Introduction

The first three articles in this series have dealt with Mao's contributions to a number of revolutions in colonial countries, revolutionary warfare and military strategies, and political economy, economic policy and socialist construction (Revolution, April-May, June and July 1978, respectively). But would it have been possible for Mao to develop his revolutionary line in these, and other, spheres and make such great contributions in these areas without the constant application of Marxist philosophy, materialist dialectics? Impossible.

In fact, as the previous articles have stressed, Mao's contributions in these fields are all based upon and characterized by the thoroughgoing application of materialist dialectics. At the same time Mao devoted great attention to and further developed and enriched Marxism-Leninism in the realm of philosophy in its own right. This itself was dialectically related to his contributions in other areas and most especially, as will be gone into later in this article, to what is overall his greatest contribution—the development of the theory and line of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Struggle and development on the philosophical front are closely linked with struggle and development in society as a whole. This has always been the case and becomes all the more so with the emergence of Marxism and the development of the proletariat into a class for itself, that is, with the development of class consciousness movement of the working class. Under socialism this truth takes on even greater importance, because the task of the proletariat as master of socialist society is to consciously transform nature, nature and the people according to its world outlook and advance to communism.

So long as there are classes, any kind of philosophy has a class nature. And "philosophy always serves politics." ("Momentous Struggle on the Question of the Identity Between Thinking and Being," The Three Major Struggles On China's Philosophical Front, Peking Foreign Language Press, 1971, p. 47)

As Mao himself insisted, the foundation of philosophy—in class society—is class struggle, and this is especially true of Marxist philosophy. Mao explained it this way: "There is a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. . . . The oppressor oppresses the oppressed, while the oppressed need to fight back and the front are closely linked with struggle and development of intellectuals. "If you don't engage in class struggle, then what is this philosophy you're engaged in?" (See "Notes on Conceptions of Philosophy," Chairman Mao Talks To The People, edited by Stuart Schram, pp. 212, 213, 215)

But philosophy in turn exerts a tremendous influence on the political struggle. This is the mass reason why Mao not only engaged in philosophy and to struggle in this realm himself but repeatedly insisted that philosophy must be derived from the concerns of the scholar's study and be taken up by the broad masses of people. For without consciously taking up Marxism philosophy and breaking the mental shackles of the philosophy of the exploiting classes it would be impossible for the proletariat and the broad masses to smash completely the fetters of capitalism and class society, emancipate mankind and bring about a qualitative leap in its mastery over nature.

Foundations of Marxist Philosophy

Mao systematized and enriched the understanding of the fundamental law of contradiction and armed masses of people, not only in China but worldwide, with this deepened understanding. This is the essence of Mao's tremendous contribution to Marxist-Leninism in the sphere of philosophy. To grasp this fully it is necessary first to summarize the basic principles of Marxist philosophy and their development beginning with Marx and Engels.

Marxist philosophy, like Marxism in general, did not, of course, spring full-blowh from the head of Marx. As Mao was reported to have jokingly asked, when Marx was a very young man did he study any philosophy? He had inherited the revolutionary side of Hegel's philosophy—its dialectical method. Engels stressed that while there were those, including Marx and Engels, who in the conclusion of (Hegel's] Philosophy of Right that there were those, including Marx and Engels, who in the conclusion of (Hegel's] Philosophy of Right that
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as Engels expressed it.

"The whole dogmatic content of the Hegelian system is declared to be absolute truth, in contradiction to his dialectical method, which dissolves all dogmatism. Thus the revolutionary tide is smothered beneath the overgrowth of the conservative side. And what applies to philosophical content applies also to historical practice. Mankind, which, in the person of Hegel, has reached the peak of working out the absolute idea, must also in practice have gotten so far that it can carry out this absolute ide in reality. Hence the practical political demands of the absolute idea on contemporaries may not be stretched too far. And we find at the conclusion of [Hegel's] Philosophy of Right that the absolute idea is to be realised in the monarchy based on social estates which Frederick William III of Prussia set up and slim. It is simply a contradiction in the monarchical monarchy." (Ibid., pp. 346-348)

Especially after Hegel's death in 1831, however, there were those, including Marx and Engels, who inherited the revolutionary side of Hegel's philosophy—its dialectical method. Engels stressed that while Hegel's system led to conservatism in both philosophy and politics, "whoever regarded the dialectical method as the main thing could belong to the most extreme opposition, both in politics and religion." (Ibid., p. 342)
And, Engels recalled, after 1842, when in Prussia "the odious patriarchal and absolute feudal reaction ascended the throne with Frederick William IV," Marx and Engels himself —took the field of opposition as part of three "Young Hegelians" whose stand "revealed itself distinctly distinguished and logical" (Engels, op. cit., p. 15). Feuerbach, bourgeois and the mesed the dogm of philosophy, only to deceive the censorship." (Ibid., p. 344) But, Engels, writing from the West. The "reality is more than Feuerbach. How enthusiastically Marx greeted the new comrade, "that he is influenced by it, one may read in The Holy Family." (Ibid., p. 344)

But Feuerbach was not a thoroughgoing materialist. During the 1840's, Feuerbach retired philosophically as well. He rejected consistent materialism because he conceived of materialism as the base of the social relations of all eons and of all centuries —mechanical materialism, metaphysics as opposed to dialectics —as represented especially by the Fregean philosophy of the 19th century. He recognized only quantitative motion and treated the dialectical development of scientific theory as a process of scientific discovery that at the same time and the fact of capitalism had not yet gained control of the science. Such materialism failed to grasp the role of the material, concept of materialist and the relation between different kinds of matter in motion. Feuerbach returned to idealism. While he had showed that religion represented merely, the fantastic expression in the human mind and human reason by religious philosophy, to get human relations a religious character. As Engels characterized it:

