

THE ORIGIN OF THE CRITICISM AGAINST 'TWO COMBINE INTO ONE'

by Fan Ruoyu, Beijing *Hongqi* (in Chinese), No 10, 2 Oct 79 pp 64-69.

Translated in *China Report: Red Flag*, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, JPRS, vol. 74680. October, 1979, pp. 109-118.

[Editors note; Concerning the question of "two combine into one," surely everyone can have an opinion and launch an academic discussion accordingly. However, when this question was raised, that "theoretical authority" of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" indulged in conspiracies and tricks to deceive the higher as well as lower levels. He arbitrarily turned this question into a political question, engineered an unjust political case and caused Yang Xianzhen and other comrades to suffer injustice and political persecution over an extended period of time. In the conspiratorial activity in which that "theoretical authority" [apparently an ironical reference to Kang Sheng—*tsw*], ganged up with Chen Boda to concoct this unjust political case, this journal once published, under the signature of "Reporter," an article entitled "A New Polemic on the Philosophical Front," in which it manufactured many charges and resorted to many slanderous and untrue phrases against Comrade Yang Xianzhen, creating extremely adverse effects. In order to expose the conspiracies and tricks of that "theoretical authority" and to redeem this journal from the bad influence it created, we are specially publishing this article by Comrade Fan Ruoyu. A fine old saying goes like this: "We urge you: to indulge yourself in even a small trick, for everyone will recognize it; and we urge you not to indulge yourself in any selfish end, for everyone will learn about it." Conspiracies and intrigues, self-deceptions and deceptions can only prevail for a while. But in the end it will be difficult for them to escape the punishment of history. The destiny of that "theoretical authority" who indulged exclusively in conspiracies and intrigues is no exception.

On 31 May this year, GUANGMING RIDAO published "A Reassessment of the 'Polemic' on the Question of 'Two Combine Into One.'" On 21 August, RENMIN RIBAO published "The Criticism Against 'Two Combine Into One' Is an Unjust Political Case." These two articles basically exposed how that "theoretical authority" made use of this academic question of "two combine into one" to carry out political persecution against Comrade Yang Xianzhen. When the criticism of "two combine into one" began, I saw some of the events that took place. After the "gang of four" had been toppled, I realized something which I had not realized before. In particular, "if I want to speak about others, I should first speak about myself." At that time I followed the verbally delivered program of that "theoretical authority" and made the mistake of writing a report to "criticize" Comrade Yang Xianzhen politically. Thus, I feel that it is all the more my duty to reveal what I knew about the situation.

How Did the Discussion on "Two Combine Into One" Begin?

To explain a complicated situation one has to begin from the beginning. Around April and May 1964, students of the central party school were studying philosophy. In his lecture. Comrade Li Ming, lecturer of the philosophy teaching and research section, said: "The law of the unity of opposites embodies the question of 'one divides into two' as well as the question of 'two combine into one'; in the past we have talked a great deal about 'one divides into two' and too little about 'two combine into one.' You can all do some research and write some articles in respect to the latter." Some students expressed their agreement with this, while others expressed disagreement. Discussions were held, and the leadership was asked to make known its position. For the sake of discretion, the party committee of the party school twice

commissioned me to seek instructions from that "theoretical authority" (at that time, due to our relations in work, I was living with that "theoretical authority"). Around the middle of May I submitted my first request for instruction: "Is there the question of 'two combine into one' in the law of the unity of opposites? Is the formulation of 'two combine into one' correct or not?" He instructed: "Li Ming says that there is the question of 'two combine into one' in the law of the unity of opposites. But I have no idea what 'two combine into one' implies and cannot judge whether it is correct or not." Since he says that in the past we talked too little about 'two combine into one,' this shows that the issue was discussed. Li Ming could not be the first one to talk about it. Who, then, was the first one to discuss it? We should find out about this matter." He was implying that Comrade Li Ming and others were spokesmen for Comrade Yang Xianzhen.

On 29 May, GUANGMING RIBAO published the article "'One Divides Into Two' and 'Two Combine Into One,'" written by Comrades Ai Hengwu and Lin Qingshan. My second request was: "Can we not judge whether 'two combine into one' is correct in accordance with the content of the article by Ai and Lin?" He instructed: "Since the article by Ai and Lin has been published in the newspaper, philosophical circles will surely carry out discussions. Through discussions they will naturally arrive at some conclusion. The leadership of the party school need not make known its position hastily. Some people say that 'two combine into one' was first put forth by Yang Xianzhen. Are there transcripts of speeches or records? We should look into this!" At first the students of the party school could either agree or disagree with the formulation of this academic question of "two combine into one"; but since the party school is a teaching organ, the students, in order to unify their understanding, asked the leadership to make known its position. Under the circumstances, the school's party committee asked for instruction from the higher level. This was normal practice. Now that I recall, in his two instructions that "theoretical authority" only evaded an answer to the question of whether the formulation of the academic question of "two combine into one" was correct. In his first instruction he wanted to find out who first put forth "two combine into one." In his second instruction he wanted to find evidence of Comrade Yang Xianzhen's discussion in "two combine into one." His two instructions did not answer what we asked. This showed something abnormal. But at that time I did not realize that, prior to the party's school request for instruction, he was already engaged in numerous abnormal activities.

