CHAIRMAN MAO'S THEORY OF THE DIFFERENTIATION OF THE THREE WORLDS IS A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO MARXISM-LENINISM

CHAIRMAN MAO'S THEORY OF THE DIFFERENTIATION OF THE THREE WORLDS IS A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO MARXISM-LENINISM

Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao*
(*People's Daily*)

(November 1, 1977)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

First edition 1977

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

MORE than a year has elapsed since the passing of our great leader and teacher Chairman Mao Tsetung. He is no longer with us, but he has bequeathed us a very rich and precious legacy. Invincible Mao Tsetung Thought will always illuminate the road of our struggle as we continue the revolution.

In his life as a great revolutionary, Chairman Mao inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism both in theory and in practice. His contributions to the Chinese revolution and the world revolution are immortal.

Under Chairman Mao's leadership the Chinese people triumphed in the revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, founded the socialist People's Republic of China and brought about a radical change in the situation in the East and throughout the world. In guiding the Chinese revolution through its various stages, he correctly solved such fundamental problems as the seizure of state power through waging armed struggle to encircle the cities from the countryside, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat through winning nation-wide victory in the new-democratic revolution and the switch over to the socialist revolution, and the development of socialism and the prevention of capitalist restoration through continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a new period and under new circumstances, he accumulated and summed up a rich store of experi-

ence in revolution and construction and greatly developed Marxist-Leninist theory. This is a valuable asset not only to the Chinese people but also to the international proletariat and revolutionary people of the world.

Consistently upholding proletarian internationalism, Chairman Mao formulated China's line, principles and policies in foreign affairs and guided their implementation. He taught us to strengthen our unity with the socialist countries and with the proletariat and oppressed people and nations throughout the world and firmly support the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries; he taught us to follow the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence in developing relations with all countries, to persist in combating the imperialist and social-imperialist policies of aggression and war and superpower hegemonism, to fight any manifestation of great-nation chauvinism in our relations with other countries and never to seek hegemony. Over a long period of time, Comrade Chou En-lai, his close comrade-in-arms, implemented his revolutionary line in foreign affairs with firmness and great distinction. We Chinese people will follow our respected and beloved Premier Chou's example and will always faithfully carry out these behests of Chairman Mao's.

By integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the world revolution, Chairman Mao scientifically analysed the international situation in different periods and drew illuminating conclusions, thus greatly promoting the revolutionary cause of the proletariat and the liberation of the oppressed nations all over the world.

With the boldness and vision of a proletarian revolutionary, Chairman Mao initiated a momentous struggle

in the international communist movement to repudiate modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist renegade clique as its centre, and rallied the international proletariat to push on under the militant banner of Marxism-Leninism.

Chairman Mao put forward the theory of the differentiation of the three worlds at a time when the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, became locked in a cut-throat struggle for world hegemony and were actively preparing for a new war. This theory provides the international proletariat, the socialist countries and the oppressed nations with a powerful ideological weapon for forging unity and building the broadest united front against the two hegemonist powers and their war policies and for pushing the world revolution forward.

Chairman Mao was the greatest Marxist of our time. Like Lenin, he was the great teacher of the international proletariat and the oppressed people and nations. He has made an inestimable contribution to the progress of mankind.

In this article we propose to explain at some length his theory of the three worlds and its far-reaching significance for the revolutionary struggle of the people of all countries.

The Differentiation of the Three Worlds Is a Scientific Marxist Assessment of Present-Day World Realities

Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds scientifically epitomizes the objective realities of class struggle

on the world arena today. In this theory he inherited, defended and developed basic Marxist-Leninist principles.

In his talk with the leader of a third world country in February 1974, Chairman Mao said, **"In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the second world. We are the third world." "The third world has a huge population. With the exception of Japan, Asia belongs to the third world. The whole of Africa belongs to the third world, and Latin America too."**

This differentiation is a scientific conclusion which is based on the analysis of the development of the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world and the changes in them in accordance with Lenin's theses that our era is the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, that the development of imperialist countries is uneven and the imperialist powers inevitably try to redivide the world by means of war, and that, as imperialism has brought about the division of the whole world into oppressor and oppressed nations, the international proletariat must fight together with the oppressed nations.

In order to have a correct understanding of Chairman Mao's thesis of the differentiation of the three worlds, we must apply dialectical materialism to appraising present-day international political phenomena and start from reality and not from abstractions, as Lenin and Stalin did when they discussed the connections between national and international problems, saying that these must **"not be considered in isolation but on . . . a world**

scale"[1] and **"should be appraised not from the point of view of formal democracy, but from the point of view of the actual results, as shown by the general balance sheet of the struggle against imperialism."**[2]

In appearance, this theory of Chairman Mao's seems to involve only relations between countries and between nations in the present-day world, but, in essence, it bears directly on the vital question of present-day class struggle on a world scale. **In the final analysis, national struggle is a matter of class struggle.**[3] The same holds true of relations between countries. Relations between countries or nations are based on relations between classes, and they are interconnected and extremely complicated. We can hardly form correct judgments on international political phenomena and make a correct differentiation of the political forces of the world if we adopt an idealistic or metaphysical approach and make abstract, isolated observations instead of proceeding from the international class struggle as a whole and making a concrete analysis of concrete cases at a given time, in a given place and under given conditions.