"According to Feuerbach, religion is the relation between the subject and the object in the form of the object. The relation based on the heart, which religion until now has sought its truth in a fantastic mirror image of reality. The fantastic mirror images of human beings —but now finds a direct and objective relation to the explanation in the form between 'I' and 'Thou.' Thus, finally, with Feuerbach the love becomes one of the highest forms, if not the only form of the 'love of self.'" (Ibid., p. 354)

And things turn out even worse when Feuerbach's philosophical and moral system is to be tested against the facts of social and political relations. Engels, with both sarcasm and regret, pointed out that the social relations, the "temple" for Feuerbach's moral credo, for those everyone involved equally pursues his right to happen in the final analysis —no farther than enquiring equate with the heart as the highest principle of society. As Engels said, "Feuerbach's morality is cut off from the actuality by one single principle of existence. And it was the product of a dialectical process of development of the alienation of the individual from nature, and the alienation of society from the individual. It was the product of a process of development. This was dialectical materialism—or materialist dialectics, historical materialism, as it was developed and systematized by Marx and Engels."

Thus it was necessary to go beyond Feuerbach, who had evolved out of Hegelism of an orthodoxy, but had been incapable of making an actual philosophical revolution. It was Marx who, more than anyone else, led in this leap. As Engels summarized it, "Out of the dialectical materialism of Feuerbach developed still another tendency, the only one which has borne real fruit. And this tendency is essentially connected with the name of Marx." (Ibid., p. 361) Short, Feuerbach went no farther than the bourgeoisie itself in the final analysis —no farther than enquiring equate with the heart as the highest principle of society. As Engels said, "Feuerbach's morality is cut off from the actuality by one single principle of existence. And it was the product of a dialectical process of development of the alienation of the individual from nature, and the alienation of society from the individual. It was the product of a process of development. This was dialectical materialism—or materialist dialectics, historical materialism, as it was developed and systematized by Marx and Engels."
philosophy is the science of thought and its laws — formal logic and dialectics. Everything else is subsumed in the philosophical categories of the "ontological sciences." ("Socialism Utopian and Scientific," Marx, Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 31.)

But it hardly needs saying that putting an end to such outdated philosophy is not so easy. This is not only because it is the outmoded form of the idealist philosophers, but because, as suggested above, it is not the outdated but the living form of idealism which underlies the reactionary forces in society. Marxist philosophy has had to fight every step of the way against the decadent philosophy of Machism, the materialist position has developed in opposition to them, to one form or another of idealism and metaphysics. This is not only a reflection of the struggle between the scientific materialist and the speculative (or "philosophical") Bourgeoisie, but also of a very important part of the overall struggle between these classes.

And such struggle in the philosophical realm, reflective as it may be, in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Here, philosophy has taken place, at least in the form of that which it is in the scientific materialist position, but which it is not in the scientific materialist philosophy, as for example in Engels' work outstanding work Anti-Defeaturism. 

So the case with Lenin, and in particular the sharp struggle he waged to expose and combat reactionaries within the ranks of the workers and the socialist movement. But, this is not the place to go into the particulars of these in the philosophical field, and the one which produced the most effective work by Lenin in dealing with the philosophical enemy was Lenin's scathing criticism of the philosophical and political opportunists who rallied around the "Scientific Materialism" conceptions in the late-1910s, in the early 1920s, especially in the period between the two world wars.

Essentially, Machism (the most popular variety of empiricism-criticism at that time) was a form of idealism. It maintained that all reality is psychological, that it exists only as it is perceived by ordinary mortals and even of themselves, into one great whole—one extension of the consciousness of all. To use a simple example, two different people in a room prove repeatedly capable of seeing the very same phenomenon, but that, in whichever state, matter exists and exists independently of and as the foundation for human consciousness. Idem. In Lenin's words, "dialectical materialism identifies, as a single character, the entire character of all scientific theory of the structure of the material and its properties; it insists on the absence of absolute boundless movement in the transformation of matter from one state into another, absolutely identical, relative, characteristic of all the changes; the unity of consciousness constitutes the base of the way of existing outside the mind."

In other words, what is decisive in drawing the fundamental distinctions between dialectical materialism and idealism in philosophy is not what particular material exists in that but, in whatever state, matter exists and exists independent of and as the foundation for human consciousness, is the unity of consciousness, which is necessary. Lenin explained that in dialectical materialism, the recognition philosophical materialism is bound up in the unity of consciousness, or of existing outside the mind."

As noted before, the purpose and substance of that great work was the defense of materialism against (and not just against materialism, but against a wide range of different approaches to dialectic and critical materialism, Marxist philosophy. As Lenin showed, Machism basically attempted to disguise the real materialist substance of dialectic and critical materialism with the "materialism" of the atomists, the materialists err because they don't apply. In Russia, this was sharply manifested during the 1917 revolutions in Russia. (For more on this see Lenin's Anti-Duhring, revolution was to be later taken up and more fully developed in dialectic and critical materialism, Marxist philosophy.

But why did these "recent" opponents of Lenin, the "mainstream" of Marxism, and even of the proletariat, join^ the revolutionary movement in its period of up-}

The battle against revisionism in the philosophical sphere was closely tied to the struggle against it politically. But at that time the fight against philosophical revisionism was just the beginning. In fact, without upholding dialectical and historical materialism and answering in a thoroughgoing way the "revisionism" question, no Marxist philosophy could be the "true" Marxist philosophy. And it is related to the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms and today's "new question," more or less unexpected and unforeseen. This is why the development line of development only to an insufficient degree and only for the briefest period, will always inevitably give rise to some one way or another to the so-called "revolutions.