How Could the Article "'One Divides Into Two' and 'Two Combine Into One'" Be Published?

The article by Ai and Lin was recommended to GUANGMING RIBAO by Comrade Li Ming (who was once a reporter for GUANGMING RIBAO). The final proof was submitted to that "theoretical authority" to be checked and approved. At a meeting held on 24 July 1964 to discuss and criticize the "orientation and procedure" of "two combine into one," he said: "When I read the article (referring to the article by Ai and Lin), I thought: they must be spokesmen for Yang Xianzhen." On 21 September 1966, at the Cultural Revolution joint meeting of party schools, he said that "GUANGMING RIBAO was the first to discover that something was wrong with 'two combine into one.'" This was what happened: The philosophy teaching and research section of the party school wrote an article and submitted it for publication to the philosophy column of GUANGMING RIBAO. GUANGMING RIBAO discovered that something was wrong. However, some people did not think so, There was a debate. It was later found out that the article came from the party school, which held that nothing was wrong and wanted to publish it. GUANGMING RIBAO got the final proof ready and gave it to me to read. On reading it I found that something was wrong and told GUANGMING RIBAO that manuscripts of this nature should all be withheld from publication." If the activities of that "theoretical authority" were normal, then

why, since he had read the final proof of the article by Ai and Lin and had discovered that something was wrong, did he profess ignorance and tell the party school that he "could not understand" the implication of "two combine into one" and "could not judge whether it was correct"? Even if he had not read the final proof when the party school asked him for instruction, why did he, after reading the final proof, express his opinion to GUANGMING RIBAO, which was not directly under his leadership» while at the same time hide the truth from the party school, which was directly under his leadership? More importantly, since he had already told GUANGMING RIBAO to "withhold from publication" the article by Ai and Lin, then why was the article published later on? "There are living ghosts beside dead men." So, Guan Feng, the trusted follower of that "theoretical authority," had also read the final proof of the article by Ai and Lin and told the people of the "anti-revisionist philosophy group" that the article was "a big poisonous weed and a big fish!" At the meeting on 24 July that "theoretical authority" said that "that 'anti-revisionist philosophy group' of Guan Feng strongly opposed" the article by Ai and Lin. From this we can see that, when GUANGMING RIBAO later decided to publish the article by Ai and Lin, its aim was to catch the "big fish." This was the first step in the conspiratorial activity of that "theoretical authority."

How Did the Article "'Two Combine Into One' Is Not a Dialectical Method" Come To Be Published?

On 5 June 1964, that is, 7 days after the publication of the article by Ai and Lin, GUANGMING RIBAO published an article entitled "'Two Combine Into One' Is Not a Dialectical Method." That "theoretical authority" pointed at this article and happily said to others: "Sima Yi is quick in response!" So it turned out that the author of this article was present when Guan Feng pointed to the final proof of the article by Ai and Lin, saying that it was a "big fish." I cannot haphazardly guess the motive of the author himself in responding so quickly with his article. But as for that "theoretical authority," I can say with grounds that this was a trap that he had long set up.

The final proof of the article "'Two Combine Into One' Is Not a Dialectical Method" was sent personally by the former responsible comrade of GUANGMING RIBAO to that "theoretical authority" to be checked and approved. After he had read the final proof, he looked at that comrade and said: "On the whole the article is all right, but there is a problem.... Further on in his article (the author) proposes the formula: From 'one divides into two' within a unified object we progress to 'one divides into two' of a unified object. New things will appear, and again 'one divides into two' within a unified object will progress to 'one divides into two' of a unified object. I have not studied this aspect. I want the author to consider whether he is certain of this, If not he can delete this part. There will be trouble if other people seize on our shortcoming. So, that "theoretical authority," who often seized on other's shortcomings, was aware that "there would be trouble if other people seized on his shortcoming"! We can see that this article was checked, approved and revised by him.

At that meeting on 24 July that "theoretical authority" said: "GUANGMING RIBAO sent me the final proof of the article "'Two Combine Into One' Is Not a Dialectical Method,' together with the newspaper of 29 May (Note: the day the article by Ai and Lin was published). I asked them to publish it without delay. On 5 June (Note: the day of publication of the article), at the modern drama festival, I asked Jiang Qing to send it to the chairman." From that point on he waved the banner of Chairman Mao to deceive the higher and lower levels and confused this academic question of "two combine into one" with the political question. On 12 July he said to the former responsible comrade of GUANGMING RIBAO: "What I like is confusion all over the world! At present GUANGMING RIBAO publishes only one issue (of the philosophy supplement). This is not enough! We can publish more issues and put out additional issues."