Marxist-Leninists invariably adhere to the stand of the international proletariat, uphold the general interests of the revolutionary people of all countries in international class struggle and persist in the replacement of the capitalist system with the communist system as their maximum programme. But the situation with re-

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up," *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

[2] J. V. Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," *Works*, Vol. 6.

[3] Mao Tsetung, "Statement Supporting the Afro-Americans' Just Struggle Against U.S. Imperialist Racist Discrimination," August 8, 1963.

gard to this struggle is intricate and volatile. The international bourgeoisie has never been a monolithic whole, nor can it ever be. The international working-class movement has also experienced one split after another, subject as it is to the influence of alien classes. In waging the struggle on the international arena, the proletariat must unite with all those who can be united in the light of what is imperative and feasible in different historical periods, so as to **develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the diehards.**[4] Therefore, we can never lay down any hard and fast formula for differentiating the world's political forces (i.e., differentiating ourselves, our friends and our enemies in the international class struggle).

Following the emergence of the first socialist country, Lenin, referring to the two kinds of diplomacy, the bourgeois and the proletarian, said in 1921 that **"there are now two worlds: the old world of capitalism, . . . and the rising new world. . . ."**[5] Stalin said in 1919, **"The world has definitely and irrevocably split into two camps: the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism."**[6] Of course, this conclusion reflected the new fundamental contradiction in the world following the October Revolution. But Lenin and Stalin never denied that other fundamental contradictions existed in the world or that there were other ways to differentiate the world's political forces. For instance, in his report on the national and colonial questions at the Second

---

[4] Mao Tsetung, "Current Problems of Tactics in the Anti-Japanese United Front," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. II.

[5] V. I. Lenin, "The Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets," *Collected Works*, Vol. 33.

[6] J. V. Stalin, "Two Camps," *Works*, Vol. 4.

Congress of the Communist International in 1920, Lenin said, **"The characteristic feature of imperialism consists in the whole world . . . being divided into a large number of oppressed nations and an insignificant number of oppressor nations, the latter possessing colossal wealth and powerful armed forces."**[7] When Stalin dealt with the national question in *The Foundations of Leninism* in 1924, he too said that **" . . . the world is divided into two camps: the camp of a handful of civilized nations, which possess finance capital and exploit the vast majority of the population of the globe; and the camp of the oppressed and exploited peoples in the colonies and dependent countries, which constitute that majority."**[8] In fact, these conclusions reflected the existence of another kind of fundamental contradiction in the world. The differentiations drawn by Lenin and Stalin are undoubtedly both correct, the only difference lying in what they emphasized. When they had to make a comprehensive and concrete differentiation of the world's political forces in a given period, they started with an over-all investigation of the many fundamental contradictions existing in the world.

The transition from the capitalist to the socialist system on a global scale is a very long and tortuous process, full of complicated struggles, and it is inevitable that in the process there will be different alignments of the world's political forces in different periods. The objective realities of world class struggle determine the proletariat's differentiation of the world's political forces

---

[7] V. I. Lenin, "Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions," delivered at the Second Congress of the Communist International, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

[8] J. V. Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," *Works*, Vol. 6.

and the consequent strategy and tactics to be adopted in the struggle. Here it will be helpful to our understanding of the theory of the three worlds if we briefly review certain historical instances in which Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Chairman Mao differentiated world political forces.

While mainly carrying out their revolutionary activities in Western Europe, Marx and Engels invariably had in mind the general situation in Europe and the world as a whole when they surveyed the class struggle in different countries. For the first time in history they sent out the great call **"Workers of all countries, unite!"** and again for the first time they pointed out that the cause of the international proletariat was inseparably linked with the struggle of the oppressed nations for liberation. Engels said, **"A nation cannot become free and at the same time continue to oppress other nations. The liberation of Germany cannot therefore take place without the liberation of Poland from German oppression."**[9] Marx said, **"After occupying myself with the Irish question for many years I have come to the conclusion that the decisive blow against the English ruling classes (and it will be decisive for the workers' movement all over the world)** *cannot* **be delivered** *in England* **but** *only in Ireland.*"[10] Both of them attached great importance not only to the struggle for independence by European nations such as Poland and Ireland but also to that waged in China and India, countries remote from Europe. The sum total of the international proletariat's

---

[9] K. Marx and F. Engels, "On Poland," *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Vol. 4.

[10] "Marx to S. Meyer and A. Vogt, April 9, 1870," *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels.*

interests was always the starting point from which they examined specific national movements and political forces. As Lenin once pointed out, **"Marx is known to have favoured Polish independence in the interests of *European* democracy in its struggle against the power and influence — or, it might be said, against the omnipotence and predominating reactionary influence — of tsarism."**[11] Engels said of Marx that one of his contributions was that he was the first to make the point in 1848 — and he subsequently stressed it time and again — that **"the Western European labour parties must of necessity wage an implacable war against Russian tsarism,"**[12] because the Russian tsarist empire was the biggest fortress of European reaction and because it always had expansionist ambitions with respect to Europe and aimed at making the liberation of the European proletariat impossible. To the end of their days Marx and Engels made frequent reference to resolute opposition to the Russian tsarist empire's policy of aggression as the criterion by which to differentiate Europe's political forces and to determine to which national movement in Europe the international proletariat should give its support. It is clear that in so doing Marx and Engels were by no means oblivious of the international class struggle. On the contrary, they had the proletariat's fundamental interests in the international class struggle very much in mind. What should we learn from Marx and Engels in this respect? We should at least learn the following: First, like Marx and

---

[11] V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up," *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

[12] F. Engels, "The Foreign Policy of Russian Tsarism," *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Vol. 22.

