

Translation of the German booklet entitled: „Die Theorie der drei Welten“ — eine marxistisch-leninistische Theorie?“ Zu den Thesen der neuen opportunistischen Strömung“. Verlag Roter Morgen, Dortmund April 1977.  
First published as supplement of the communist weekly „Roter Morgen“, central organ of the Communist Party of Germany/Marxist-Leninist, KPD/ML, No. 11/1977.

The quotations cited in the following text were adjusted to English editions as far as possible. In those cases the English editions were not available, the publisher made translations of the German texts by his own. Those quotations are marked with the hint „(Germ. ed.)“.

## INTRODUCTION

**As the struggle between imperialism, international bourgeoisie and reactionary forces on the one side and socialism, the international proletariat and the peoples of the world on the other intensifies, a new opportunist current has developed in recent years, with the apparent aim of working against the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples of the world.**

This new opportunist current is most commonly found ostensibly taking up the cause of the proletariat, of the peoples of the world, by pretending to combat the threat of a new imperialist war. But in actual fact it does not work for the overthrow of imperialism, that source of all imperialist wars, but demands, under the banner of the struggle against Russian social-imperialism, collaboration with the Western imperialists, even collaboration with US imperialism. It condemns revolutionary class struggle as „ultra-left“, the socialist revolution as „serving Russian social-imperialism“. Essentially this works for the subjugation of the proletariat under imperialism.

We know this current especially in the form of the group „Rote Fahne“ (KPD).\*) It utilizes the changes in the inter-

\*) Group „Rote Fahne“: Opportunist splitting-organization in West Germany. Having emerged from the heterogeneous petty bourgeois students movement in West Berlin, it usurped in 1970 unjustifiedly the name KPD. From the very beginning the politics of this group were directed against Marxism-Leninism, against the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its main aim was to destroy the Communist party, to smash the KPD/ML. Having pursued for years a policy without principles, characterized by opportunism and petty bourgeois vacillation, the group „Rote Fahne“ started in spring 1975 a social-chauvinist course, which it has worked out today to a complete revisionist counter-revolutionary programme. Today the group „Rote Fahne“ is the chief representative of a new international opportunist current in West Germany. (One of the leaders of this group is the later mentioned C. Semler).

First edition, July 1977  
Published by Verlag Roter Morgen GmbH  
46 Dortmund 30  
Printed in West Germany by Alpha-Druck GmbH, Dortmund  
ISBN 3-88196-039-2

Translation of the German booklet entitled: „Die ‚Theorie der drei Welten‘ — eine marxistisch-leninistische Theorie?“ Zu den Thesen der neuen opportunistischen Strömung“, Verlag Roter Morgen, Dortmund April 1977. First published as supplement of the communist weekly „Roter Morgen“, central organ of the Communist Party of Germany/Marxist-Leninist, KPD/ML, No. 11/1977.

The quotations cited in the following text were adjusted to English editions as far as possible. In those cases the English editions were not available, the publisher made translations of the German texts by his own. Those quotations are marked with the hint „(Germ. ed.)“.

## INTRODUCTION

**As the struggle between imperialism, international bourgeoisie and reactionary forces on the one side and socialism, the international proletariat and the peoples of the world on the other intensifies, a new opportunist current has developed in recent years, with the apparent aim of working against the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples of the world.**

This new opportunist current is most commonly found ostensibly taking up the cause of the proletariat, of the peoples of the world, by pretending to combat the threat of a new imperialist war. But in actual fact it does not work for the overthrow of imperialism, that source of all imperialist wars, but demands, under the banner of the struggle against Russian social-imperialism, collaboration with the Western imperialists, even collaboration with US imperialism. It condemns revolutionary class struggle as „ultra-left“, the socialist revolution as „serving Russian social-imperialism“. Essentially this works for the subjugation of the proletariat under imperialism.

We know this current especially in the form of the group „Rote Fahne“ (KPD). \* It utilizes the changes in the inter-

<sup>1)</sup> Group „Rote Fahne“: Opportunist splitting-organization in West Germany. Having emerged from the heterogeneous petty bourgeois students movement in West Berlin, it usurped in 1970 unjustifiedly the name KPD. From the very beginning the politics of this group were directed against Marxism-Leninism, against the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its main aim was to destroy the Communist party, to smash the KPD/ML. Having pursued for years a policy without principles, characterized by opportunism and petty bourgeois vacillation, the group „Rote Fahne“ started in spring 1975 a social-chauvinist course, which it has worked out today to a complete revisionist counter-revolutionary programme. Today the group „Rote Fahne“ is the chief representative of a new international opportunist current in West Germany. (One of the leaders of this group is the later mentioned C. Semler).

First edition, July 1977  
Published by Verlag Roter Morgen GmbH  
46 Dortmund 30  
Printed in West Germany by Alpha-Druck GmbH, Dortmund  
ISBN 3-88196-039-2

national situation and the imminent threat of war in order to spread its revisionist line. This is a method familiar to us from the Khrushchev revisionists: using the threat of an imperialist war in order to lame the struggle for the proletarian revolution. Contrary to the modern revisionists, however, this new opportunist current is cleverer in so far as it passes itself off as „anti-revisionist“ and maintains that it is defending Marxism-Leninism and the teachings of Stalin and Mao Tsetung against modern revisionism. In this way this new opportunist current tries to infiltrate the Marxist-Leninist parties because thus it can liquidate the struggle for the proletarian revolution most effectively.

This new opportunist current is by no means only to be found in West Germany. In Western Europe, for example, apart from the group „Rote Fahne“, the counter-revolutionary Vilar and his gang in Portugal have rendered their „services“ to this movement. This current is to be found in practically all Western European countries — even in the U.S.A., there are forces which call for an end to class struggle and to co-operation with U.S. imperialism „against Russian social imperialism“ and who nevertheless claim to be „Marxist-Leninists“.

Even if there are differences between the various sections of this international opportunist current, especially as regards how cleverly they disguise their revisionist line, all their representatives still have one thing in common: in pursuing their reactionary politics they refer to a so-called „Three World Theory“ which they take as the theoretical basis for their treachery, their capitulation in the face of imperialism, and by means of which they want to pass the whole affair off as a „further development of Marxism-Leninism“. According to them, the „Three World Theory“ is the „fundamental analysis of the modern world“, a „strategic conception“ according to which the Marxist-Leninists must allegedly define their strategy and tactics. In this booklet we intend to take a closer look at this theory.

### THE „THREE WORLD THEORY“ AND LENIN'S ANALYSIS OF THE EPOCH OF IMPERIALISM ARE INCOMPATIBLE

Of course we cannot prevent this opportunist-revisionist current from brewing its theories. But when they claim that their theories are the „basis for Marxist-Leninists“ and refer to Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung, in doing so, this must be prevented. For without doubt the so-called „Three-World-Theory“, if it is extolled as a „strategic conception“, means a revision of the general line of the international Communist movement. In their struggle the Marxist-Leninists in the whole world have a common starting point in defining their strategy and tactics: Lenin's analysis of the contradictions in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution.

This basis, which has stood the test in the struggles of the international proletariat and the peoples of the world should now be thrown overboard by all Marxist-Leninists and replaced by the „Three World Scheme“? That the so-called „Three World Theory“ can be neither a replacement for nor a „concrete expression“ of Lenin's analysis and his conclusions becomes clear as crystal when we compare the two.