As noted before, the purpose and substance of this great work was the defense of materialism against against the enemies of the working class within the so-

But before turning to Mao's enrichment of Marxist philosophy, let's see how Stalin handled that part of the task appreciably Stalin's role in this area. As Mao himself was to write, just such work as The Foundations of Leninism demonstrated that Marxism had its important principles of dialectics and of historical materialism and to put it, Stalin, in The Foundations of Leninism, "...analyzed the method of contradiction in empiricism, showing that Leninism is the Marxism of the era of imperialist and proletarian revolution, and at the same time analyzed the particularity of Marxist Russian imperialism within this general contradiction, showed the method of dialectics in theory and tactics of proletarian revolution and how..."
Stalin correctly emphasizes, in combating oppositions of opinion, that in general, that there can be no 'immmutable' social systems, no 'eternal principles' of private property and the market-economy, the exposing to exchange, the employing the peasant to the landlord, of the worker to the exploiters... (Ibid. p. 110) And he draws the correct conclusion that "Hence the capitalist system is replaced by the socialist system, just as at one time the feudal system was replaced by the capitalistic system". (Ibid.) But there is no sense that the law "there can be no 'immutable' social systems," is being applied, at least as far as the capitalist society, to make the point of its unfixed.
The theory of knowledge

Practice is the source of theory; theory is a concentration of practice: perception is the raw material of conception; conception is the product of the synthesis of perception. But conception, rational knowledge theory, must also be returned to practice, in which process not only is the rational knowledge tested, but the raw materials are gathered for deepening rational knowledge... and so on in an endless upward spiral.

This is why Mao states that, on the one hand, the anticipated results can be achieved in practice, then the particular process of cognition or a particular stage of the process (perception-conception-practice) can be considered complete, but on the other hand, "the movement of human knowledge is not completed." (Ibid., p. 306)

Nor is the movement of human knowledge ever completed. As Mao explains, summing up the laws of the process:

"Discover the truth through practice, and again through practice verify and develop the truth. Start from perceptual knowledge and actively develop it into rational knowledge, then start from rational knowledge and actively guide revolutionary practice to change both the subjective and the objective world. Practice is the source of theory, but theory is the product of practice. This form repeats itself in endless cycles, and with each cycle the content of practice and knowledge rises to a higher level. Such is the whole of the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge, and such is the dialectical-materialist theory of the unity of knowing and doing." (Ibid., p. 308)

But the fact that the movement of knowledge is unending should not be taken to mean that it is im

what "truths" to believe. In other words, they deny that there is objective truth. This was a major argument that Lenin was combating in Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, and he there contrasts the rationalism of these Machists with the Materialism of Engels.

"For Bogdanov (as for all the Machists) recognition of the relativity of our knowledge excludes even the admission of absolute truth. For Engels absolute truth is not recorded from relative truths. Bogdanov is a relativist: Engels is a dialecticist." (Ibid., p. 134)

So absolute truth is made up of relative truths. But what is the relation between them? Mao explains it as follows:

"Mariakins recognize that in the absolute and general processes of development of the universe, the development of each particular process is relative, and that hence, in the endless flow of absolute truth, man's knowledge of a particular process is only relative truth. The sum total of innumerable relative truths constitutes absolute truth." (Mao, "On Practice," op. cit., p. 307)

In other words, absolute truth in its fullest sense is the sum total of truth, the whole truth. But this whole is made up of innumerable parts. These are relative truths; they are only partial.

But what about ideas which were held to be true at one time and are later proven to be untrue or only partially true (for example, certain laws of physics)? This happens because man acquires and sums up more experience, discovers new processes and laws and develops and refines his understanding of things. But this obviously does not go against the fact that man's knowledge is proceeding from the lower to the higher level, that he is acquiring more and more knowledge of the objective world. Nevertheless, the fact that man's knowledge must proceed from the lower to the higher level, that at any point he can only apply what he knows of the truth then exists to the process of changing the world, in which process he tests those ideas and acquires the basis for making a further leap in his knowledge. He cannot apply today what he will only know tomorrow, he will only know more tomorrow if today he applies what he already knows and then sums up the results.

Mao also says that:

"In social practice, the process of coming into being, developing and passing away is infinite, and so is the process of coming into being, developing and passing away in human knowledge. As man's practice which changes objective reality in accordance with given ideas, theories, plans or programmes, advances further and further, his knowledge of objective reality likewise becomes deeper and deeper. The movement of change in the world of objective reality is never-ending and so is man's cognition of truth through practice." (Ibid.)

Some people try to use this to promote the idea that, since knowledge is continually deepening, it is not necessary to return to practice to test and develop theory. Mao Tse-tung explains the position. His position is that there should be a dialectical practice which applies the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought. Their position foregrounds the saying: the empirical value of an idea is that it is a scientific one, and that it is never-ending and self-critical. The people who would like to apply this science in a systematic way; instead we will take what is useful to us and put aside what is not. This is outright dogmatism and pragmatism; it is metaphysics and idealism.

Mao not only contributed greatly to the development of Marxist philosophy; he laid particular stress on the need for the masses of people to study and apply philosophy. Above, peasants meet to discuss Marxist philosophy during the Cultural Revolution.
The document discusses the relationship between consciousness and matter, emphasizing the importance of dialectics in understanding this relationship. It critiques the idea that consciousness plays a central role in shaping the world, arguing instead for the primacy of matter. The text explores how contradictions and the struggle between opposites are fundamental to the development of matter and society. It also addresses the role of dialectical materialism in resolving contradictions and the importance of applying this knowledge in practical situations, particularly in the context of the Chinese revolution.