Engels, we should acclaim the great national revolutionary movement that has embraced all oppressed nations and shaken the world, and should regard it as an important pre-condition and a sure guarantee for the triumph of the international proletariat. Second, we should pay constant attention to the contradictions between the capitalist countries and identify the arch enemies of the international working-class movement as Marx and Engels did, and wage an unrelenting struggle against the biggest fortresses of world reaction today, namely, Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism.

Lenin was the first to point out that the world had already entered the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution and also the first to found a socialist state under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He was the first to regard the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism as a component part of the socialist movement of the world proletariat and set forth the strategic policy, **"Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!"** In his article "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx" written in 1913, Lenin said, **"But the opportunists have scarcely congratulated themselves on the inauguration of 'social peace,' and on the fact that storms were needless under 'democracy,' when a new source of great world storms opened up in Asia. The Russian Revolution was followed by the Turkish, the Persian and the Chinese revolutions. It is in this era of storms and their 'repercussions' in Europe that we are now living."**[13] Concerning the relationship between the revolutionary movement of the international proletariat

[13] V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx," *Collected Works*, Vol. 18.

and that of the oppressed nations, Lenin wrote in 1916: **"The social revolution cannot come about except in the form of an epoch of proletarian civil war against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries combined with a** *whole series* **of democratic and revolutionary movements, including movements for national liberation, in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations."**[14] These views of Lenin's remain valid today.

After the October Revolution and World War I Lenin made a "Report on the International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International" at the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920 in which he explicitly divided the countries of the world, whose total population was then 1,750 million, into three categories and made this division the basic point of departure for determining the strategy and tactics of the international proletariat. He said: **"Thus we get the main outlines of the picture of the world as it appeared after the imperialist war. A billion and a quarter oppressed in the colonies — countries which are being cut up alive, like Persia, Turkey and China; and countries which have been vanquished and flung into the position of colonies** (Here Lenin meant such countries as Austro-Hungary, Germany and Bulgaria as well as Soviet Russia which was likewise thrown back by the war **"to what is equivalent to a colonial position"** — *Ed.*). **Not more than a quarter of a billion inhabit countries which have retained their old positions, but have fallen into economic dependence upon America, and all of them, during the war, were in a state of military**

---

[14] V. I. Lenin. "A Caricature of Marxism and 'Imperialist Economism,'" *Collected Works*, Vol. 23.

dependence, for the war affected the whole world and did not permit a single state to remain really neutral. And finally, we have not more than a quarter of a billion inhabitants of countries in which only the upper stratum, of course, only the capitalists, benefited by the partition of the world (Here Lenin meant countries such as the United States, Japan and Britain — *Ed.*). **. . . I would like you to memorize this picture of the world, for all the fundamental contradictions of capitalism, of imperialism, which are leading to revolution, all the fundamental contradictions in the working-class movement which have led to the furious struggle against the Second International . . . are all connected with this division of the population of the world."**[15]

How well Lenin put it! With respect to the question of differentiating the world's political forces, it sounds as though he had the actual struggles of today in mind. Attaching the greatest importance to the contradiction between oppressed and oppressor nations and the contradiction between imperialist countries, Lenin divided the countries of the world into three categories and linked this division closely to all the fundamental contradictions in the imperialist world and in the international working-class movement. This proposition of his is diametrically opposed to the opportunism, or **"bourgeois socialism"**[16] of the Second International which always looked down upon the struggle of the oppressed nations. In his report, instead of simply dividing the

---

[15] V. I. Lenin, "Report on the International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International," delivered at the Second Congress of the Communist International, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

[16] Ibid.

countries of the world into two categories, capitalist and socialist, Lenin put different countries of the capitalist world into three categories — the oppressed colonial and semi-colonial countries and vanquished countries, countries which retained their old positions, and countries which had won the war and benefited by the partition of the world; he placed socialist Russia and the oppressed nations and countries in the same category. Lenin took full account of the great role the 1,250 million people played in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism on the world arena, saying, **"There are 1,250 million people who find it impossible to live in the conditions of servitude which 'advanced' and civilized capitalism wishes to impose on them: after all, these represent 70 per cent of the world's population."**[17] Speaking shortly before his death of the inevitability of the final victory of socialism throughout the world, Lenin continued to maintain: **"In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism is fully and absolutely assured."**[18] Obviously, except for the Soviet social-imperialists who have completely betrayed his cause, no one will say that

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better," *Collected Works*, Vol. 33.