What are the essential contradictions, which Lenin worked out in his comprehensive analysis of imperialism? In his work „The foundations of Leninism“, Stalin gives an excellent summary of this basic analysis, as follows:  
„*Lenin called imperialism „moribund capitalism“.*“

*Why? Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins. Of these contradictions, there are three which must be regarded as the most important.*

*The first contradiction is the contradiction between labour and capital. Imperialism is the omnipotence of the monopolist trusts and syndicates, of the banks and the financial oligarchy, in the industrial countries. In the fight against this omnipotence, the customary methods of the working class — trade unions and cooperatives, parliamentary parties and the parliamentary struggle — have proved to be totally inadequate. Either place yourself at the mercy of capital, eke out a wretched existence as of old and sink lower and lower, or adopt a new weapon — this is the alternative imperialism puts before the vast masses of the proletariat. Imperialism brings the working class to revolution.*

*The second contradiction is the contradiction among the various financial groups and imperialist Powers in their struggle for sources of raw materials, for foreign territory. Imperialism is the export of capital to the sources of raw materials, the frenzied struggle for monopolist possession of these sources, the struggle for a redivision of the already divided world, a struggle waged with particular fury by new financial groups and Powers seeking a place in the sun against the old groups and Powers, which cling tenaciously to what they have seized. This frenzied struggle among the various groups of capitalists is notable in that it includes as an inevitable element imperialist wars, wars for the annexation of foreign territories. This circumstance, in its turn, is notable in that it leads to the mutual weakening of the imperialists, to the weakening of the position of capitalism in general, to the acceleration of the advent of the proletarian revolution and to the practical necessity of this revolution.*

*The third contradiction is the contradiction between the handful of ruling, 'civilised' nations and the hundreds*

*of millions of the colonial and dependent peoples of the world. Imperialism is the most barefaced exploitation and the most inhuman oppression of hundreds of millions of people inhabiting vast colonies and dependent countries. The purpose of this exploitation and of this oppression is to squeeze out super-profits. But in exploiting these countries imperialism is compelled to build there railways, factories and mills, industrial and commercial centres. The appearance of a class of proletarians, the emergence of a native intelligentsia, the awakening of national consciousness, the growth of the liberation movement — such are the inevitable results of this policy. The growth of the revolutionary movement in all colonies and dependent countries without exception clearly testifies to this fact. This circumstance is of importance for the proletariat in as much as it saps radically the position of capitalism by converting the colonies and dependent countries from reserves of imperialism into reserves of the proletarian revolution." 1*

Do these three fundamental contradictions then determine what happens in the world today? No, not quite. For the summary, which Stalin gives, refers expressively to the time before the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin took over power in Russia. With the victory of the October Revolution, with the setting up to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union under the Leadership of Lenin and Stalin, with the beginning of the first socialist state, a further, fourth contradiction became of fundamental importance for the social development of the world: **the contradiction between socialism and imperialism.** In a resolution of the VII. World Congress of the Communist International this is made clear, as follows

*"The victory of socialism has turned the Soviet Union into a power which puts in motion the broad strata of the population, classes, nations, peoples and states. This signifies a new and mighty shift on world scale in the power*

*relation between the classes in favour of socialism and against capitalism, the beginning of a new stage in the development of the proletarian world revolution."* 2

These four essential contradictions determine the epoch of imperialism and their development will finally lead the workers of all countries and the peoples of the world to revolt against imperialism, to seal its downfall. So these four essential contradictions have ever since been the starting point for Marxist-Leninists in defining the general line of the Communist movement.

On the other hand these fundamentals have only ever been attacked by revisionists, Trotskysts, opportunists and all enemies of Marxism-Leninism. Khrushchev and the whole international revisionist gang tried to blur these four essential contradictions, in order to justify their policy of counter-revolution, collaboration with imperialism and restoration of capitalism. But the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tsetung and the Party of Labour of Albania under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hoxha exposed these machinations of the modern revisionists and defended the teachings of Marxism-Leninism in a comprehensive and thorough struggle, together with all true Marxist-Leninists in the world. An outstanding document of this struggle is the Communist Party of China's "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" of 1963. Amongst other things it categorically affirms that the starting point for determining the General Line can only be **the analysis of the four essential contradictions from a class stand.**

In its programme, our party, the KPD/ML, also made a concrete analysis of the present state of the four essential contradictions from a class standpoint and from this basis determined its line, strategy and tactics. The report on the activity of the Central Committee of the KPD/ML states explicitly:

*"Our party adheres strictly to the following conviction:*

*as imperialism still exists and its nature hat not changed, as we are therefore still in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the analysis of Lenin and Stalin as to the essential contradictions which set in motion the development of the world is as valid as ever. Every Marxist-Leninist party must act accordingly. It is still as valid as ever that tendency of the present development of the world is determined by the intensification of the four most important contradictions of the epoch."* 3

We will defend this Marxist-Leninist viewpoint against all attacks from the modern revisionists — including this new opportunist-revisionist variety.

Let us take a closer look at this "Three World Theory" which the opportunists so loudly hail as a starting point for determining strategy and tactics instead of the four essential contradictions. According to this theory the world is divided into three parts: the two imperialist superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union, constitute the "First World", as the greatest international exploiters and oppressors. Countries like Japan, West Germany and other imperialist countries are included in the "Second World"; they are called "developing" countries and exploit and oppress the countries of the "Third World" while still themselves being exposed to oppression, exploitation, control and threats from the two superpowers. Finally, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are termed the "Third World", the countries which are most harshly exploited and oppressed by colonialism and imperialism, especially by the two superpowers. These countries are termed the main force in the struggle against the two superpowers. The "strategy" which is derived from this division, amounts to uniting the "Third" and "Second World" in the struggle against the "First World", the two superpowers.

If we compare Lenin's and Stalin's analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the epoch of imperialism with the "Three World Theory", which the opportunist current

makes use of, something strikes us at once: while the Lenin-Stalin analysis of the essential contradictions clearly exposes the class content of the contradictions, while it shows that these contradictions will inevitably lead to the outbreak of revolution in all countries, and also that these contradictions can only be solved by revolutions, the „Three World Theory“ does not appear to be aware of the struggle of the proletariat. Nevertheless, fearing nothing more than that their pretence of being Marxist-Leninists could be unmasked, the opportunists simply maintain, „What’s the matter? The four essential contradictions are, included‘ in full in the ‚Three World Theory‘, it is the ‚concrete expression‘ of the four essential contradictions. “

This is a gross lie, and the theoretical organ of the group „Rote Fahne“ proves this for anyone who can add one and one. There they write: „**Firstly**, there is the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed peoples and nations. This is expressed in concentrated form in the contradiction between the two superpowers, especially Russian social-imperialism, and the oppressed peoples, nations and states, especially in the Third World. **Secondly**, there is the inner imperialist contradiction. This is expressed today in most concentrated form in the contradiction between the two superpowers. It further manifests itself in the contradiction between the two superpowers, especially Russian social-imperialism on the one hand, and the capitalist and imperialist countries of the Second World on the other, then in the contradiction between the countries of the Second World, finally in the contradiction between the monopoly groups of various countries and between sections of the bourgeoisie in each country. “ And in the next sentence they write: „In the Three World Theory, the present expression of the **four** basic contradictions in the world is exactly summarised. “ **It’s true: to them, one and one is four — they seem to live in another world.**

### *The „Three World Theory“ does not recognize the socialist countries*

How worthless the „Three World Theory“ of the opportunists is for understanding and changing the world in the light of Marxism-Leninism is clearly shown by the fact that this „theory“ apparently has no room for socialist countries. And in fact they don’t appear at all in this theory. Let’s take as an example socialist Albania, the beacon of socialism, whose beams shine out beyond Europe into the whole world and show the international proletariat and the peoples of the world the way of their liberation. Is Albania perhaps a colonial, dependent country of the „Third World“? Or is it then an imperialist country of the so-called „Second World“, a country like West Germany, Japan, France etc., which exploits and oppresses other peoples? Or is it even an imperialist superpower? Or does socialist Albania not belong to this world at all?

