

The Significance of the Theory of Three Worlds

— Excerpts of an article by Kazimierz Mijal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party

Some time ago, Kazimierz Mijal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party, wrote the article "Long Live Mao Tsetung Thought." Chairman Mao, the article points out, integrated the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution and thus defended and enriched Marxism-Leninism. His analysis of present-day international relationships and his theory of the differentiation of the three worlds derived from such an analysis expounded by means of the classical Marxist-Leninist method the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world. Chairman Mao's analysis, the writer adds, is helpful to the proletariat of all countries and the Marxist-Leninist Parties in working out the political line for their own revolution.

Below we publish excerpts from parts three, five and six of the article, which is in seven parts. — Ed.

The World Socialist System

The world after the Russian October Revolution was divided into two systems — the capitalist and the socialist. The socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union came into being as many countries took the road of building socialism at the end of World War II. With the passing of Stalin and the usurpation of power of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the modern revisionists, the Soviet Union

became a social-imperialist power and the existence of the socialist camp came to an end.

The disintegration of the socialist camp does not mean that socialism as a world system no longer exists. These are two separate things.

The banner of the Great October Revolution discarded by the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist clique has been kept afloat by the great Chinese revolution, which enriches and preserves intact the treasure house and honour of the October Revolution and is forging ahead along the road of the October Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is exerting an ever greater influence on the progress of mankind.

Since our country came under military occupation the people of Poland have become familiar with a spate of slanders put about by the Brezhnev revisionist clique that Mao Tsetung's great China "betrays" Marxist-Leninist principles. However, the Polish and the international proletariat know that these are lies concocted by the renegades to Marxism-Leninism and the fascist enemies of socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

China is a socialist country and also a developing country belonging to the third world. The third world countries are with China. The world socialist system and the international proletariat constitute the unprecedentedly powerful mainstay of the world revolutionary forces and rallying round them are the revolu-

tionary forces of all peoples who in their struggle to win independence, political sovereignty and economic independence for all countries and nations and to oppose imperialist wars are bringing into being a worldwide democratic united front to fight against imperialism, colonialism and the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

While defending the fruits of the Chinese revolution and socialist construction and protecting China's dictatorship of the proletariat from the grave menace of Russian social-imperialism, Mao Tsetung safeguarded the world socialist system against the real threat and possible extinction at the hands of the forces of international imperialism.

Fundamental Contradictions in The Present-Day World

Mao Tsetung's analysis of the structure of the capitalist world and his differentiation of the mutually opposed three worlds on the basis of the analysis greatly facilitate the proletariat of all countries and all genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties in deciding their own revolutionary political line.

The fundamental contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is all-pervasive in the capitalist world. Wherever capital is active and the contradiction exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, there is struggle between the two classes. This is the A B C of Marxism.

Fundamental contradictions exist between imperialist countries and between monopoly groups and are sharpening all the time. Of these contradictions, the major one is between the United States and the Soviet Union. Thus, the two superpowers naturally form the first world. The contradictions among the developed countries excluding the United States and the Soviet Union, though in themselves important, are nevertheless secondary in significance and so they make up a separate group — the second world. However important the contradictions between the first world of superpowers and the second world of developed countries may be, their significance pales beside the major con-

tradiction between the United States and the Soviet Union. The two superpowers are pushing imperialist, colonialist and hegemonist policies, hoping to gain world domination by bringing under their control not only the third world countries but the developed second world countries as well.

Sharpening fundamental contradictions exist between the biggest imperialist countries that make up the first world and the colonial, semi-colonial and newly liberated countries and dependent countries that constitute the third world. As the biggest imperialist countries, the two superpowers are the biggest enemies of the third world countries. But while striving to put the third world under their control, they at the same time curb the expansion and influence of the developed second world countries and make them increasingly dependent. To all third world countries and mankind as a whole, the two superpowers pose the greatest danger. But in specific conditions there may be differences. Sometimes it may be this superpower and sometimes the other which is the direct and chief enemy of a certain third world country.

In the present situation when contradictions are developing in the capitalist world as a whole, it cannot be said that any third world country will inevitably be ruled by or become an appendage of a certain superpower with which it establishes bilateral state relations, political relations, economic relations or cultural relations on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence while struggling for liberation or after getting rid of the other superpower's influence. The danger exists, but it may not become a reality.

Today, those developed second world countries without colonies are continuing to struggle to maintain and expand their spheres of influence and traditional markets, particularly in regard to the third world countries, in order to import cheap raw materials and labour power and export to them capital, industrial products and services. These developed second world countries do not make up a close-knit political bloc for certain fundamental economic contradictions divide them. Furthermore, the serious class struggles in these countries are growing more acute and complex with each passing day.