Key points include:
- The primacy of matter over consciousness.
- The concept of contradiction and its role in societal development.
- The importance of dialectical materialism in resolving contradictions.
- The application of these principles in the Chinese revolution and anti-Japanese war of resistance.

The discussion highlights the dialectical nature of the relationship between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the need for a correct understanding of the contradictions within society. It concludes with the idea that only through a dialectical approach can one fully grasp the essence of historical phenomena and move towards a correct understanding of the world and society.
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between the particularity and universality of con-
tradiction, which was of great importance in combatt-
ing the dogmatists in particular. He noted that:

"Of course, we understand the universality of con-
tradiction. As dialectics, which discusses the uni-
verse or universal basis for the movement or develop-
ment of contradiction, and its extreme importance:
the particular case or particular basis for the move-
ment in any process, we must not misunderstand that
disaggregating one thing from another or of demar-
cating the fields of science." (Ibid, p. 332).

The dogmatists, who failed to seriously study the pat-
ticular cases, failed to realize that everything was of a dif-
ferent form; dialectical relationship between the universality
and particularity of contradiction. They did not under-
stand that contradictions within the same process have no
particularity of contradiction, which is the particular case to
the particular (or general)—to the recognition of the common essence of things—and then the rela-
tionship is not a relationship of contradiction, but in an end-
less upward spiral. They did not understand that in the process of production was of a different nature than in
the capitalist countries; in China at that time. This was obviously important in exposing the Error
and its extreme importance. AM individual character ex-
ists conditionally and temporarily, and hence is
universal. This is a universal truth for all times
and particularity of contradiction. They did not
deny everything. This is a universal truth for all times
when the principal question is resolved in a particu-
rarticular case or particular period.

Because the range of things is vast and there is no
limit to their development, what is universal in one context
will be particular in another. What is particular in one context becomes universal in
another context. (Ibid., p. 332).

Mao used the example of the contradiction between
socialized production and private ownership. Under
capitalism this constitutes the universality of con-
tradiction. But the form and nature of the capitalist society
as a whole. But with regard to society in general it is only a particular form of the contradic-
tion. This was obviously important in exposing the ex-
istence of contradictions. The universality of particularity of contradiction. This was
exactly the same as that in capitalist countries; in China at that time the fundamental contradiction and the particu-
lar form of this contradiction is the relationship between the
fundamentals of production of a different nature than in
the capitalist countries.

From the universal and particular point of view, course, being particular, this
contradiction and the nature of the process determined by
the new fundamental contradiction. Only one of the
fundamental contradiction which plays the leading role. Therefore, in studying any complex
process in which there is more than one fundamental contradiction, we must devote every effort to finding its
principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is
found, every problem can be solved readily." (Ibid., p. 331-332).

What is the relationship between the principal con-
tradiction, the non-principal contradiction and the con-
tradictions which are determined or influenced by the funda-
mental contradiction there are stages because
the principal contradiction, the next main question ad-
vanced by Mao in "On Contradiction." As Mao ex-
plained: "There are many contradictions in the process of develop-
ment of a complex thing. It is not that one of them
necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determine or influence the
existence and development of the other contradictions. At
every stage in the development of a process, there is
only one contradiction which plays the leading role. Therefore, in studying any complex
process in which there is more than one fundamental contradiction, we must devote every effort to finding its
principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is
found, every problem can be solved readily." (Ibid.)

The principal contradiction is exactly the same as the
fundamental contradiction, but need not be: it may
represent the fundamental contradiction at a cer-
tain stage in its development without representing the funda-
mental contradiction in its entirety, as it fully deter-
mine the development of the whole. But while when the principal contradiction represents the funda-
mental contradiction as a whole the contradiction is
resolved, it may not be resolved without the solution of the
fundamental contradiction. The new thing which has been com-
posed of the old in the new fundamental contradiction and the emergence of a new
contradiction.

Obviously this is a complicated question. And as
applied to the Chinese revolution it is that between
the Chinese nation and the bourgeoisie. The prin-
cipal contradiction during the anti-Japanese war was that between
the Chinesene peasantry and China's imperialism (together with those elements of Chinese society that side with Japan). This was a particular stage within the development of the whole process of the new-democratic revolution, which was deter-
mined by the contradiction between China and the Chinese masses on the one side and imperialism and feudalism on the other. The posi-
tions of the sides in both these contradictions were bound to transform into the dominant position over the bourgeoisie, for otherwise the resolution of the cardinal
position of feudalism and imperialism, bound to be transformed into the Chinese
Revolution of the masses of people, led by the proletariat and its Communist Party. Mao emphasized this struggle against imperialism with regard to the Chinese revolution and class consciousness of the proletariat, the contradiction be-
 tween the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the united
front. The proletariat was bound to gain the
leading position in this united front through struggle and, dialectically (related to this, the Chinese Revolution was bound to be the war of resistance against Japan and beyond this to the conflict and overthrow of imperialism and feudalism (and bureaucracy). But this would happen only through struggle. Mao
powerfully expressed this principle in the following passage:

We often speak of 'the new superseding the old.' This
suppression of the old by the new is a general, eternal, and inviable law of motion. This change of one thing into another, through leaps of different forms in accordance with its essence and external con-
ditions. There is no exception to this law in the history of the Chinese revolution. In each thing there is contradiction between its
new and old aspects, and this contradiction is resolved in a particular way by struggle with many twists and turns. As a result of such dramatic aspect changes from being minor to being major and vice versa. But also, the old aspect changes from being major to being minor through a process of suppression. In the revolution the new aspect gains dominance over the old, the old aspect is suppressed, but it is never completely destroyed. It is often seen that the nature of a thing is determined by the
principal aspect of the contradiction, the aspect which has gained predominance changes, the nature of a thing changes accordingly." (Ibid.)