According to the „Three World Theory“, it makes no difference whether the countries are socialist or capitalist. Great socialist China, which under the leadership of Mao Tsetung became a bastion of the world revolution, would be at most the „bastion of the Third World“, according to the theories of the opportunists — the first among equals, in a line with the fascist Shah-regime, or the Chilean gang of hangmen. Apart from the fact that this is a huge insult to socialism, this shows that the opportunists do not understand the importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the socialist countries in the struggle for world revolution.

Why then do the imperialists and reactionaries try in every way to influence the domestic and foreign policies of the socialist countries, to undermine the development of these countries? Why do they leave no stone unturned in their attempts at infiltration, subversion and overthrow? Why do the imperialists and the reactionaries in the world give vent

to such rage at the sight of Albania? Because there the dictatorship of the proletariat rules, because world revolution possesses an iron bastion in the shape of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania.

That just shows that the contradiction between socialism and imperialism is of essential importance. But this basic teaching of Marxism-Leninism is what is denied by the opportunists with their "Three World Theory". And this is not just a theoretical problem; political questions are at stake which are of far-reaching importance for the struggle of the proletariat. For, according to this theory, which doesn't divide the countries into bourgeois-capitalist and socialist countries, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us to do, it wouldn't, for example, really matter whether the dictatorship of the proletariat is successfully defended in China or if forcing China on to the path of capitalism. Such an attitude towards the socialist countries leads to an ideological weakening of the proletariat as regards the defence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the socialist countries and a promotion of the attacks of imperialism, the attacks of the class enemy on the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time it amounts to disorientating the proletariat in the capitalist countries in its struggle for the socialist revolution and blurring the goal of its struggle. Exactly the same can be said of the "Three World Theory", especially of its champions, the representatives of the new opportunist-revisionist current, as Mao Tsetung flung at the counter-revolutionary Deng Hsiao-ping: "That person doesn't take up class struggle, he never speaks about this principal link in the chain... He makes no distinction between Marxism and imperialism."

*A theory, which does not recognize classes, can never be a theory of the proletariat*

Let the representatives of this current swear as loudly as they like that the four essential contradictions are "exactly summarised" in the "Three World Theory" — there is not mention in their theory of the contradiction between bourgeois and proletariat either. And their politics and practice prove, that it's not a question of theoretical errors in their case, but that their theory is, on the contrary, deliberately designed to justify their policy of class co-operation, of sabotage against class struggle in the capitalist countries. We can see this in the counter-revolutionary utterance of their leader Semler: "preaching revolution in one's own country" today is "catchword heroism, indeed it's worse, it's the modern expression of Trozkyism in the revolutionary movement."

The "Three World Theory" serves these opportunists and revisionists to no other purpose but to divert the proletariat in the capitalist countries from its main task, the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in its own country. Instead, it is advised to unite with the imperialists of the "Second World". Co-operation with the bourgeoisie, capitulation in the face of imperialism, disparagement of revolutionary class struggle, hiding this revisionist line in a theoretical shell and giving it a verner of Marxist-Leninist science — that is the role which the "Three World Theory" plays for the opportunist current. In fact this theory does no less than revise the teachings of historical materialism and throws the "Communist Manifesto" of Marx and Engels on the rubbish-heap.

Was it perhaps the fundamental idea of the "Communist Manifesto" to divide the world up into countries in various worlds? No, Engels himself wrote in the introduction to the English Edition of 1888, the "fundamental proposition",

the „nucleus“ of the „Manifesto“ is:

*„that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch, that consequently the whole history of mankind (. . .) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes: that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class — the proletariat — cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class — the bourgeoisie — without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles.“* 4

The class question, therefore, liberation from exploitation and oppression, is the crucial question. And this occupies the central position in the theory of the proletariat, in its general line and in its strategy and tactics. A theory like that of the new opportunist current, however, according to which there are not even any classes, can never be a theory of Marxism-Leninism, but rather is aimed against the proletariat and against Marxism-Leninism.

#### *How lackeys of imperialism are named „anti-imperialists“*

Well, what is the standpoint of the „Three World Theory“ as regards the essential contradiction between imperialism on the one hand and the oppressed peoples and nations on the other? Of course, when it talks about the contradiction between so-called „Third World“ countries and imperialism, especially the two imperialist superpowers, this expresses to a certain degree the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed peoples and nations.

But this essential contradiction, too, is blurred in the end by the „Three World Theory“, because it negates the class question. It does not distinguish at all whether feudal lords and comprador bourgeoisie, linked in a thousand different ways with imperialism, are in power in the countries of Asia, Africa or Latin America. It does not enquire whether the proletariat and the Communists are brutally oppressed in this country or that — for the opportunists all these countries and their governments are unconditionally and equivalently „forces against imperialism“.

How then do Marxist-Leninists approach this question? Firstly, Marxist-Leninists assume that every force in the oppressed, semicolonial and colonial countries, which takes part in the struggle against oppression by imperialism, is objectively a revolutionary force. Mao Tsetung writes in his work „On New Democracy“:

*„No matter what classes, parties or individuals in an oppressed nation join the revolution, and no matter whether they themselves are conscious of the point or understand it, so long as they oppose imperialism, their revolution becomes part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution and they become its allies.“* 5

For the same reason Comrade Stalin emphasised, too: *„The struggle that the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchist views of the Emir and his associates, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism. . . .“* 6

So this does not mean that the proletariat always, everywhere and in all cases should support every national movement, but rather:

*„It means that support must be given to such national movements as tend to weaken, to overthrow imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it.“* 7

Lackeys of imperialism, like those who rule for example in Chile, in Iran or in Brazil, who serve to strengthen and



preserve imperialism and its influence are in no way „revolutionary“, they should not be supported, they must be combated. And here the „Three World Theory“ blurs the demarcation line between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary in the national question. According to this theory these regimes are just „governments of countries in the ‚Third World‘ “ — so they belong to the „main force in the struggle against imperialism“. Thus not the slightest distinction is made between lackeys of imperialism and fighters against imperialism.

