duehring*, New York, 1939, p. 132.
6. Lenin, "On Dialectics," *op. cit.*, p. 81.
7. Engels, *Anti-Duehring*, p. 133.
8. Lenin, "On Dialectics," *op. cit.*, p. 81.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.
10. V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI, Moscow, 1950, p. 143. Criticizing Bela Kun, the Hungarian Communist, Lenin said: "He gives up the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, the concrete analysis of concrete conditions."
11. Mao Tse-tung, *On Practice*, New York, 1951.
12. Quoted from *Sun Tzu*, a book written by Sun Tzu, also known as Sun Wu or Sun Wu-tzu, an eminent Chinese expert on military science and strategy in the fifth century B.C.
13. Wei Cheng (580-643) was a statesman and historian in the early period of the T'ang dynasty (618-906). The remark is found in *Tse Chih Tung Chien*, an ancient Chinese annual compiled by Ssu-Ma Kuang in the Sung dynasty (960-1276).

14. *Water Margin*, one of the greatest Chinese novels, is ascribed to Shih Nai-an who lived in the fourteenth century between the Yuan and Ming dynasties. The novel deals with a revolutionary peasant war in the Sung dynasty, led by Sung Chiang. Chu village was in the vicinity of Liangshanpo, the base from which Sung Chiang conducted the war against the ruling classes. The novel has been translated by Pearl Buck, under the title, *All Men Are Brothers*.
15. V. I. Lenin, "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Present Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin," *Selected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 66.
16. The Revolution of 1911, led by the bourgeoisie, overthrew the Manchu dynasty and established a new government under the presidency of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. The revolution was abortive, and within a few months the government reverted to the most reactionary feudalists and warlords under the leadership of Yuan Shih-kai.
17. At the first National Convention of the Kuomintang, held in Canton in January 1924 under the chairmanship of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, a united front was established between the national bourgeoisie and the workers and peasants represented by the Communist Party. The revolutionary war thus launched resulted in the defeat of the Northern warlord government in 1927. In the summer of the same year, under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek and in alliance with the imperialists, the bourgeoisie betrayed the united front and the common principles of the revolution, and launched civil war against the workers and peasants led by the Communist Party.
18. The second national united front was established in 1936. As early as 1933, when the Japanese were invading China's Northeast areas, the Communists proposed an end to the civil war and a United Anti-Japanese Front aimed at national unity, armed resistance to the Japanese, and the building of a new democratic republic. Under great popular pressure to resist the Japanese, the Kuomintang was forced in 1936 to suspend its civil war policy, and for two years a comparatively strong anti-Japanese unity was maintained. With the fall of Wuhan to the Japanese in October 1938, elements of the Kuomintang, such as Wang Ching-wei, deserted to the Japanese, and the Kuomintang itself began gradually to shift its efforts from the battlefield against Japan to struggle against the armies under Communist leadership.
19. Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925), a graduate of a Hongkong medical college and living most of his life in political exile abroad, was the outstanding figure in the Chinese bourgeois revolution against the Manchu dynasty. As sponsor of the first national united front between the Kuomintang and the Communists, he furthered the transition to a people's democratic revolution under the leadership of the workers and

- peasants. His widow, Soong Ching-ling, became a Vice Chairman of the People's Republic of China on its establishment in 1949.
20. The Sian Incident occurred on December 12, 1936, when the Kuomintang troops commanded by Generals Chang Hsueh-liang and Yang Hu-ch'eng, acting under the influence of the widespread anti-Japanese movement, arrested Chiang Kai-shek in Sian as a last resort to force him to unite with the Communists to resist Japanese aggression. As a result of the mediation of the Communist Party, Chiang was set free after he accepted the conditions for a national united front.
 21. *Ch'en Tu-hsueism* refers to the Right opportunist policies of Ch'en Tu-hsui, who was general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party in the early years, and eventually turned renegade. His policies contributed heavily to the defeat of the Revolution of 1924-27, for in his attempt to reconcile the Kuomintang he deserted the peasantry then engaged or about to engage in revolutionary struggle against the landlords, thus depriving the working class of its main ally in the revolution. Under his leadership, the party also neglected its middle-class allies and especially the armed forces. The Kuomintang could destroy the united front and make war against the people in 1927 chiefly because it capitalized on this weakness of the Communist Party.
 22. Joseph Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, New York, 1939.
 23. The Opium War (1839-42) was caused by the invasion of China by the British, and was precipitated by British insistence upon forcing opium upon the Chinese in contravention of Chinese law. The resulting Treaty of Nanking marked the formal beginning of China's century-long status as a semi-colony of the Western powers. Though defeated, China's efforts to defend herself opened her long struggle "to change the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal form of society into an independent democratic society." (Mao Tse-tung, *China's New Democracy*, New York, p. 17.)
 24. The Sino-Japanese War of 1894 was launched by Japan under the pretext of quelling a rebellion in Korea, over which the Chinese government claimed sovereignty. China's armed forces suffered a severe defeat. Besides entrenching itself in Korea, Japan gained possession of large Chinese areas (Taiwan, the Pescadores Islands, and the Liaotung Peninsula), and extorted indemnity as well as extensive imperialist privileges throughout China.
 25. An imperialist force, composed of British, American, Russian, German and Japanese contingents, intervened in 1900 to disperse a peasant uprising, known as the Boxer Rebellion, initially aimed at overthrowing the absolutist regime and ousting the foreign invaders. The Empress maneuvered the uprising into becoming a tool of her corrupt regime, while posing as a fellow-victim of the foreigners. The invading im-