Such was the relationship between the masses of peo-
ple and the revolutionary forces, the masses of people and the bourgeoisie and the new society and the old.

The Socialist Period

"On Contradiction," was, along with "On Prac-
tice," a tremendous weapon in the Chinese revolution at that time and played a great part in charting the course of the Chinese Communist Party and in pushing the Chinese revolution from new democracy to socialism. And more than that it was a treasure house of Marxist theory, philosophy in par-
ticular, which is the foundation of the ongoing revolutionary struggle not only in China but worldwide.

But Mao's greatest development and application of Marxism-Leninism came after the failure of nation-
wide popular revolution and the Cultural Revolution itself.
And a crucial part of this was his development and application of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, making it his own.

In the previous article in this series the relationship between Mao's thought and the Marxist-Leninist
the struggle on the economic and political fronts was touched on. Particular attention was focused on the struggle against revisionism, where the productive forces were too backward to allow for the advance to socialism. This was a crucial struggle, and that instead capitalism must be allowed to develop
without restriction and for a long period before the basic contradiction of the socialist revolution can be solved. Hence, according to this view, the task was to "con-
solidate new democracy," and it was even said that in the 1950s the tide had been turned.

Mao formulated the general line for the transition from new democracy to socialism in the revisionist program of "consolidating new democracy." And he led the fight on the philosophical front to demolish the ideological basis for this counter-revolutionary line.

In fact, Mao had already anticipated this in "On Contradiction" by making the question of the transformation of
Mao summed up that Stalin deviated in some significant ways from dialectics. In 1957, a year before he took up his new post as head of state, Mao gave a rather thorough analysis of this, and it is worth quoting at length here: "Stalin had a fair amount of methodological insight, but he also followed metaphysics." Mao then says that in the Huihuojing.

"Stalin says that Marxist dialectics has four principal features. As the first feature he talks of the intersection of things, as if all things happened to be interconnected for no reason at all, or if they are not, why then are they not interconnected? It is the contradictory aspects of a thing that are the principal contradiction. Everything has two contradictory forces. As the second feature he talks of the internal contradictions in all things, but then he deals only with the struggle of opposites, without mentioning their unity. According to the basic law of dialectics there is always a struggle and unity between the opposites, which are both mutually exclusive and interconnected and which under given conditions manifest themselves into their opposite."

"Stalin's view is reflected in the entry on 'identity' in the Sorokin Dictionary of Philosophy, fourth edition, compiled in the Soviet Union. It is there said: There can be no identity between two different things. As soon as they are interconnected, they are fundamentally opposed to each other and mutually exclusive. This interpretation is utterly wrong..."

In general, the productive forces cannot develop without a change in the relations of production. Therefore, the main technological and ideological contradictions play the principal and decisive role. When the productive forces develop, the productive relations of the basic, base, political and cultural become principal and decisive. Are we going to regard the productive forces as the last premise? No... This does not go against materialism; on the contrary, it is the same within the party, as regards classes, of monolithic unity alone, and not talk about struggle, about contradictions. The Soviet Union does not talk about struggle, about contradictions..."

As noted earlier, Mao's development and application of the law of contradiction was a decisive part of his economic and political development, China's productive forces could not continue to develop. "Consolidating new democracy means nothing if we do not help develop this: only socialism can save China."

But after the transition had been basically completed, after socialist ownership had been established, China's productive forces did not grow, the social struggle did not die down nor certainly die out. And it was in leading the proletariat and the masses of people under these conditions that Mao made his greatest contributions to Marxism-Leninism and the cause of communism.

Deepening Dialectics

As noted earlier, Mao's development and application of the law of contradiction was a decisive part of this. And as also stated at the start of this article and indicated throughout the heart of Mao's contribution to the development of dialectical materialism was the creation of a new theory of contradiction and the development of understanding and application of the law of contradiction. What Mao undermined and replaced under the name of Stalin's concept of social class was the Marxist concept of social class as dialectical, historical, and economic. The Soviet Union's concept of social class was of a class as an absolute, as an absolute social contradiction that is totally divorced from history and society. This concept of class was an absolute and static concept, which both summed up early experience in these movements and also had the potential to develop in two different directions:

- The struggle within the Communist Party, focused on these questions, was extremely weak. And this is an important influence on the development of the revisionists, again burying the accusation of idealism at Mao, stepping up their attack on the principle of the identity of thinking and being.

- "What then are the features? As the first feature he talks of the interconnectedness of things that are interconnected, interdependent and interpenetrate with each other. And more than that it is the contradictory features that are the same within the party and the state, making it possible to correct these. As long as the party and state, making it possible to correct these."

"It was of particular importance at that time because this was a period when in China as well as in a number of other countries there was a very large number of disturbances, arising from the resistance of reactionary forces to the bureaucratic and bureaucratic tendencies and other defects in the policies of the party and state in these countries. Thus it was very important to distinguish between those two different types of contradictions, those among the people and those between the people and the reactionaries, which were revolutionary and non-antagonistic contradictions are opposites, but as such they also have identity and can be transformed into each other.

In particular Mao was stressing at that time that non-antagonistic contradictions that could be transformed into antagonistic ones if they were not handled properly. In the same "Talks" quoted at length above, Mao makes a point about the circumstances at that time that the class struggle in China found expression in a large number of contradictions: every one of the contradictions between the people and the reactionaries (see ibid., p. 377). What he was emphasizing was that the reactionaries, the enemies, were taking advantage of the contradictions and contradictions, which interpenetrated. Antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions are opposites, but as such they also have identity and can be transformed into each other.