Further: what is the Marxist-Leninist standpoint as regards the national bourgeoisie in the colonial and semi-colonial countries? As long as it fights against imperialism, it, too, objectively speaking, plays a revolutionary role, it, too, whether it wants to or not, becomes an ally of the proletarian-socialist world revolution. But is the national bourgeoisie in these countries a consistent fighter against imperialism? Mao Tsetung writes on this subject:

*„Being a bourgeoisie in a colonial and semi-colonial country and oppressed by imperialism, the Chinese national bourgeoisie retains a certain revolutionary quality at certain periods and to a certain degree — even in the era of imperialism — in its opposition to the foreign imperialists and the domestic governments of bureaucrats and warlords (... ) and it may ally itself with the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie against such enemies as it is ready to oppose.“* 8

But the national bourgeoisie has another aspect:

*„At the same time, however, being a bourgeois class in a colonial and semi-colonial country and so being extremely flabby economically and politically, the Chinese national bourgeoisie also has another quality, namely, a proneness to conciliation with the enemies of the revolution. Even when it takes part in the revolution, it is unwilling to break with imperialism completely and, moreover, it is closely associated with the exploitation of the rural areas through land rent; thus it is neither willing nor able to overthrow*

*imperialism, and much less the feudal forces, in a thorough way.“* 9

What follows from this? On the one hand, the proletariat in these countries in the form of its Communist Party, the broad peasant masses in their struggle against imperialism and feudalism can win the national bourgeoisie as an ally (temporarily and to a certain degree) to carry out the new democratic revolution. However, it also follows that the national bourgeoisie, because of its unreliable character, cannot be the leading force of this revolution, and that the proletariat must take over the leadership in this revolution.

But what follows from this for the Marxist-Leninists as regards support for the national liberation movements? It follows, that they cannot unconditionally support the national bourgeoisie of these countries. Just that was Lenin's standpoint in this question:

*„The Communist International can only support the bourgeois-democratic national movements in the colonial and backward countries on condition that the elements of the future proletarian parties, which are Communist parties not just in name, are rallied in all backward countries and educated in the consciousness of their special task, the struggle against the bourgeois-democratic movements within their nations. The Communist International must take a temporary alliance with the bourgeois democracy of the colonies and backward countries, must not, however, merge with it, but must without fail preserve the independence of the proletarian movement — even in its nucleus form.“* 10

That means, therefore, that as regards the revolutionary national liberation movements Marxist-Leninists assume that the broad masses of the people, especially the working peasants, are the main force in the struggle against imperialism and that the decisive force in this struggle is the working class. The remedy for the peoples of the dependent and weak nations does not consist in entrusting themselves to

the national bourgeoisie, but in using their strength to carry through the new democratic revolution and then marching beyond that to the socialist revolution: for in the end only the socialist revolution can completely guarantee national independence and freedom. That is why Lenin emphasises: *"In the present international situation there is no other salvation for the dependent and weak nations than a federation of soviet republics."* 11

The opportunists may reproach us by saying that we violate proletarian internationalism, because we don't unconditionally support what they call the "Third World". Well, just because we are proletarian internationalists and stick to the principle that our support is due to the fighting peoples and especially the Marxist-Leninist parties in Africa, Asia and Latin America, which are in part engaged in armed struggle, we refuse to unconditionally treat all these countries alike. You opportunists use this method to support such reactionary lackeys of imperialism as the Shah in Iran or the militarist cliques in Latin America. And against your demands for union with the lackeys of imperialism and merging with the national bourgeoisie we hold up the parole: **workers of all countries and oppressed people, unite!**

As far as the contradictions between the imperialists are concerned, the representatives of the opportunist-revisionist current always stress to Marxist-Leninists that they can better utilize the contradictions between the imperialists with their "Three World Theory" for a much higher degree. Let us take a closer look at this assertion.

*Utilizing the contradictions between the imperialists  
or uniting with the Bourgeoisie?*

The "Three World Theory" distinguishes without doubt between the two imperialist superpowers and the other

imperialist powers, when it speaks of the "First" and "Second World". But do Marxist-Leninists make no distinction between the various imperialist powers on the basis of the four essential contradictions? Of course they do. The Programme of the KPD/ML, which was recently adopted at the Third Party Congress, is a good example of this. As regards the international situation it clearly distinguishes between the two biggest exploiters, oppressors and war-mongers, the US-imperialists and the Russian social-imperialists on the one hand and the weaker imperialist powers on the other. But just because we are Marxist-Leninists, we stress that imperialists of all shapes and sizes belong to one world, the imperialist world, that — regardless of the differences between the two superpowers and the other imperialist powers — they are all imperialists and always will be. But that is exactly what the representatives of the opportunist current with their "Three World Theory" want to blur. When they speak of the union of the "second and third world against the two superpowers", one is supposed to get the impression that the West German, French und Belgian imperialists work together with the oppressed peoples and nations for a just cause, which the proletariat in the imperialist countries must support.

But what kind of contradictions are there between the two imperialist superpowers and the other imperialist powers? They are determined solely by competition, by the imperialists' struggle for "a place in the sun". The various measures taken by the weaker imperialists against intervention and control by the two superpowers spring from their craving to preserve, strengthen and expand their own imperialist domain; they have nothing in common with the struggle of the proletariat and the peoples to overthrow imperialism. Of course the proletariat can utilize the contradictions between its enemies to a certain degree. But whoever gives the impression, as the opportunist current does, that the West German imperialists, for example, look after

the interests of the people against the two superpowers, betrays class struggle and the struggle of the proletariat, which is directed against all forms of imperialism.

In the case of the Red Flag Group, this comes clearly to the fore when it calls upon the proletariat to „criticize“ certain „government courses“ as regards the superpowers, at the same time, however, calls upon it not to overthrow West German imperialism, as that would weaken the „united front against the two superpowers“. And it comes even more clearly to the fore when the opportunists call upon us to strengthen the military apparatus of the bourgeoisie — because this is supposed to be in the interests of the struggle against the imperialist superpowers. This is nothing less than „justifying“ the West German imperialists' part in a future imperialist war. It is the same betrayal as the German proletariat experienced from the social chauvinists of the Second International, from Bernstein and Kautsky. That is what the opportunists mean, when they say that with their theory they can „better utilize“ the contradictions between the imperialists: the mean relying on, co-operation with imperialism.

As regards utilizing the contradictions between the imperialists, the Polemics on the Subject of the General Line say the following:

*„The proletarian party must lead the masses in waging struggles against the enemies, and it must know how to utilize the contradictions among those enemies. But the purpose of using these contradictions is to make it easier to attain the goal of the people's revolutionary struggles and not to liquidate these struggles.“ 12*

Co-operation with imperialism, acting against the proletarian revolution — is this not liquidation of the struggles of the people? Is this not collaboration with the bourgeoisie?

Imperialism is reaction all along the line, it must be fought against until it falls. That is the basis from which we

must start, if we want to utilize the contradictions between the imperialists. In all respects. In respect of the question of defending independence and sovereignty, too. For the imperialist bourgeoisie is thoroughly reactionary in the national question, too. It has completely betrayed national interests. Stalin said about this at the XIX Party Congress of the CPSU:

*„Formerly the bourgeoisie was considered the head of the nation, it stood up for the rights and independence of the nation and placed them, above all else'. Now there is not a trace left of, national principle'. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. Without doubt you, the representatives of the Communist and democratic parties will have to raise and carry forward this banner, if you are patriots of your country, if you want to be the leading force in the nation. There is no-one else, who can raise it.“ 13*

The new opportunist current does not agree with Stalin's analysis. It maintains that the imperialist bourgeoisie has again raised the banner of national independence in the struggle against the two superpowers. Thus they justify their support of their „own“ bourgeoisie, the policy of the West German, French, Belgian or Swiss monopoly bourgeoisie of establishing and expanding their own imperialist power in the lee of the two superpowers.