Although the article "'Two Combine Into One' Is Not a Dialectical Method" did not go beyond the realm of academic discussion, that "theoretical authority" made use of this article as a preparatory step to confuse an academic question with a political question. Just as he said later, in the beginning "he would consciously carry out an academic struggle" to "first of all arouse everyone to speak up." Then he would "develop" the academic question into a political question. Publication of the article "'Two Combine Into One' Is Not a Dialectical Method" was the second step of the conspiratorial activity of that "theoretical authority."

What Was the Purpose of the Article "A Discussion With Comrade Yang Xianzhen on the Question of 'Two Combine Into One'?"

Not long afterward, pressed by that "theoretical authority," the party school found the notes which Comrade Yang Xianzhen had used in a lecture at the Xinjiang class on 3 April 1964. These lecture notes came under the heading of "We Must Learn How To Grasp the Law of the Unity of Opposites in Doing Our Work and Respect the Dialectical Method in Actual Work." In his lecture he talked about the question of "two combine into one." That "theoretical authority" finally got hold of the "criminal evidence" of Comrade Yang Xianzhen and felt that he could "solve" the problem of Comrade Yang Xianzhen. He said to me: "The party Central Committee wanted me to be in charge of the party school. But the affairs in the Cao Camp are very difficult to handle! In the past I could not solve the problem of Yang Xianzhen. because Cherp were still many people at the higher level who would speak up for him!" The veteran cadres of the party school all knew that it was not that the affairs of the party school were very difficult to handle, but that the affairs of that "theoretical authority" were very difficult to handle! Not only were his affairs in the party school very difficult to handle, but his affairs in other units, as long as he poked his nose into them, also became very difficult to handle.

In accordance with the plan and procedure of that "theoretical authority," on 17 July 1964 RENMIN RIBAO published an article entitled "A Discussion With Comrade Yang Xianzhen on the Question of 'Two Combine Into One.'" This was an article of criticism drafted by the theoretical department of RENMIN RIBAO on the orders of that "theoretical authority" to attack Comrade Yang Xianzhen's lecture notes. He personally presided over the discussion and revision of this article. I took part in this discussion and revision. In the Cultural Revolution, that "theoretical authority" used this article to further persecute Comrade Yang Xianzhen. In several of his talks at the central party school he openly revealed the truth of the matter:

- On 27 August 1967, mentioning this article, he said: "I presided over this article. The reason I used the signatures of Wang Zhong and Guo Peiheng was that they were working at the Xinjiang class, where Yang Xianzhen talked about 'two combine into one.'"
- On 5 September of the same year, in connection with this article, he said: "It is not a random matter to publicly criticize a member of the party Central Committee in a party newspaper. This in itself is a political criticism against Yang Xianzhen."
- On 5 November 1966, mentioning this article, he said: "After the struggle against 'two combine into one' in 1964, this question became more public. In the beginning it was like an academic struggle. We also consciously carried out that struggle for a while so as to arouse every-one to speak up. Later on we criticized Yang Xianzhen by name and made it a political issue. With this struggle, Yang Xianzhen was toppled." In the Cultural Revolution, whoever ruthlessly persecuted veteran cadres was rendering a deed for Lin Biao and the "gang of four." The primary responsibility for persecuting Comrade Yang Xianzhen belonged to that "theoretical authority." He often lied, yet, in order to display his service shamefully, at this point he even spoke the truth. This was precisely what

happened: He also presided over the article that criticized Comrade Yang Xianzhen by name; criticism by name was his conscious act of turning an academic issue into a political issue; criticism by name in itself was an attempt to criticize Comrade Yang Xianzhen politically; and with this political criticism. Comrade Yang Xianzhen was "toppled"! Although this first article that criticized someone by name was not an obvious and direct political criticism, that "theoretical authority" made it very clear that criticism by name in itself was a political criticism. This article was the third step in the conspiratorial activity of that "theoretical authority."

How Did They Set the Tone for the Article "A New Polemic on the Philosophical Front"?