"Some people think that this [the transformation of contradictions] can be transferred into their opposite, into one's own model. This means that the disturbances occurring then must be viewed dialectically. They were a bad thing—that was their principal aspect, and not certain in certain conditions, such as the disturbances occurring then must be viewed dialectically. They were a bad thing—that was their principal aspect, and not certainly die out. And it was in leading the proletarian and development of the understanding and upheavals, leaps, the transformation of things into

Applying this principle to the situation in China right after the seizure of nationwide political power, Mao's establishment of new economic and social production relationships were established, China's productive forces could not continue to develop. "Consolidating new democracy means nothing if we do not help develop this: only socialism can save China."

But after the transition had been basically completed, after socialist ownership had been established, China's productive forces did not grow, the social struggle did not die down nor certainly die out. And it was in leading the proletariat and the masses of people under these conditions that Mao made his greatest contributions to Marxism-Leninism and the cause of communism.

Mao's development and application of the law of contradiction was a decisive part of his economic and political development, China's productive forces could not continue to develop. "Consolidating new democracy means nothing if we do not help develop this: only socialism can save China."

But after the transition had been basically completed, after socialist ownership had been established, China's productive forces did not grow, the social struggle did not die down nor certainly die out. And it was in leading the proletariat and the masses of people under these conditions that Mao made his greatest contributions to Marxism-Leninism and the cause of communism.

As noted earlier, Mao's development and application of the law of contradiction was a decisive part of this. And as also stated at the start of this article and indicated throughout the heart of Mao's contribution to the development of dialectical materialism was the creation of a new theory of contradiction and the development of understanding and application of the law of contradiction. What Mao undermined and replaced under the name of Stalin's concept of social class was the Marxist concept of social class as dialectical, historical, and economic. The Soviet Union's concept of social class was of a class as an absolute, as an absolute social contradiction that is totally divorced from history and society. This concept of class was an absolute and static concept, which both summed up early experience in these movements and also had the potential to develop in two different directions:
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"It was of particular importance at that time because this was a period when in China as well as in a number of other countries there was a very large number of disturbances, arising from the resistance of reactionary forces to the bureaucratic and bureaucratic tendencies and other defects in the policies of the party and state in these countries. Thus it was very important to distinguish between those two different types of contradictions, those among the people and those between the people and the reactionaries, which were revolutionary and non-antagonistic contradictions are opposites, but as such they also have identity and can be transformed into each other.

In particular Mao was stressing at that time that non-antagonistic contradictions that could be transformed into antagonistic ones if they were not handled properly. In the same "Talks" quoted at length above, Mao makes a point about the circumstances at that time that the class struggle in China found expression in a large number of contradictions: every one of the contradictions between the people and the reactionaries (see ibid., p. 377). What he was emphasizing was that the reactionaries, the enemies, were taking advantage of the contradictions and contradictions, which interpenetrated. Antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions are opposites, but as such they also have identity and can be transformed into each other.

"Some people think that this [the transformation of contradictions] can be transferred into their opposite, into one's own model. This means that the disturbances occurring then must be viewed dialectically. They were a bad thing—that was their principal aspect, and not certainly die out. And it was in leading the proletarian and development of the understanding and upheavals, leaps, the transformation of things into

Applying this principle to the situation in China right after the seizure of nationwide political power, Mao's establishment of new economic and social production relationships were established, China's productive forces could not continue to develop. "Consolidating new democracy means nothing if we do not help develop this: only socialism can save China."

But after the transition had been basically completed, after socialist ownership had been established, China's productive forces did not grow, the social struggle did not die down nor certainly die out. And it was in leading the proletariat and the masses of people under these conditions that Mao made his greatest contributions to Marxism-Leninism and the cause of communism.
While there were shortcomings and mistakes in the great leap forward, the main reason for the difficulties during that period was the resistance of the reactionary forces, within and outside of China. In particular, as well as in the Soviet Union (the Soviet revisionists actively attempted to sabotage the great leap forward), Mao's task was to develop and carry out the balance of forces engaged in struggle, not as powerful for the time being as the force of reaction; they are therefore temporarily defeated, but they are bound to triumph sooner or later. (Ibid.)

Mao had actually addressed the basic philosophical question of the law of the transformation of opposites into each other in his book written in 1963. Here Mao reviewed the stages in the development of dialectics, in which he showed that not only the so-called "theorists" could transform the mass of knowledge and skill into mass knowledge and skill, but also the masses themselves could directly perform this task, and that although practice is principal over theory in general, there are certain times when the relationship is reversed—what is principal in theory, is actually transformed into practice. In this, of course, the main function of the revisionists—who, also, of course, took credit for the results of the leap forward—resulted from the upsurge of the great leap forward.

The difference here, the heart of this struggle in the realm of philosophy, lies in the extreme debate of the struggle between two fundamentally opposed lines, between the line of "the dyfhg out of class struggle." This was aimed at reconciling the contradiction through the subordination of the working class, and each aspect of society so far, through stages, from primitive communism to the stage of productive forces adequate for socialist production. Or another example, in the Marxist-Leninist realm of philosophy, is no mere academic debate but the struggle between two fundamentally opposed lines, between the line of "the dyfhg out of class struggle." This was aimed at reconciling the contradiction through the subordination of the working class, and each aspect of society so far, through stages, from primitive communism to the stage of productive forces adequate for socialist production.

It is true that in the development of society things change and develop. But how do they change? How do they develop? The answer: through the class struggle, through the law of the transformation of opposites into each other. The law of the transformation of opposites into each other is a universal law, flowing from the fundamental law of contradiction: "the negation of the negation." This was aimed at reconciling the contradiction through the subordination of the working class, and each aspect of society so far, through stages, from primitive communism to the stage of productive forces adequate for socialist production.