This role of the new opportunist and social-chauvinist current as an agent can clearly be seen by the way they judge the plundering, exploitation and oppression of the peoples by West German imperialism, for example. According to the „Three World Theory“, West German imperialism's infiltration of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America is not imperialist exploitation and oppression, but „economic co-operation“, its policy of blackmail and pressure on these countries is played down as a „dialogue

between the Second and Third World". Could West German imperialism imagine better support from the social-chauvinists and opportunists of the group „Rote Fahne" and their brothers? That is social chauvinism of the first water. And the representatives of this opportunist current have the impudence to claim that it is especially thorough-going and principled „internationalism".

In the question of the treatment of contradictions between the imperialists, the „Three World Theory" thus proves itself to be of use to the bourgeoisie and imperialism, and at the same time aimed against the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples for world revolution, for the overthrow of imperialism in every country.

#### *A historical example*

A historical example may again throw light on the consequences of this theory of the opportunists and social-chauvinists for the struggles of the peoples: in the mid-fifties, when the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin had not yet degenerated, US-imperialism was the main enemy of the peoples of the world, it was the sole imperialist superpower. England and France on the other hand were smaller imperialist powers. Was then the struggle of the peoples and nations in those areas where these two powers ruled, against British and French colonialism, just? Yes, it was just and had to be supported by the truly Marxist-Leninist parties.

But how would this have been judged according to the „Three World Theory"? British and French imperialism, as weaker imperialist powers, would have had to unite with the colonial countries against the main enemy, the superpower USA. And the liberation struggle of the peoples and nations oppressed by British and French imperialism would have been wrong, because it would have weakened the „united front" against the superpower. So the parties would have

had to act against the liberation movements?

This is by no means a made-up story. In fact there were similar theories then. And it is significant for the present opportunist-revisionist current to see who came out with these theories: they were spread by the traitorous forces in the Communist Party of France, who were then already on the way to chauvinism and revisionism.

## MARXISM-LENINISM OR REVISIONISM

Let us sum up: the "Three World Theory" is neither an exact summary of the four essential contradictions, as Lenin and Stalin analysed them, nor a substitute — and it cannot be one, for it does not fulfil the fundamental law of Marxism-Leninism, that is, starting out from the class standpoint of the proletariat. In his report at the 7th Party Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania, Comrade Enver Hoxha said the following about terms like "second world", "third world", etc.:

*"All these terms, which refer to the various political forces acting in the world today, cover up and do not bring out the class character of these political forces, the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the key problem which is predominant today on a national and international scale, the ruthless struggle between the bourgeois-imperialist world, on the one hand, and socialism, the world proletariat, and its natural allies, on the other."*

And he continued:

*"The most that these terms and divisions can indicate is the extent of the influence and impact of world capital, international or national, on various states and areas of the world. They can also indicate the more powerful or less powerful support points of imperialism and social-imperialism, and they may also indicate the existence of the peoples' aspirations to live free and independent of the*

*superpowers. But, viewing the question from the angle of the class criterion, with some exceptions, in these states, antagonist classes and the exploitation of man by man exist, and the proletariat and working people of these countries are ruled by the bourgeoisie in this or that form. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that in our epoch, countries are grouped according to the social system prevailing in them, into bourgeois-capitalist countries and socialist countries. The theories on the so-called intermediate stage of non-capitalist development, so zealously propagated by the Khrushchevite revisionists, are meant to sabotage the sincere socialist aspirations that exist in many countries, to cause ideological confusion, and to undermine the struggle of the progressive forces.*

*Similarly, regarding the assessment of the policy pursued by various states and governments, the Marxists proceed again from the class criterion, from the stands these governments and countries maintain towards imperialism and socialism, towards their own people and reaction.*

*On the basis of these teachings the revolutionary movement and the proletariat build their strategy and tactics, find, and unite with, their true allies in the struggle against imperialism, the bourgeoisie and reaction."* 14

Our party also used terms like "Second" and "Third World" for a while — just in order to distinguish "the strength of international or national world capital". Various Marxist-Leninist brother parties use these terms today, too. Is the use of non-use of these terms then the dividing-line between Marxism-Leninism and the new opportunist current? No, for example our party — even when it used these terms — still insisted, in the face of the opportunists, that the four essential contradictions are the starting point for determining the General Line. If we now no longer speak of the "First", "Second" and "Third World", this is for two reasons: firstly, because even these individual terms gloss over the class character of the politi-

cal forces in the world; secondly, in order to draw a clear line of demarcation between us and the opportunist current and its theories.

Marxism-Leninism stops and revisionism begins when the „Three World Theory“ is claimed to be a strategic concept, in order to distract from the socialist revolution, when capitulation in the face of imperialism or collaboration with certain imperialist powers is said to be justified by the theory. For the opportunist current the „Three World Theory“ is just a means of better concealing their revisionist views and aims and of giving the impression that this is Marxist-Leninist politics — especially as they refer to Lenin and Mao Tsetung thereby. In fact they don't even keep to their „great strategic conception“. For according to their theory **both** superpowers are the greatest international exploiters, oppressors and war-mongers'needing to be fought. How is this consistent with the way these opportunists simultaneously argue for the strengthening of US armament and the NATO, that they argue against the struggle of the German people to drive the US occupation army from West Germany, because all this is supposed to be necessary in the struggle against Russian social-imperialism?

The „Three World Theory“ serves the new opportunist current solely as a vehicle for their revisionist policy of class reconciliation and capitulation in the face of imperialism. It is so well adapted to use by this current because it denies the class question, because under the mantle of class neutrality it is easy to spread the class standpoint of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

**So it is not a question of isolated deviations or isolated errors, in the case of the new opportunist current and its use of the „Three World Theory“, but rather, as our Party stated in the report on the activity of the Central Committee at the Third Party Congress, of a variation of modern revisionism, against which we must and shall fight accordingly.**

## LENIN — AN ADHERENT TO THE THREE WORLD THEORY?

Of course the representatives of the new opportunist-revisionist current are well aware that their „Three World Theory“, extolled as a „strategic concept“, is difficult to disguise as a „Marxist-Leninist Theory“ — the cleft between the principles of Marxism-Leninism and their revisionist parables is only too apparent. But they swear all the louder that their opportunist and revisionist nonsense bears the signature of the classical writers of Marxism-Leninism themselves. Recently some of them have even maintained that Lenin himself, as early as 1920, divided the world into three parts, although differently from today. They want to give the impression that the „Three World Theory“ has actually not been invented by them, but is a „well-tried principle“ of Marxism-Leninism.

The opportunists present the following as proof: Lenin had on various occasions analysed the world situation and distinguished between three worlds. An example for this is said to be the Second World Congress of the Third International, at which Lenin even insisted that the Third International should devote special attention to this division. Let us examine this with the help of Lenin's speech.