Lenin "abandoned class principles," "preached reactionary theories of geopolitics,"[19] and so on when expressing these views, which are imbued with proletarian internationalism and confidence in victory for the communist movement. What should we learn from Lenin here? We should at least learn the following: Like Lenin, we should hail and support the liberation movement of the oppressed nations in Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere and regard it as an important component of the socialist revolutionary movement of the world proletariat. We should divide the countries of the world today into three new categories on the basis of the new international class relations now prevailing and find complete and absolute assurance of the ultimate victory of socialism throughout the world in the united struggle of the international proletariat and the third world people who make up more than 70 per cent of the world's population.

After Lenin's death, Stalin defended his thesis that the proletariat must unite with the oppressed nations and pointed out that the national liberation movement should embrace all the forces opposing imperialist aggression, regardless of their class status and political attitude. By way of example he indicated that although the Emir of Afghanistan held fast to monarchy as an institution and the leaders of the Egyptian national liberation movement were of bourgeois origin and were opposed to socialism, the struggles they waged for the independence of their nations were, objectively, revolutionary struggles, for they served to **"weaken, disinte-**

[19] The Soviet journal *International Affairs*, No. 6, 1974.

grate and undermine imperialism."[20] When criticizing the Trotskyite opposition, Stalin pointed out: **"The sin of the opposition here is that it has completely abandoned this line of Lenin's and has slipped into that of the Second International, which denies the expediency of supporting revolutionary wars waged by colonial countries against imperialism."**[21]

Stalin more than once spoke of the capitalist and the socialist worlds opposing each other, but in concretely differentiating the world political forces in different periods he proceeded from the over-all situation in the changing international class struggle. As early as 1927, at the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), he made the following division of the existing world political forces, saying, **"Judge for yourselves. Of the 1,905 million inhabitants** *of the entire globe,* **1,134 million live in the colonies and dependent countries, 143,000,000 live in the U.S.S.R., 264,000,000 live in the intermediate countries, and only 363,000,000 live in the big imperialist countries, which oppress the colonies and dependent countries."**[22] In March 1939, at the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), he defined Germany, Italy and Japan as aggressor countries and Britain, France and the United States as non-aggressor countries. Immediately after Hitlerite Germany attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, Stalin saw to it that the Soviet Union became allied to the United States, Britain and other countries to form an anti-fascist camp. In 1942 he said that **"it may now**

---

[20] J. V. Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," *Works,* Vol. 6.

[21] J. V. Stalin, "Political Report of the Central Committee," delivered at the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), *Works,* Vol. 10.

[22] Ibid.

be regarded as beyond dispute that in the course of the war imposed upon the nations by Hitlerite Germany, a radical demarcation of forces and the formation of two opposite camps have taken place: the camp of the Italo-German coalition, and the camp of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition" and that **"it follows that the logic of facts is stronger than any other logic."**[23] Of course, in the world today there is no such thing as a new Italo-German coalition or a new Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. Instead, there are two hegemonist powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, and a united front of the people of the world against them. What we wish to stress here is that the action taken by Stalin did not in the least affect the status of the Soviet Union as a socialist country or impede the development of the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat. On the contrary, his was the only correct course of action for defending the fundamental interests of the socialist Soviet Union and the international proletariat. Can we blame Stalin for not strictly following the formula of the capitalist world vs. the socialist world in this instance? Can we doubt the great significance of the division of the world's political forces at the time into the fascist camp and the anti-fascist camp? Can the division of the world's political forces be based not on the logic of facts but on a logic that transcends facts?

Let us go back for a moment to a thesis of Stalin's in *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* written a year before his death: **"It is said that the contradictions between capitalism and socialism are**

[23] J. V. Stalin, "Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," *Pravda*, November 7, 1942.

stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Theoretically, of course, that is true." "Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries." "Consequently, the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp." He further pointed out that **"the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force."**[24] It is primarily between the United States, a capitalist country, and the Soviet Union, where capitalism has been restored, that world war is inevitable today. Apparently, the thesis that the logic of facts is stronger than any other logic still holds true.

It is thus plain that all the revolutionary teachers of the proletariat differentiated the world's political forces by relying on an objective and penetrating analysis of the over-all situation in the international class struggle in different periods, instead of following any hard and fast formula. The differentiation of the present-day political forces into three worlds by Chairman Mao, the greatest Marxist of our time, is a historical product of his creative application of Marxism over the years to the observation and analysis of the development of the world's fundamental contradictions and the changes in them.

In his work *On New Democracy* published in 1940, Chairman Mao inherited, defended and developed the theory of Lenin and Stalin that after World War I, and especially after the October Revolution, every national

[24] J. V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*

liberation movement formed part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution. He pointed out in explicit terms, **"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."**[25] Did this analysis of Chairman Mao's correspond to the objective realities of international class struggle? Obviously it did. No one can doubt this, because it was precisely by proceeding from this viewpoint that in the years of the Japanese imperialist invasion of China the Chinese Communist Party formed a united front with all the anti-Japanese forces, including Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, and won victory in the war against Japan. Similarly, after the war it was by uniting with all the anti-imperialist democratic forces which could be united that it went on to overthrow the Kuomintang's reactionary rule and found the People's Republic of China under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the days following World War II, U.S. imperialism raised an incessant anti-Soviet clamour. With exceptional perspicacity Chairman Mao exposed the real purpose of this hue and cry. He pointed out that **"the United States and the Soviet Union are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa"** and that **"at present, the actual significance of the U.S. slogan of waging an anti-Soviet war is the oppression of the**

---

[25] Mao Tsetung, "On New Democracy," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. II.