Externally, these countries are fighting on two fronts. They have to preserve and expand their own influence in the third world countries and at the same time oppose the two superpowers that are more blatant than ever in interfering with their domestic affairs and are scheming to shift on to them the burdens of a growing economic crisis and the losses resulting from a general capitalist crisis.

In their struggle to oppose the main danger the two superpowers pose to their interests, to oppose the outbreak of a new imperialist world war and to consolidate their sovereignty and political and economic independence, the third world countries can and should make use of the differences among the developed second world countries, the contradictions between the first and second worlds and the ever growing and sharpening contradictions between the two superpowers.

The fundamental contradiction between the world capitalist system and the world socialist system is not a contradiction within capitalism itself but an extremely important and sharp contradiction between capitalism as a whole and the countries building socialism. The revisionist leaders of the Soviet Communist Party describe this type of contradiction as the major contradiction in the present-day world which rises above all internal capitalist contradictions. This, however, is incorrect.

Today, all countries have established definite and necessary economic, political and cultural relations with one another. Such relations exist between socialist and capitalist countries, including relations with imperialist countries based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. But the necessary concessions made within this scope to achieve understanding and co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit do not provide any reason for the working class of the developed capitalist countries to suspend and weaken the class struggle, or for the people of the third world countries to suspend or weaken the people's revolutionary struggle. When the revisionist leading clique of the Soviet Communist Party compromised and co-operated with the bourgeoisie at the price of stamping out the class struggle and the people's revolutionary struggle

as it wished, the leadership of the Communist Party of China most resolutely drew a distinction with this Right opportunist trend.

"At no time must one rely on one imperialist power against another or preserve oneself in front of another imperialist power." Who could possibly be the object of such warning? The trouble with the bourgeois agents in the communist movement is not a matter of "reliance," they actually serve the bourgeoisie. All Marxist-Leninist Parties have pointed out that such warning is wrong. The Marxist-Leninist Parties yet to gain power will never "rely on" the domestic bourgeoisie, nor will they seek any understanding or compromise with the superpowers. But that's precisely what was done by the old social-democratic parties and is done by the modern revisionists, for both are bourgeois workers' parties. From the foregoing, we can come to the conclusion that such warning probably has the socialist and capitalist countries in mind, warning their governments not to reach any understanding or compromise with either superpower, because only thus can people understand the implication of the term "reliance." But this assertion is equally incorrect.

We are well aware of how Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung were resolved in rejecting such closed-door slogans as "To hell with all agreements and compromises!" Marx and Engels pointed out that "where it is a matter of a struggle against the existing Government, we ally ourselves even with our enemies." (Stein, 1849.) Lenin made use of even the most reactionary forces in Russia and the international arena to win victory for the revolution. Stalin also made use of some troops of the reactionary emigre Polish Government against Hitlerite Germany. Likewise, during the War of Resistance Against Japan, Mao Tsetung also made use of the reactionary Kuomintang forces with which he had fallen out. The use of reactionary imperialist forces to oppose the main enemy is diametrically different from putting reliance on the reactionary imperialist forces. Even during the second imperialist war when the Soviet Union was up against such heavy odds, it joined the alliance against Hitler. This, however, cannot be interpreted as Soviet "reliance" on the United States and Britain.

For the international proletariat, to determine who is the most dangerous enemy of revolution and socialism at the present stage by no means undermines the basic tasks raised in the light of Marxism-Leninism and the fundamental principles of class struggle, nor does it fall into abstract discussions of whether the United States and the Soviet Union constitute the "same" danger. The concrete analysis of concrete conditions is the revolutionary soul of Marxism while the critics of the theory of the three worlds totally disregard this fact. They excessively play up their loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist teachings and proletarian internationalism. They quote Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but when they analyse a problem, they totally disregard the crux of the matter. As a result, no matter what their intention is and at times even contrary to their will, they are defending the position of Russian social-imperialism objectively.

Asia, Africa and Latin America are the main area of the storms of the world revolution which deals imperialism direct blows. This is how things stand. After World War II, no revolutionary storms took place in Europe, North America and Oceania. There were strikes and even general strikes but they were only economically motivated. There were students' demonstrations, and there were even revolutionary workers' demonstrations in France in 1968 and violent blood-shedding revolutionary struggles in Poland in 1970 and 1976 waged by the proletariat against the revisionist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. While these led to changes of the ruling circles, the foundation of the rule of capital and the bourgeoisie was not undermined. Even in the case of the fascist Portuguese government, its collapse was due to the defeat in the imperialist war it waged against its African colonies. Therefore, to be able to adopt a revolutionary and objective attitude in assessing the revolutionary storms in the world (these were seriously dealt with by Mao Tsetung and the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party) and to be able to take a sincere approach to the world's revolutionary events in which our brothers and the oppressed and exploited people of various countries shed their blood, we should throw away the bourgeois frame of mind of regarding Europe as the centre and the "theory" of looking at the Asian,

African and Latin American people from the position of an "elite nation." This "theory" advanced with the worst of motives by Russian social-imperialism in dealing with these nations has been criticized and repudiated, as it should, by the leadership of the C.P.C. Central Committee.