Lenin gives a picture of the international situation in his speech, as it had developed after the new division of imperialist power relations resulting from the war. Lenin shows thereby that the population of the world lives

basically in three categories of countries:

*„One and a quarter milliard oppressed people in the colonies — countries which are dismembered alive like Persia, Turkey and China, or countries which have been defeated and (like Germany by the Versailles Treaty - The editor) put into the position of colonies. „Not more than a quarter of a milliard people in those countries which (like France — the editor) have retained their old position. But they have all got into economic dependence on America and all found themselves during the war in military dependence. For the war had grasped hold of the whole world and not a single state was allowed to stay really neutral. „And finally not more than a quarter of a milliard inhabitants of countries (England, Japan, America — the editor) which — of course only the upper class, the capitalists — profited from the division of the earth. “ 15*

In fact, therefore, Lenin gives a picture of the world situation, in which he divides the countries into three categories. Does that not then confirm the assertions of the opportunists? No, Lenin was a mighty proletarian ideologist, who approached all questions from the standpoint of the proletariat, from the standpoint of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And so Lenin used his picture of the world situation for one purpose alone: to show, that as a result of the new division of imperialist world power through the imperialist war, an even smaller group of capitalists than before plunges an even greater mass of people into even greater misery, that *„one and a quarter milliard people, who have no means of existence, are dependent on a handful of rich people. “ 16*

He showed that the new conditions which had now been created, had led to a world crisis, that the *„economic position of the masses has become unbearable and on the other hand decay has started among the small minority of almighty, victorious countries and is progressing further*

*and further. “ — and that this means nothing less than that „the conditions for the world revolution are maturing. “ 17*

That was what Lenin wanted to direct the special attention of the Third International to, namely the question, how the Communist International could utilize this world crisis in all countries to drive on the revolution, the overthrow of the exploiters and oppressors.

*„We must now prove ‘by the practice of the revolutionary parties, “ said Lenin, „that they have enough conviction, organisation, contact with the exploited masses, decisiveness and ability to utilize this crisis for a successful, victorious revolution. To prepare ourselves for such a demonstration ‘ — that is the main reason we have gathered together at this congress of the Third International. “ 18*

In other words: Lenin placed in the centre of his analysis the class question, the question of the socialist revolution, the question of world revolution. In no way did he conclude, like the opportunist current today, that for example German imperialism, which was now subjugated by the Versailles Treaty, could suddenly play a progressive role in the face of U. S. imperialism. Nor that the German proletariat, together with „its“ bourgeoisie, should go to battle against the victorious powers which had dictated the Peace of Versailles, and that the revolution in Germany was to be postponed to when the cows come home. On the contrary, Lenin showed the German people, too, the path of the proletarian revolution, as Ernst Thälmann emphasised:

*„Thus Lenin shows us the march-route: the way to national liberty follows the path of the seizure of power by the proletariat in alliance with the working people, it is attainable only through social liberation. “ 19*

Yes, even as regards the national movements in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Lenin emphasized that the Communist International could not support these unconditionally. Here Lenin again put the class question:

*„The bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and that of the colonial countries have drawn closer to one another to a certain extent, so that the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries hat often — in most cases even — supported the national movements, but simultaneously, in collusion with the imperialist bourgeoisie, that is, together, with it, fought against all revolutionary movements and classes.“* 20 Lenin concluded from this *„that we as Communists must only support the bourgeois liberation movements in the colonial countries, and shall do so, when these movements are truly revolutionary, when their representatives do not prevent us from educating and organising the peasantry and the broad masses of the exploited in the revolutionary spirit. On the other hand, if these conditions are not existent, then the Communists in these countries must fight the reformist bourgeoisie, to which the heroes of the Second International belong.“* 21

Lenin would not be the mighty proletarian ideologist he certainly is, he would have been a bourgeois nationalist — as some literary philistines in the new opportunist current now want to present him — if he had not worked out the question of the struggle for national liberation and for national independence on the basis of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution, on the basis of the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

*„Leninism“, says Stalin, „is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular.“* 22

With petty-bourgeois revisionist theories, however, which amount to glossing over the class question and which furiously attack the struggle for the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, Leninism has nothing in common, in fact it is in irreconcilable opposition to them. When, however, the representatives of the new

opportunist-revisionist current try to take Lenin as their chief witness for their anti-Leninist theories that is a malicious attempt to falsify Leninism, to rob it of its revolutionary content. Such attempts, however, — the victorious struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism has shown this clearly — are doomed to failure, for Leninism, in the form of all truly Marxist-Leninist parties, is stronger than all its enemies.



## A MALICIOUS ATTACK ON COMRADE MAO TSETUNG

Instead of openly admitting to having pieced together their own theory and to wanting to revise Marxism-Leninism, the representatives of the new opportunist-revisionist current speculate with tricks and forgeries, in order to hide behind the classical writers of Marxism-Leninism. They try to impute their opportunist theories not only to Lenin, but also to Mao Tsetung. Comrade Mao Tsetung, they say, was even the real inventor of their opportunist-revisionist line.

As early as August 1946 Mao Tsetung, in a talk with the American correspondent Anna Louise Strong, is supposed to have given an estimate of the international situation, corresponding in principle to a T to the „Three World Theory“. And in the „Proposal Concerning the General Line of the Communist Movement“, which was drawn up by the Communist Party of China in 1963 under the personal leadership of Mao Tsetung in the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism, the principle of the „Three World Theory“ is also supposed to be advocated in principle.

For Marxist-Leninists both Mao Tsetung's talk with the American correspondent Strong and the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“ are of exceptional importance, because both excellently show that the peoples of the world are strong in their struggle, imperialism, however, weak, and that, if the peoples of the world under the leadership of the international proletariat with the Marxist-Leninist par-

ties at its head fight bravely, the victory in this battle will certainly belong to the peoples of the world, to the cause of socialism. But how do the opportunists approach Mao Tsetung's talk with the American correspondent, how do they approach the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“? Do they examine the attitude with which Mao Tsetung approached the international situation? Do they adopt his implacable attitude to imperialism — that is, any form of imperialism? Of course not. Their efforts are all concentrated on one point — justifying their policy of reconciliation with imperialism, of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. They are only interested in the fact that, in the talk with Anna Louise Strong and in the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“, „an intermediate zone“ is talked about, lying between the USA and the Soviet Union.