American people and the expansion of the U.S. forces of aggression in the rest of the capitalist world."[26] Chairman Mao called on the American people and all the nations and people faced with the threat of aggression by the United States to unite and counter the attacks of the U.S. reactionaries and their running dogs. Did this analysis of Chairman Mao's correspond to the objective realities of international class struggle at the time? Obviously it did. No one can doubt this, because events then and since have confirmed the validity of his analysis.

The Suez Canal incident of 1956 brought to light the sharpening contradictions between the imperialist powers. Chairman Mao pointed out at the time, **"From this incident we can pin-point the focus of struggle in the world today. The contradiction between the imperialist countries and the socialist countries is certainly most acute. But the imperialist countries are now contending with each other for the control of different areas in the name of opposing communism. . . . In the Middle East, two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict. The two kinds of contradictions are: first, those between different imperialist powers, that is, between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France and, second, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations. The three kinds of forces are: one, the United States, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate imperialist powers, and three,**

[26] Mao Tsetung, "Talk with the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. IV.

the oppressed nations."[27] Did this analysis of Chairman Mao's correspond to the objective realities of international class struggle at that time? Again, it obviously did. No one can doubt this, because events then and since have likewise borne out the validity of his analysis.

It is not difficult to see that Chairman Mao's analysis of the three kinds of forces was the forerunner of his theory of the three worlds. The difference between the two is chiefly due to the existence, however precarious, of a socialist camp at the time. Later, with the Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique's complete betrayal of the cause of communism, capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union, and it degenerated and became a social-imperialist country. True, there are China and the other socialist countries, but what was once the socialist camp no longer exists, nor do historical conditions necessitate its formation for a second time. Meanwhile, many countries in the imperialist camp no longer took their cue from the United States and even openly stood up to it. Through hard struggles, most of the colonial and semi-colonial countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America successively declared independence. Through a period of great upheaval, great division and great realignment the world's political forces are now faced with a new historical situation. In the 1960s, the ruling clique in the Soviet Union were already very far gone in their betrayal of socialism, but for a time U.S. imperialism remained the arch enemy of the people of the world. Then, after a succession of grave events, the Soviet Union not only turned into an imperialist superpower

---

[27] Mao Tsetung, "Talks at a Conference of Secretaries of Provincial, Municipal and Autonomous Region Party Committees," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. V.

that threatened the world as the United States did, but also became the most dangerous source of another world war. The Soviet ruling clique's betrayal inevitably led to splits of varying degrees and caused temporary difficulties in the international workers' movement and the ranks of the world's anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle. What is the way out? Can we shut our eyes to the events taking place in this period and make believe that the imperialist camp and the socialist camp still exist in the world and regard the opposition between the two as the principal contradiction in world politics? Can we just exclude the Soviet Union and the countries subservient to it from the socialist camp while sticking to the formula and assume that, apart from the socialist countries, all the rest are just an undifferentiated reactionary mass constituting the capitalist world? Obviously, this would only make it impossible for the people of the world to see the facts and therefore the correct way forward. Tremendous changes in the present-day international situation and the daily growth of the people's strength in different countries and of the factors for revolution demand a new classification of the world's political forces, so that a new global strategy can be formulated for the international proletariat and the oppressed people according to the new relationship between ourselves, our friends and our enemies. Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds meets precisely this demand.

This theory makes it clear: The two imperialist superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, constitute the first world. They have become the biggest international exploiters, oppressors and aggressors and the common enemies of the people of the world, and the

rivalry between them is bound to lead to a new world war. The contention for world supremacy between the two hegemonist powers, the menace they pose to the people of all lands and the latter's resistance to them — this has become the central problem in present-day world politics. The socialist countries, the mainstay of the international proletariat, and the oppressed nations, who are the worst exploited and oppressed and who account for the great majority of the population of the world, together form the third world. They stand in the forefront of the struggle against the two hegemonists and are the main force in the world-wide struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. The developed countries in between the two worlds constitute the second world. They oppress and exploit the oppressed nations and are at the same time controlled and bullied by the superpowers. They have a dual character, and stand in contradiction with both the first and the third worlds. But they are still a force the third world can win over or unite with in the struggle against hegemonism. This theory summarizes the strategic situation concerning the most important class struggle in the contemporary world in which the people of the whole world are one party and the two hegemonist powers the other. The internal class struggles of various countries are actually inseparable from the global class struggle. Therefore, this theory of the differentiation of the three worlds is the most comprehensive summing-up of the various fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world. This scientific thesis of Chairman Mao's has enriched the theories concerning the uneven development of imperialism and the contradictions between imperialist countries inevitably leading to war, concerning social-im-

perialism, concerning the struggle of the oppressed nations as forming an important component of the socialist revolution of the world proletariat, concerning the mutual support between the international proletariat, the socialist countries and the national liberation movements and concerning the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution — all of which are important contributions to Marxism-Leninism.