According to the warning by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Communist Party, it seems that to emphasize the great significance of the revolutionary storms in the third world countries means disregarding the role of the socialist system and the working class in the developed capitalist countries. This is utterly groundless slander.

The revolutionary struggle of the third world countries will not hamper but encourage the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries to embark on the road of revolutionary storm with greater tempo.

In making an analysis of economic relations, Marx, Engels and Lenin affirmed the differentiation of the naturally shaped capitalist world, as it was divided into "two worlds" — the industrial world and the agricultural world, city and countryside, the oppressed nations and the oppressor nations. Does the prescription written by the critics of the theory of the three worlds mean that the founders of Marxism had "forgotten" the class struggle or deviated from the Marxist teachings? It should be noted that in each of the two worlds there simultaneously exist the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the exploited and exploiters as well as the oppressed and the oppressors.

At the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, the world was divided into three types of countries: the highly developed capitalist countries, the middling developed capitalist countries and the colonial countries. Stalin upheld this differentiation. Was the world not divided into three parts in the way it was divided into "three worlds"? Just so. This, however, did not in the least deviate from the principle of class analysis, nor did it depart from Marxism-Leninism. The purpose of doing so was to help the working class of every country and its Party formulate its political line in

(Continued on p. 25.)

behaved in the matter of the fuel supplies. As a result, the long-term co-operation plan for five items, including supplies of fuel and other raw materials, which Moscow tried to railroad through the meeting, was shelved. The session came to naught.

Since East European countries have suffered enough from importing Soviet fuel and other raw materials, they have to find other alternatives. They now put the stress on exploiting domestic resources, increasing the proportion of domestic resources in home consumption and making greater investments in the departments charged with producing fuel and other raw materials. Time and again they emphasize the need to save fuel, work out

rational economy measures and energetically expand economic and trade relations with the West and the third world countries so as to seek new sources of fuel and other raw materials.

The facts are clear. The so-called "joint investment projects" advertised by the Soviet Union are nothing but a gimmick. Many invest and only one reaps the profit. Moscow's acts of ruthless bullying, oppression and plunder cannot but evoke strong resentment from the East European C.M.E.A. countries and accelerate a centrifugal trend away from the Soviet Union. The tighter the Soviet control and exploitation of these countries, the fiercer their struggle against the Soviet attempts will be, and the more Soviet social-imperialism will be exposed.

(Continued from p. 20.)

accordance with the nature of the revolution and the revolutionary tasks confronted by each of the three types of countries.

Like the teachings by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in previous historical periods, Mao Tsetung's analysis of the present-day world and his differentiation of the three worlds based on this analysis are helpful to the proletariat of all countries and their revolutionary parties in working out their political line so as to unite all forces of the world revolution.

The Main Area of Storms of World Revolution

Delivering the Political Report on behalf of the C.P.C. Central Committee at the 1973 C.P.C. Tenth National Congress presided over by Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai said: "The third world has strengthened its unity in the struggle against hegemonism and power politics of the superpowers and is playing an ever more significant role in international affairs." The term "third world" has been used in scientific literature and political essays for more than two decades. As early as 1970, it was written into political dictionaries while some people seemed ignorant of this and went so far as to raise this question "what is the third world?" Every worker, however, could very easily answer: "This refers to the poorest, the most oppressed

and exploited people of the Asian, African and Latin American countries."

Where there are starvation, enslavement, oppression and exploitation, there are rebellions and revolutionary storms. The third world is the source of superprofits and economic strength for international monopoly capital, U.S. imperialism and Russian social-imperialism in particular. At the same time, it is also the weakest link in the chain of politics and the key area of imperialism, colonialism as well as hegemonism of the two superpowers.

In the developed capitalist countries and in the imperialist citadels with modern industry, there are concentrated the strongest immediate and potential forces of the working class. At an opportune moment when objective and subjective conditions for socialist revolution are mature, the working class will fulfil its historical mission of burying capitalism in the cradle of capitalism and the heartland of imperialism. But at present though class struggles are going on and even turning sharper lately, these countries are still not the "main area of the storms of the world revolution." We believe that the great day of large-scale battle will come sooner or later in Western Europe, Eastern Europe and North America. At present, however, "nobody can deny that the main area of the storms of the world revolution lies in the broad regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America."