*„The United States and the Soviet Union“, Mao Tsetung had stated to Anna Louise Strong, among other things, „are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Before the US reactionaries have subjugated these countries, an attack on the Soviet Union is out of the question.“ 23*

And in the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“, the opportunists refer to this statement:

*„The strategic objectives of US imperialism have been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp, put down the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to subject all the peoples and countries of the world, including its allies, to domination and enslavement by US monopoly capital.“ 24*

Why does this term „intermediate zone“ fascinate the opportunists so? They construct the following from this: „Look“, they say, „then there were colonial and semi-colonial countries, too, corresponding to the Third World to-

day, and capitalist countries, corresponding to the Second World today, on the one side, and on the other side the superpowers of the time, the USA, threatening and oppressing the others and more or less representing the First World — there you have the basic framework of the three worlds.“

Apparently these people „overlook“ in their eagerness the Soviet Union which was then still socialist and which Mao Tsetung mentioned. Was that then the Fourth World? No, the starting point for Mao Tsetung was neither a „Three“ nor „Four World Theory“, but the analysis of the four basic contradictions in the epoch of imperialism. And it is certainly not the case (as the opportunists would like to claim), that Mao Tsetung argued for the „union of the intermediate zone“, for the union of proletariat, imperialists, oppressed peoples, comprador bourgeoisie and feudal lords, for the union of revolution and counter-revolution against US imperialism. On the contrary, it was Comrade Mao Tsetung who defended Marxism-Leninism, in the battle against Khrushchevite revisionism, against the traitorous theories of class collaboration and submission to imperialism.

If the opportunists would for once take off their revisionist spectacles, they could find this especially in the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“. As we have already shown above, a correct estimate of the then current power relationship between imperialism and socialism is given there, proceeding from the four essential contradictions of the epoch of imperialism. In connection with this it was correctly stated, according to the situation as it then was, that the strategic aim of US imperialism is to perpetrate aggression against the revolutions of the subjugated masses and oppressed nations in the countries between the USA and the socialist camp, to bring these countries under its control and finally to exterminate the socialist countries, in order thus to bring the whole world under the rule of

American monopoly capital. The consequences which must be drawn from this for the struggle of the proletariat and the socialist countries, are completely clear.

As regards the struggle of the subjugated peoples and nations in the broad areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it is stated, that there the proletarian parties are set the task of carrying forward the banner in the struggle against imperialism, against new and old colonialism, in the struggle for national independence and people's democracy, of standing in the forefront of the national-democratic revolutionary movement and of fighting for a socialist future.

As regards the struggle in the capitalist and imperialist countries, it is stated, that the proletarian party is set the task of carrying out the proletarian revolution and setting up the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As regards the struggle of the socialist countries, it is stated, that, according to Lenin's statement, „*Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all oppressed peoples against all imperialists of whatever kind — that is the foreign policy of the proletariat*“, the task is, actively to support the revolutionary struggle of the subjugated masses and oppressed nations.

This was the correct Marxist-Leninist line in the struggle against imperialism and for the socialist world revolution, which the Communist Party of China under the Leadership of Comrade Mao Tsetung followed and which it defended in the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“ in the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism. This line stands in complete opposition to the opportunist-revisionist theories of Semler, Vilar and Co. Comrade Mao Tsetung, the eminent Marxist-Leninist, the eminent leader of the international proletariat, is just as little adapted as Lenin is to justifying the betrayal of the new opportunist-revisionist current.

The opportunist's attempt at giving the opposite im-

pression, is based solely on picking out isolated words and terms from the teachings of Comrade Mao Tsetung and speculating with them, in order thus to turn the teachings of Mao Tsetung into the opposite. This method becomes especially clear in the treatment of the talk which Mao Tsetung had with the American correspondent Anna Louise Strong in 1946.

In this conversation the opportunists are only interested in the term mentioned by Mao Tsetung „intermediate zone“, in order to construct arguments for their theory of class collaboration. But why was this conversation so important? Did Mao Tsetung call upon the peoples of the world to cooperate with the other imperialists against the main enemy, USA imperialism? On the contrary, Mao Tsetung's statements in this conversation were a battle-cry against imperialism, an encouragement for the peoples of the world, confidently and determinedly to carry on the struggle for the destruction of all imperialism, until they have won a complete victory over it. It was in this conversation that Mao Tsetung set up the famous thesis: „*All reactionaries are paper tigers.*“ This basic strategic concept expresses clearly, that the peoples, if they fight bravely and rely on their own strength, can defeat imperialism in any form. But is that not a sharp condemnation of those who maintain that the peoples can only stand up against the two imperialist powers if they fraternise with the other imperialists?

On the 20th anniversary of this significant conversation — the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution had just begun — the newspaper Renmin Ribao published an article in which the intransigent attitude towards imperialism, which Mao Tsetung expresses in the conversation with Anna Louise Strong, was once more confirmed. It said:

*One must „possess a spirit of rebellion as is expressed in the Chinese proverb, Whoever is afraid of being quartered, does not dare to drag the emperor from his horse‘. Whoever*

*is afraid that there are wolves ahead and tigers in the rear or that a man could be crushed by a falling leaf, can only be a slave. For him a revolution, not to mention a victory, is out of the question.“ 25*

Is that not exactly in keeping with the representatives of the new opportunist current? Are they not the ones who are „afraid of being quartered“, who are afraid of dragging West German imperialism „from its horse“? Are they not the ones who cry that the working classes must not overthrow West German imperialism, must not drive USA imperialism out of West Germany, because then the tiger would come in the back door, because that would benefit Russian social-imperialism? And are they not the ones who say openly that for them today the struggle for the revolution is out of the question? Yes, they are slaves, these representatives of the new opportunist current, slaves of their imperialist bourgeoisie whom they serve and obey. — That is the consequence from what Mao Tsetung stated in his conversation with the American correspondent Strong. The opportunists can twist and turn as much as they like, they cannot turn black into white.

In the face of their difficulty in convincingly presenting the „Three World Theory“ as a strategic guiding principle for the liberation struggle of the working class and the oppressed peoples, the opportunists go even further. They don't just maintain, that Mao Tsetung in 1946 and in the „Proposal Concerning the General Line“ allegedly laid the foundation for the opportunist line which they follow with their „Three World Theory“, they even take up the following argument: the „Three World Theory“ was developed more recently by none other than Mao Tsetung himself; therefore it is the guiding principle for all peoples and all Marxist-Leninist parties and therefore anyone who does not conform to it, splits the unity of the Communist world movement and benefits imperialism.

Here they bring all their guns into play, but on closer

examination we find that this, too, backfires.

Firstly, no one has yet been able to show us this alleged analysis of Mao Tsetung. Comrade Ernst Aust pointed out in his speech at the closing meeting of the Third Party Congress that the „three worlds“ may once have been used by Mao Tsetung as a simile. That is possible, we don't know for sure. What we do know is, that Mao Tsetung was a great Marxist-Leninist, an eminent leader of the international proletariat and the peoples of the world in their struggle and that it is malicious and base to maintain that Comrade Mao Tsetung who defended the Marxist-Leninist General Line in the victorious struggle against modern revisionism, actually wanted to revise it. Comrade Ernst Aust expressly emphasized in his speech at the closing meeting of the Third Party Congress of the KPD/ML:

*„Whoever insinuates that Comrade Mao Tsetung wanted to annul these essential contradictions, as they were formulated by the Communist world movement in the General Line, by a new theory, derides and insults Comrade Mao Tsetung.“ 26*

These dirty methods of the opportunists are only too familiar to us from the Trotskyites and revisionists, who after Lenin's death and Stalin's death proceeded in exactly the same way, attacking their teachings from behind and distorting them.

The opportunists' methods alone unmask their false game. Just imagine: the opportunists want to make the correct Communist General Line of all Communist parties dependent on an alleged quotation which no one even knows of. Such a method of procedure is unthinkable in the truly Marxist-Leninist world movement. It is completely foreign to it. Is the Communist General Line then a secret science which operates with unknown quotations and secret tips? The opportunists may construct their theories in this way, but Marxism-Leninism is a science based on scientific research and scientifically applied.