- perialist troops looted the capital and ravaged the countryside.
26. See Note 17.
 27. The Manchu or Ch'ing dynasty ruled China from 1644 until its overthrow by the Revolution of 1911.
 28. The Northern Expedition, launched in 1925 by the revolutionary united front, during the next two years occupied the great valleys of the Yangtze and the Huangho, and defeated the Northern warlord government.
 29. After the betrayal of the united front by Chiang Kai-shek in 1927, the Communists established themselves in a number of bases, principally in the Southern provinces. A series of "extermination" campaigns, launched by Chiang Kai-shek with material aid from the imperialist powers, was repulsed. But by 1934 the Communist forces were obliged to evacuate their main Southern bases. Breaking through the cordon of Kuomintang armies, they began the historic Long March. The main column of 30,000 fought its way over a difficult route of 6,000 miles, arriving at the end of 1935 in Yen-an, in the northern province of Shensi, where the new Communist base was established.
 30. V. I. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done*, New York, 1929, p. 28.
 31. Lenin, "Extracts from Hegel's Logic," *Philosophic Notebooks*.
 32. The *Book of Mountains and Seas* was written during the Era of the Warring States between the fourth and second centuries B.C. In one of the legends, Kuafu is described as a superhuman being who runs a race with the sun. Winning the race, he makes a tour in the heart of the sun but finally dies of thirst.
 33. Yi is a legendary hero of ancient China, particularly famous for his archery. According to a legend in *Huai-Nan Tzu*, a book compiled under the auspices of Prince Liu An in the second century B.C., there were ten suns in the sky in the days of Emperor Yao. In view of the damage to vegetation from the suns, Yao ordered Yi to shoot them down. In another legend recorded by Wang I, Liu An's contemporary, the archer shot down nine of the ten suns.
 34. *Pilgrimage to the West* is a mythological novel written in the sixteenth century. Sun Wu-kung, hero of the novel, is a personified monkey. He has the mysterious power of changing himself into 72 forms, including birds, animals, plants and inanimate objects. There is an abridged English translation by Arthur Waley entitled, *Monkey*.
 35. *Strange Tales from the Carefree Studio* is a collection of short stories written by Pu Sung-ling in the seventeenth century, comprising 431 pieces, mostly stories of ghosts, fairies, and foxes, collected from folklore. An English translation by Herbert Giles is entitled, *Strange Tales from a Chinese Studio*.
 36. Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Chicago, 1904, pp. 310-11.

37. Lenin, "*On Dialectics*," *op. cit.*, p. 82.
38. The quotation first appeared in the *History of the Earlier Han Dynasty* by Pan Ku, a celebrated historian in the first century A.D., and has been a popular saying ever since.
39. Lenin, "*On Dialectics*," *op. cit.*, p. 82.
40. Chang Kuo-tao's Right opportunist policies were defeated in the period of the Long March (see Note 29) and shortly thereafter, as part of the struggle to establish the policy of the anti-Japanese national united front. He ended up by betraying the party when he joined the anti-Communist secret service of the Kuomintang.
41. Lenin's critical notes on Nikolai Bukharin's *Economics of the Transition Period*.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

ON PRACTICE

A critical essay attacking misconceptions on the role of theory and practice.

Mao Tse-tung

Paper, 15¢

PROBLEMS OF ART AND LITERATURE

The role of artists and writers in the people's struggle for liberation.

Mao Tse-tung

Paper, 25¢

MATERIALISM AND EMPIRIO-CRITICISM

Lenin's basic philosophic work.

V. I. Lenin

\$3.50

THE GERMAN IDEOLOGY

One of the classics of Marxist theory. A fundamental work on historical materialism.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

Trade, \$3.00; Pop., \$2.25

LUDWIG FEUERBACH

The philosophy of Hegel and Feuerbach. Contains the famous "Theses on Feuerbach" by Marx.

Frederick Engels

Trade, \$1.50; Paper, 50¢

DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

A succinct presentation of the philosophic foundations of Marxism.

Joseph Stalin

Cloth, \$1.50; Paper, 25¢

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM: An Introductory Course. Maurice Cornforth

A systematic and popular presentation, in three volumes:

I. Materialism and the Dialectical Method Cloth, \$1.75, Paper, \$1.00

II. Historical Materialism Cloth, \$2.50; Paper, \$1.50

III. Theory of Knowledge Cloth, \$2.50; Paper, \$1.50

PRAGMATISM

A critique of the philosophy of imperialism. Cloth, \$2.75; Paper, \$1.50

Harry K. Wells

Write for Complete Catalog

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

35¢