At a meeting on 23 September 1964 that "theoretical authority" announced: "We must carry out discussion on 'two combine into one' in an organized, planned and systematic manner." Later on he said: "After the criticism by name in RENMIN RIBAO, we should gradually develop toward the political aspect. The next step will be to carry out political criticism in RED FLAG." So, according to his plan and procedure, the article entitled "A New Polemic on the Philosophical Front," by the "journal's reporter," was published in issue No 16 of the 1964 RED FLAG. This RED FLAG article said; "Just as our party was strengthening the propaganda on the revolutionary dialectical method of 'one divides into two,' Comrade Yang Xianzhen, on the contrary, talked vehemently about the so-called theory of 'two combine into one' and put on a rival show against the party." "To observe the relationship among the various classes in society in accordance with the theory of 'two combine into one' advocated by Comrade Yang Xianzhen, we will inevitably write off class boundaries, cancel the class struggle and bring about the theory of class conciliation." "To vehemently propagate the theory of 'two combine into one' at this point, Comrade Yang Xianzhen is consciously conforming to the needs of modern revisionism and assisting the modern revisionists in propagating peace among the classes, class cooperation and the theory of compromise among contradictions. At the same time, he is also consciously conforming to the needs of the bourgeoisie and remnant feudal forces at home and providing them with the so-called 'theoretical* weapon to resist the socialist education movement." Furthermore, the article also accused other comrades of "defending 'two combine into one.'" The labels which this article put on Comrade Yang Xianzhen and other comrades were all products of the "hat" factory run jointly by that "theoretical authority" and Chen Boda.

In early August 1964, at a meeting presided over by that "theoretical authority" and Chen Boda, an outline of the article was drawn up in accordance with the argument that "'two combine into one' is a theory of class conciliation advocating 'combining into one' Marxism and revisionism, 'combining into one' the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and 'combining into one*' imperialism & colonialism." At that time I had not yet gone to work for RED FLAG and therefore did not take part in drawing up the outline setting a political tone for "two combine into one." Later on, when RED FLAG drafted the article on the basis of this outline, I did take part in the work. However, in the Cultural Revolution, when that "theoretical authority" persecuted me, he said that I "actually harbored while appearing to criticize" Comrade Yang Xianzhen, and he brought the "charge" of "implementing Yang Xianzhen's counter-revolutionary revisionist line" against me. Practice is the only criterion for testing the truth. I could not possibly have implemented a line which never existed in this world. But, as regards the question of Comrade Yang Xianzhen, I did implement the ultra-left line which that "theoretical authority" pushed!

I have already mentioned the question of the tone of the RED FLAG "reporter." I can further point out that even the name of "reporter" was designed by that "theoretical authority." At that time some people suggested publishing the article under the signature of the "journal's commentator." He shook his head and said: "For the standard of the article, the name 'commentator' carries too much weight." Others suggested publishing the article under the signature of "the journal's correspondent." He again shook his head and said: "If we use the

signature 'journal's correspondent,' then people will think that this is the viewpoint of an individual correspondent and does not represent RED FLAG. It will carry too little weight." Finally, he designed this signature which did not carry too little or too much weight: "the journal's reporter"! That RED FLAG article basically completed his plan of creating an unjust political case. This was the fourth step in the conspiratorial activity of that "theoretical authority."

What Do I Have To Expose en the Question of "Two Combine Into One"?

As I said above, what I expose are the several key steps in the conspiratorial activity which that "theoretical authority" initially launched in his criticism against "two combine into one." He turned the normal discussion of "two combine into one" which the students of the party school carried out in study into a large-scale tempestuous criticism, and he turned an academic and theoretical question into a political question. Of course, a theoretical question is related to a political question, and one cannot be separated entirely from the other. Conforming to the needs of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" in usurping party and state power, every so-called "theory" which that "theoretical authority" concocted was an out-and-out political question. However, a theoretical question should be distinguished from a political question, and one should not be equated with the other. In evaluating and discussing people and events relating to a theoretical question and a political question, we must practically and realistically carry out concrete analysis and must not, without grounds or analysis, turn any-one's theoretical question into a political question. Furthermore, we must not permit the use of a discussion on a theoretical question to carry out a political frameup.

What I expose is the conspiracy that "theoretical authority" was engaged in, which did not involve the academic and theoretical discussion of "two combine into one." Conspiracies must be exposed, while discussions on different academic opinions should be carried out. To date some comrades have read over 300 speeches and records of comments by that "theoretical authority," but they have not been able to find any academic and theoretical criticism against "two combine into one." I mentioned above that he discussed with the former responsible comrade of GUANGMING RIBAO the question of "the formula of one divides into two within a unified object." One can say that he managed to touch on theory in a way. But then he immediately stated that "I have not studied this aspect." As regards "two combine into one," people noted that he only once expressed his opinion on the theory, which was that "he did not study it." And people could not find even one opinion of his on what he had studied. He did not need to study theory. All he studied was how to resort to conspiracies and intrigues! His criticism of "two combine into one" shows that he is a true conspirator who is used to engaging in conspiracies. It also shows that he is a false "theoretical authority" who never studies theory. Here I would like to conclude by alluding to a few lines of classical poetry--

Why should we ask:

Who is true—Lord Zhou or Wang Mang? Can we not tell from how they live?

So it is said that:

When falsehood passes for truth, then truth becomes falsehood and when one indulges in falsehood, one ends in the same manner?