Small wonder the Soviet social-imperialists have viciously attacked this brilliant theory of Chairman Mao's. They cannot be expected to admit that the Soviet Union under their rule has become an imperialist superpower and the most dangerous source of another world war, just as renegades and aggressors cannot be expected to admit what they are. They frantically malign the theory of the three worlds as renouncing class struggle and lumping socialist countries together with capitalist countries, and so on. Not only is their abuse directed against the great Marxist Chairman Mao and the great Communist Party of China, it is hurled at the great Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as well. For, as we have seen, in principle Chairman Mao's differentiation of the three worlds completely accords with the criterion set by Marx and Engels in the latter half of the 19th century for differentiating the political forces in Europe according to their attitude towards the Russian Tsarist empire. Similarly, it accords with Lenin's classification of the world into three types of countries after World War I and Stalin's division of the countries before World War II into aggressor and non-aggressor countries and into the fascist camp as distinct from the anti-fascist camp during the war. Moreover, it is a logical development from their theories on differentiating the world's political forces.

True, those who frenziedly calumniate the theory of the three worlds still style themselves "loyal successors" to Lenin's cause, but when we judge a person, can we go by his mere words and not by his deeds? If we judge them by their deeds, doesn't it become clear that it is they who have betrayed the proletariat in the class struggle and made a socialist country degenerate and become a capitalist one?

In our own country, there are persons who frantically oppose Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds. They are none other than Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao, Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan, or the "gang of four." Hoisting a most "revolutionary" banner, they opposed China's support to the third world, opposed China's effort to unite with all forces that can be united, and opposed our dealing blows at the most dangerous enemy. They vainly tried to sabotage the building of an international united front against hegemonism and disrupt China's anti-hegemonist struggle, doing Soviet social-imperialism a good turn. To a certain extent, their disruptive activities had a deleterious effect, but our Party and government have unswervingly adhered to the revolutionary line in foreign affairs formulated by Chairman Mao. The "gang of four" in no way represent the Chinese people. They are traitors disowned by the Chinese people.

No matter how the Soviet social-imperialists and the "gang of four" curse the theory of the three worlds, its validity is borne out more and more by what is actually happening in world politics today. Its impact is therefore making itself increasingly felt. In the Political Report to the Eleventh National Congress of the Communist Party of China Chairman Hua Kuo-feng says, "Chairman Mao's thesis differentiating the three worlds gives a correct

orientation to the present international struggle and clearly defines the main revolutionary forces, the chief enemies, and the middle forces that can be won over and united, enabling the international proletariat to unite with all the forces that can be united to form the broadest possible united front in class struggles against the chief enemies on the world arena." This thesis not only meets the strategic requirements of the contemporary struggle of the international prcletariat and the oppressed people and nations of the world. It also meets the strategic requirements of the struggle for the victory of socialism and communism. It will inspire the people of the world in their united effort to strive for great victories in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism under the guidance of a firm and explicit policy.

The Two Hegemonist Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, Are the Common Enemies of the People of the World; the Soviet Union is the Most Dangerous Source of World War

The emergence of the two superpowers is a new phenomenon in the history of the development of imperialism. The uneven development of imperialism inevitably leads to conflicts and wars which in turn aggravate this uneven development and give rise today to the predominance of imperialist superpowers over the run-of-the-mill imperialist powers. Lenin said: **"Imperialism means the progressively mounting oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers; it means a period of wars between the latter to extend and consolidate the**

oppression of nations."[28] Today, this handful of imperialist powers has been reduced to only two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, which are capable of contending for world hegemony, and all the other imperialist powers have been relegated to the status of second- or even third-rate powers. The distinctive features of a superpower are as follows: its state apparatus is controlled by monopoly capital in its most concentrated form, and it relies on its economic and military power, which is far greater than that of other countries, to carry on economic exploitation and political oppression and to strive for military control on a global scale; each superpower sets exclusive world hegemony as its goal and to this end makes frantic preparations for a new world war.

Instances of a couple of great powers trying to gain world supremacy can be cited in the history of imperialism, but they are not in the same league with the Soviet Union and the United States today. The scramble for hegemony between these two countries is the peculiar outcome of the developments following World War II.

In the post-war period, the concentration of U.S. monopoly capital and its expansion abroad assumed startling proportions. As recent statistics show, in 1976 the twelve giant industrial corporations with sales over 10 billion dollars each together accounted for 27 per cent and 29 per cent respectively of the total assets and sales of the 500 largest industrial corporations in the United States; the ten giant commercial banks held 61 per cent of the assets and deposits of the country's 50 biggest

[28] V. I. Lenin, "The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21.

commercial banks.[29] The export of U.S. capital which was highly concentrated after the war has risen by leaps and bounds in the last twenty years or so. While direct private investments abroad stood at 11.8 billion dollars in 1950, they jumped to 137.2 billion dollars in 1976.[30] The high and rapid concentration of monopoly capital formed the economic foundation of the United States as an imperialist superpower. Exploiting the economic and military superiority it acquired in the war, the monopoly it enjoyed over atomic weapons and a wide range of sophisticated military science and technology, the world-wide dollar-centred currency system it set up and the various military blocs it controlled in North America, Latin America, Europe, Asia and Oceania, U.S. imperialism occupied an unprecedented overlord position in the capitalist world, and it had all the other capitalist countries under its thumb. For many years it acted as the world's gendarme and perpetrated numerous bloody crimes against the revolutionary people (the people of the United States included) and the oppressed nations of the world. But however much this enemy of the world's people blustered, it had to take crushing blows from the people of Asia in wars of aggression which it thought it could win hands down. The heroic Korean people were the first to explode the myth of U.S. invincibility. In their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation, the people of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos plunged U.S. imperialism into military, political and economic crises and hastened its decline. In the meantime, Western Europe and Japan steadily recovered, grew in

[29] The U.S. journal *Fortune*, May and July issues, 1977.