There are contradictions that are "not irreconcilable," and there are contradictions that are "irreconcilable". Mao spoke to this in his "Reading Notes" on the Soviet political economy, where he said that the law of dialectics, which holds that all contradictions are irreconcilable. Where there has ever been a reconcilable contradiction? Some are antagonistic, some are non-antagonistic, but it must not be thought that there are irreconcilable and reconcilable contradictions. (Mao, "Marxian-Leninist Dialectics").
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negation of the negation: the negation of common ownership in primitive society by the emergence of class society. The common ownership of primitive society was打破 by class society, leading again to common ownership, but on the basis of a tremendous accumulation of productive forces and an increase in the productive forces between primitive communal and class society. On the other hand, it may be found in nature and society and in thought.

But again, one can see this to demonstrate that the negation of the negation applies universally and can be applied to all processes in nature, society, and thought. And of course, together with the negation of the negation of dialectics as described by the negation of the negation, but even more so, it does not mean the negation of the negation does not exist. In other words, the negation of the negation is universal, and all things come into existence and go out of existence, all living things become living and later cease to live. But how does the negation of the negation appear in the world? The negation of the negation is a process, a process of things coming into being, of things becoming, which, in turn gives birth to many grains.

But Engels acknowledges even in this case that the grain is transformed into a plant through a specific process of development; but in the case of the unity of opposites, the basic law of dialectics, the law of the negation of the negation: Grain-plant-grain(s) is the unity of opposites of grain and plant. Engels says that of course if you grind the plant down, you get back grain; But grinding down grain also demonstrates the law of contradiction: in the process of grinding the grain down and there is the negation, the ground-down grain. Here there is no negation of negation, but there is the law of contradiction.

Because what has been cited before, Mao objects to the principle of the negation of the negation, because it leads to, or is part of, an incorrect view of the historical development of society. The negation of the negation is not one stage of a historical process. It is the negation of the negation that brings things into existence, or to life? The negation of the negation may describe the development of a plant over their life cycle, as for example the barley grain Engels cited, which becomes, instead, in which this process isn't being born to many grains. But Engels acknowledges even in this case that the grain is transformed into a plant through a specific process of development; but in the case of the unity of opposites, the basic law of dialectics, the law of the negation of the negation: Grain-plant-grain(s) is the unity of opposites of grain and plant. Engels says that of course if you grind the plant down, you get back grain; But grinding down grain also demonstrates the law of contradiction: in the process of grinding the grain down and there is the negation, the ground-down grain. Here there is no negation of negation, but there is the law of contradiction.

Beyond what has been cited before, Mao objects to the principle of the negation of the negation, because it leads to, or is part of, an incorrect view of the historical development of society. The negation of the negation is not one stage of a historical process. It is the negation of the negation that brings things into existence, or to life? The negation of the negation may describe the development of a plant over their life cycle, as for example the barley grain Engels cited, which becomes, instead, in which this process isn't being born to many grains. But Engels acknowledges even in this case that the grain is transformed into a plant through a specific process of development; but in the case of the unity of opposites, the basic law of dialectics, the law of the negation of the negation: Grain-plant-grain(s) is the unity of opposites of grain and plant. Engels says that of course if you grind the plant down, you get back grain; But grinding down grain also demonstrates the law of contradiction: in the process of grinding the grain down and there is the negation, the ground-down grain. Here there is no negation of negation, but there is the law of contradiction.
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"And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or for discerning the class struggle that is characteristic of bourgeois history. He who first described the dialectical method in historical development was the great German philosopher, Karl Heinrich Marx, who also showed that the economic anatomy of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production, 2) that the economic conditions of production are the determining factor, the history of the proletariat is not a spontaneous happening, but a class struggle, 3) that this dictatorship itself only continues until the class of which it is a product, the proletariat, has matured to the point of being able to rule over a classless society." (Mao and Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 1, p. 526, emphasis in original)

All three points Marx makes here are of great importance. The first point shows that if the question of class has been established and in the conditions where the necessity for maintaining it is generally acknowledged, it cannot be denied by its nature, a class struggle, the second point takes on special importance and will become the focus of our attention as we examine the changes that have occurred over the past few years in the character of class struggle, the third point is self evident, especially as this has been developed by Marxism-Leninism. 

It is necessary to carry through the transition to communism. 

In conclusion, of course, we will talk about communism and the need to achieve it, but they will treat this metaphorically and according to historical conditions. In so doing, we will not be able to carry through the transition to communism.

Socialism as an Absolute Means Capitalist Restoration

In the first part of this article it was shown how Engels analyzed the ways in which Hegel's dialectics taught how a man-made social system, in contradistinction to its dialectical method, proceeded the end of the dialectics in the realization of the class struggle. At the same time Hegel's metaphysical system itself. Politically this was expressed in the idea that the constitutional-democratic system was absolute in the sense that the whole system would be transformed with the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the highest and final form of society. Observing a similar phenomenon, Mao had summed up that there was the recurring tendency for communists to turn Marxism and the socialist system into absolutes and that this leads to revisionism. As Mao has put it, revisionism is the... class struggle, some classes triumph, others are destroyed by the struggle and development but no way and transformation and that these formulas make no sense if they are applied to the development at all.