Did Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin perhaps become leaders of the international proletariat through unknown quotations? Of course not. They became leaders of the international Communist movement, because they created the basis of the science of the proletariat, because they created Marxism-Leninism, because every proletarian can convince himself of the correctness of their work by examining their theories and revolutionary practice. The leading role, too, which the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao Tsetung and the Party of Labour of Albania under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hoxha attained in the international Communist movement, was not due to blind faith in these two parties, but because all Marxist-Leninists could satisfy themselves of their principled defence of Marxism-Leninism in the struggle against Krushchevite revisionism.

It was Mao Tsetung who taught us not to blindly believe one thing or the other, but to examine the rightness and wrongness of a political line ourselves. In complete contrast to this, the opportunists call upon us to throw overboard the whole General Line of the Communist world movement on the basis of an unknown quotation of a leader of a Communist party. The Communist Party of China expressly warned against just such an attitude in the great Polemics against modern revisionism. Thus we read in the paper „Whence the differences come?“:

*„Such wheelings and such absolute obedience to the command staff can under no circumstances be seen as behaviour which corresponds to normal relations on the basis of independence and equality as should exist between brother parties. This behaviour corresponds rather to completely abnormal, feudal-patriarchic relations. It seems that some comrades think, one only needs to follow the others, without worrying about the interests of the proletariat and the people in their own country, the interests of the international proletariat and the interests of the peoples. The*

right path. East or West, backwards or forwards, all that is ignored. What the other says is repeated mechanically, the other moves and one follows. We can recognise here the ability to speak like a parrot, but the principles of Marxism-Leninism are lacking."

And in the same paper the following is again clearly stated: "Comrade Thorez said, the differences arose, because the Communist Party of China did not accept the propositions of the XXth Party Congress of the CPSU. This assertion is in itself a violation of the principles concerning the relations between brother parties laid down in the two Moscow Statements. According to these documents the mutual relations between brother parties are based on equality and independence. No one has the right to demand that all brother parties accept the propositions of a single party. The resolutions of the party congress of any one party cannot be regarded as the General Line of the international Communist movement and are not binding for other brother parties. If Thorez and other comrades are willing to conform to the views and resolutions of another party, that is their business. In the Communist Party of China, however, we have always argued, that for us and all other brother parties only the common principles of behaviour, only Marxism-Leninism and documents which have been unanimously accepted by the brother parties, are binding, and not the resolutions of the party congress of a brother party or anything else."

The representatives of the opportunist current today do not even rely on the resolutions of a party congress, but want to pass off some unknown quotation as the General Line, binding for the whole Marxist-Leninist movement.

Our party has always accepted those experiences, analyses and conclusions of its brother parties which are important and correct for the workers' movement, it has propagated them and creatively applied them to the conditions in our own country. That is especially true in the case of the

experiences, analyses and conclusions of the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tsetung and the Party of Labour of Albania under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hoxha. At the same time, however, it has rejected the idea of a "father party" which all other parties must blindly follow and obey. Whoever maintains today that the "Three World Theory" is binding for all parties, because it originates from Mao Tsetung, imputes to the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao Tsetung that it completely overrode the principles which apply between brother parties, and tries to brand the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao Tsetung as just such a "father party" which uses revisionist methods. We decidedly reject this assertion.

The attempt made by various representatives of the opportunist current, for example the leaders of the group "Rote Fahne", to foist their revisionist nonsense on Comrade Mao Tsetung and thereby set it up as binding for all, is a double attack on the great proletarian revolutionary and ideologist Mao Tsetung: On the one hand it is an attempt to insinuate that Mao Tsetung wanted to liquidate the four essential contradictions as the starting-point for the analysis of the world — while it was in fact Mao Tsetung who defended the four essential contradictions in the struggle against modern revisionism. And on the other hand it is the attempt to insinuate that Mao Tsetung had argued for feudal-patriarchic relations among the Marxist-Leninist parties — although it was Comrade Mao Tsetung who denounced, rejected and determinedly fought against these revisionist methods. The opportunists who loudly claim to defend the inheritance of Mao Tsetung, in fact attack it most maliciously.

## **LET US FIGHT THE NEW VARIATION OF MODERN REVISIONISM!**

Why is the Marxist-Leninists' fight against this new opportunist current, this new variation of modern revisionism so important? Their influence on the workers' movement is without doubt minimal. Nevertheless one must not underestimate the importance of the fight against this current. For it aims on the one hand at gaining influence in the Marxist-Leninist parties, in order thus to rob the proletariat of its command staff, on the other hand at splitting the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties, in order thus to destroy the international Communist movement. But in addition to this we must fight against this opportunist current and its theories, because it aims at discrediting Marxism-Leninism by passing off capitulation in the face of imperialism, collaboration with the Western imperialist countries and US imperialism as the „latest wisdom of Marxism-Leninism“. It plays thereby into the hands of the modern revisionists who have always tried to spread the lie that Marxist-Leninists conspire with the imperialists.

Marxism-Leninism or modern revisionism — that is the question in the struggle against the new opportunist current, this new variation of modern revisionism. As far as our party is concerned, it will wage an irreconcilable battle against this current — irreconcilable on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. And we are certain that Marxism-Leninism will carry off a total victory in the battle against this variation of modern revisionism.

## NOTES

- 1) J. V. Stalin, "The foundations of Leninism", Works, vol. 6, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1953, pp. 74-76
- 2) The struggle for the victory of the socialist construction, "Leninism", booklet Nr. 4, Moscow/Leningrad 1936, p. 124 (Germ. ed.)
- 3) Report to the III. Party Congress of the KPD/ML, Verlag Roter Morgen, Dortmund 1977, p. 6 (Germ. ed.)
- 4) Marx/Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1970, p. 13
- 5) Mao Tse-tung, "On new Democracy", Selected Works, vol. II, Peking 1969, pp. 346/347
- 6) J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 148
- 7) J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 147
- 8) Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works, vol. II, p. 348
- 9) Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works, vol. II, p. 349
- 10) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 138 (Germ. ed.)
- 11) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 138 (Germ. ed.)
- 12) A Proposal concerning the general line of the international Communist movement, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1963, p. 24
- 13) J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 15, pp. 189/190 (Germ. ed.)
- 14) E. Hoxha, Report to the VII. Party Congress of the PLA, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1976, pp. 172-174
- 15) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 206 (Germ. ed.)
- 16) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 206 (Germ. ed.)
- 17) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 213 (Germ. ed.)
- 18) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 215 (Germ. ed.)
- 19) E. Thälmann, in "Rote Fahne", 11. 1. 1933
- 20) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 230
- 21) V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, p. 230
- 22) J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 73
- 23) Mao Tse-tung, "Talk with Anna Louise Strong", Selected Works, vol. 4, p. 99
- 24) A proposal concerning the general line of the international Communist movement, p. 11
- 25) "The great strategic idea", Renmin Ribao, 25th of August 1966
- 26) "Long live the III. Party Congress of the KPD/ML", Verlag Roter Morgen, Dortmund 1977, p. 47 (Germ. ed.)