[30] The U.S. Department of Commerce, *Survey of Current Business*, August 1977.

economic strength and hardened their positions in competing with the United States. Thus U.S. imperialism was obliged to concede that it could no longer have its own way in the world. However, it remains the most powerful country in the capitalist world and is trying its utmost to retain its supremacy.

As the United States got bogged down in wars and its strength began to decline, Soviet social-imperialism came up from behind. The Khrushchov-Brezhnev renegade clique, which had snatched the fruits of the socialist construction carried out by the Soviet people for over 30 years, gradually transformed what had been a socialist power into an imperialist power. It had long been the wish of the imperialists to see the Soviet Union evolve peacefully from socialism to capitalism, but this evolution, resulting in contention for world supremacy in accordance with the law of the uneven development of imperialism, brought them face to face with a formidable and intractable adversary. As we all know, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has converted a highly centralized socialist economy into a state monopoly capitalist economy which is centralized to a degree unattainable even by the United States. In the ten years during which the United States was mired in its war of aggression in Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, the Soviet Union strove to develop its own strength, narrowed the gap in economic development between itself and the United States and immensely expanded its military power. It has caught up with the United States in nuclear armament and surpassed it in conventional weaponry. As its military and economic power increases, Soviet social-imperialism becomes more and more flagrant in its attempts to expand and penetrate all parts of the world.

It makes great play with its ground, naval and air forces everywhere and engages the United States in a fierce struggle for supremacy on a global scale, thus betraying its aggressive ambitions which are unparalleled in world history.

Lenin said that the imperialists divided the world **"in proportion to capital," "in proportion to strength."**[31] It is precisely by flexing their economic and military muscles, which other countries can by no means match, that these two superpowers are seeking world hegemony. In 1976 the GNP of the United States was over 1,690 billion dollars and that of the Soviet Union over 930 billion dollars;[32] together they account for about 40 per cent of the world's GNP. The value of industrial output in both the United States and the Soviet Union outstrips that of the three major European capitalist countries, West Germany, France and Britain combined. In military strength, no other imperialist country is on a par with either of the two superpowers. Both have thousands of strategic nuclear weapons, several hundred military satellites, some ten thousand military aircraft, several hundred major naval vessels and enormous stockpiles of other conventional arms. In military expenditures both the Soviet Union and the United States far exceed Western Europe, Japan and Canada combined. The war machine of each of the two superpowers in peace-time assumes a magnitude unprecedented in human history.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has been trying hard to whitewash itself by saying that while the Soviet

---

[31] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

[32] International Economic Report of the President, January 1977.

Union is a big power, it is not an imperialist superpower. Can this argument be taken seriously? Hasn't the Soviet Union been carrying on the same kind of imperialist economic plunder, political control and military expansion as the United States?

The United States exploits other countries mainly through exporting capital in the form of overseas investment. According to U.S. official statistics, in 1976 it recouped profits, earnings from patents included, amounting to 22.4 billion U.S. dollars from its direct private investments overseas, the rate of profit exceeding 16 per cent.[33] Such is the sordid record of how U.S. monopoly capital sucks the blood of the people of the world. Although the Soviet Union falls short of the United States in the total volume of profits grabbed from other countries, it is not in the least inferior to the latter in its methods of plunder. It is chiefly through "economic aid" and "military aid" to third world countries that the Soviet Union buys cheap and sells dear and squeezes enormous profits in the process. For example, the Soviet Union has been selling commodities to India in the name of "aid" at prices sometimes 20 to 30 per cent, and even 200 per cent, higher than on the world market. On the other hand it purchases commodities from India at prices sometimes 20 to 30 per cent lower.[34] According to the "Statistics of Soviet Foreign Trade," the price paid by the Soviet Union for importing natural gas from Asian countries was something like a

[33] The U.S. Department of Commerce, *Survey of Current Business*, August 1977.

[34] *Jad-O-Jehad* Weekly, Jammu, December 1973 and *India Today* published in April 1974 by the Indian Workers' Association in Britain.

half of what it charged for exporting it to the West. The same source revealed that the prices of anthracite, pig iron and other commodities exported by the Soviet Union to Egypt were 80 to 150 per cent higher than what it charged West Germany for similar exports.[35] It was reported in the Western press that in the Arab-Israeli War in October 1973, "Russia not only demanded payment in cash for the arms it sold but jacked up their prices when the war reached its height."[36] After the principal oil-exporting Arab countries paid this sum in U.S. dollars, the Soviet Union used it to extend a Eurodollar loan at an interest rate of 10 per cent or more.[37]

The United States exercises control over the economy and politics of many countries through its transnational corporations and other instruments of aggression. At present, the Soviet Union is carrying on such activities mainly within the "socialist community." In the name of "international division of labour," "planned coordination," "multilateral integration," "structural integration," etc., it controls the economic lifelines of many countries and is feverishly engaged in plundering and dominating them with regard to raw materials, the market, prices in foreign trade, production plans, forced loans and even labour-power for capital construction, and it is trying hard to bring their economies and their "limited" sovereignty completely into the Soviet orbit, so as to establish the "community's" so-called "international socialist ownership."[38]

---

[35] See "Statistics of Soviet Foreign Trade," 1970-76.