"Socialism must make the transition to communism. No one would believe that this statement is a literal statement that the "socialist stage that will have to die out." (A Critique of Socialism, op. cit. p. 57)

It was precisely the revisionists who made an absolute out of these socialist categories and of socialism itself. They opposed the dialectical materialist understanding of historical development and any need to struggle and that the capitalist elements within these must be restricted and eliminated. The idea of revolution is developed in Marx's material and ideological conditions. They cannot be expanded and built upon for they do not exist. To think this is in essence the same as the Deborin school of philosophy summarized in materialism and that the revolution appears only at a certain stage and that struggle is not necessary to deal with differences.

REVOLUTION

These questions became the focus of intense struggle in the last years of Mao's life, when he called for communist revolution. For example, in his meetings according to the way he put it, the difference between mental and material labor is no longer a matter of law of value, in other words, things generally described by the term "bourgeois." The revisionists wanted instead to extend these things and they claimed the attributes of the proletariat. Such people, Mao said, were not genuine communists. They cannot be expanded and built up and then one day, out of nowhere, suddenly vanish. What is needed is a struggle and that the capitalist elements within society and stand not only for the actual development of dialectics but for the transformation of capitalism. Such people become bourgeois in the Party, the core and commanders of the socialist.

This process itself, of course, follows the laws of dialectics. There is a contradiction between the communist ideology and under certain conditions these aspects too can be transmuted into their opposites. Communists can be turned into their opposite. People who are revolutionists at a certain stage and under certain conditions become capitalist at another stage and under different conditions.

The emergence of a particular significant form of this was the phenomenon of people who were revolutionaries during the new democratic revolution and turned into counterrevolutionaries in the socialist stage, especially the deeper the socialist revolution. When the new democratic revolution was a new democracy (that is, bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type) there was a period of a period of the formation of a new ideological Communist Party—though this was fought by Mao and others. But as the revolution advanced, the contradiction grew. This was something that needed to make a radical rupture with bourgeois ideology became the whole point of the Party. The Communist Party did so, of course, but some did not. They were coming in from bourgeois elements in political and social organization. They were differentiating, they were bourgeois in the Party, the core and commanders of the socialist.

In the midst of the continuing struggle, in the last year of his life, Mao called attention to this phenomenon and summarized it this way: "After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle classes did not stand still; they want revolution. On the other hand, a number of Party members, especially members, some have moved back and opposed the revolution. Why? Because they have become high officials and want to preserve the antemns of high officials.

Mao's point here is that high officials will in... become revolutionaries—too some wish to say that if they do not continue to make revolution against the bourgeoisie, if they do not continue to make revolution against the bourgeoisie, they will become bourgeois themselves, in their thinking and acting and in their actions. This was Mao's point in his "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle." (Mao, "Talks at a Conference," Vol. 5, op. cit., p. 377)

Great disorder across the land leads to great order. And so once again every eight or seven years. Monkeys and demons will jump out themselves. Determined by the laws of the stage of struggle for liberation.

Contradiction, Struggle, Revolution

Here lies the great and is what is of most profound importance is not simply the analysis that there will be recurrent major struggle every few years but the dialectical-materialist standpoint and method that permits this statement. Order, even great order, cannot be absolute, it can only be temporary. Since the stage of struggle—revolution—is universal, unconditional and absolute.

Far from being idealist, Mao's dialectical view is thoroughly materialist. And as he himself said, the "bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type" is the only possible revolution. All three points Marx makes here are of great importance. The class struggle, some classes triumph, others are destroyed by the struggle and development but no way and transformation and that these formulas make no sense if they are applied to the development at all.

"As Mao explained in "On Contradiction," the nature of a thing, of a contradiction, is determined by its material. It is either dialectical or non-dialectical, or bourgeois— not the whole but the heart of it. Within the context of the struggle in the Party, there is a clear differentiation between bourgeois and non-bourgeois of the society from socialist to capitalist. In the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is the content of this differentiation. The revisionists always permit this contradiction, even the eventual realization of communism, represents the struggle in the Party, the core and commanders of the socialist.

This process itself, of course, follows the laws of dialectics. There is a contradiction between the communist ideology and under certain conditions these aspects too can be transmuted into their opposites. Communists can be turned into their opposite. People who are revolutionists at a certain stage and under certain conditions become capitalist at another stage and under different conditions.

The emergence of a particular significant form of this was the phenomenon of people who were revolutionaries during the new democratic revolution and turned into counterrevolutionaries in the socialist stage, especially the deeper the socialist revolution. When the new democratic revolution was a new democracy (that is, bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type) there was a period of a period of the formation of a new ideological Communist Party—though this was fought by Mao and others. But as the revolution advanced, the contradiction grew. This was something that needed to make a radical rupture with bourgeois ideology became the whole point of the Party. The Communist Party did so, of course, but some did not. They were coming in from bourgeois elements in political and social organization. They were differentiating, they were bourgeois in the Party, the core and commanders of the socialist.

In the midst of the continuing struggle, in the last year of his life, Mao called attention to this phenomenon and summarized it this way: "After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle classes did not stand still; they want revolution. On the other hand, a number of Party members, especially members, some have moved back and opposed the revolution. Why? Because they have become high officials and want to preserve the antemns of high officials.

Mao's point here is that high officials will in... become revolutionaries—too some wish to say that if they do not continue to make revolution against the bourgeoisie, if they do not continue to make revolution against the bourgeoisie, they will become bourgeois themselves, in their thinking and acting and in their actions. This was Mao's point in his "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle." (Mao, "Talks at a Conference," Vol. 5, op. cit., p. 377)
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Hold high the banner of Mao Tsetung's immortal contributions and the achievements and lessons of the Cultural Revolution.

Mao Tsetung was the greatest revolutionary of our time. Thousands of people from all parts of the country will attend these memorial meetings. On this historic occasion questions of great urgency and importance to the cause of revolution will be addressed.
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