[36] *Le Monde*, April 18, 1974.

[37] The U.S. journal *Money Manager*, April 14, 1974.

[38] Speech by O. Bogomolov, *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (*World Marxist Review*), No. 6, 1974.

The United States has gone in for selling arms on a world scale in order to extract huge profits from other countries and dominate them. Between 1966 and 1976 it exported arms to the value of 34.9 billion dollars. In the same period and for the same purpose, the Soviet Union sold arms amounting to 20.2 billion dollars.[39] According to data issued by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, already in 1974 arms sales by the Soviet Union amounted to 5.5 billion dollars, accounting for 37.5 per cent of the world total in that year and making it the second biggest merchant of death after the United States. Furthermore, the Soviet Union endeavours to control its clients by such means as terminating supplies of needed parts and accessories and dunning them for payment.

To clear the way for its hegemony, the United States has subverted a number of lawfully instituted governments in Latin America, Asia and Africa. The Soviet Union has done and is doing the same thing in a number of countries in Africa and Eastern Europe.

The United States has some 400,000 of its armed forces stationed in foreign lands. The Soviet Union has about 700,000 troops in other countries and has put Czechoslovakia, which is a universally recognized sovereign country, completely under prolonged (actually indefinite) military occupation.

The United States has turned the territories of many countries into U.S. military bases through military treaties. The Soviet Union has gained or availed itself of military bases or installations in Eastern Europe, the People's Republic of Mongolia, Cuba and Africa, and in

---

[39] *U.S. News & World Report*, August 1, 1977.

the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean; it has also insolently tried to perpetuate its occupation of Japan's northern territories and territorial seas. It has even tried to take the Spitsbergen Islands away from Norway. "What is mine is mine, and what is yours is negotiable." This is an ironical remark going the rounds in Western diplomatic circles, but the Soviet Union does not always bother with troublesome negotiations to decide "whether yours is mine."

The United States dispatched mercenaries to invade Cuba, earning a very bad name for itself. Likewise, the Soviet Union sent mercenaries to perpetrate armed intervention in Angola and to invade Zaire, and it is continuing to extend the scope of its aggression.

In short, both the Soviet Union and the United States are imperialist superpowers, the biggest international exploiters and oppressors, the largest forces for war and aggression and the common enemies of the people of the world. Lenin said, **"A proletariat that tolerates the slightest coercion of other nations by its 'own' nation cannot be a socialist proletariat."**[40] The conduct of the Soviet Union in international affairs is quintessential imperialism and hegemonism, without a trace of a socialist proletarian spirit. Nor is that all. Of the two imperialist superpowers, the Soviet Union is the more ferocious, the more reckless, the more treacherous, and the most dangerous source of world war.

Why must we say so? Is it because the Soviet Union occupies Chinese territory along China's northeastern and northwestern borders in contravention of treaty obligations and threatens its security? No. The United

---

[40] V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21.

States, too, has invaded and occupied our Taiwan, likewise posing a threat to our security. Undoubtedly the people of each particular region can decide which superpower or imperialist country poses the more immediate threat to them according to their own specific conditions. But here we are discussing a general question concerning the world situation as a whole rather than a particular question concerning a particular region. It is not due to any accidental, transitory or partial causes that the Soviet Union has become the more dangerous of the two superpowers on a world scale. This is determined by a whole set of historical conditions under which the Soviet Union has grown and become an imperialist superpower.

First, Soviet social-imperialism is an imperialist power following on the heels of the United States and is therefore more aggressive and adventurous. Lenin said long ago that late-comers among the imperialist countries always wanted the world to be divided anew and since they **"came to the capitalist banqueting table when all the seats were occupied,"** they were **"even more rapacious, even more predatory."**[41] **"Without a forcible redivision of colonies the *new* imperialist countries cannot obtain the privileges enjoyed by the older (*and weaker*) imperialist powers."**[42] To attain world supremacy, Soviet social-imperialism has to try and grab areas under U.S. control, just as Germany under Kaiser Wilhelm II and under Hitler and the post-war United States had to try and grab areas

---

[41] V. I. Lenin, "War and Revolution," *Collected Works*, Vol. 24.

[42] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 23.

under the control of Britain and other old-line imperialists. This is a historical law independent of man's will. Therefore, Chairman Mao pointed out in a talk in February 1976: **"The United States wants to protect its interests in the world and the Soviet Union wants to expand; this can in no way be changed."** Surely U.S. imperialism will continue to seek world domination, but it has over-reached itself and all it can do at present is to strive to protect its vested interests and go over to the defensive in its over-all strategy. On the other hand, while peddling the catch-word of "peace," Brezhnev has brazenly declared, "Strengthening its economic and defence potential has enabled the Soviet Union to launch an active and successful 'offensive' in the international arena,"[43] and "in shaping our foreign policy we now have to reckon, in one way or another, with the state of affairs in virtually every spot on the globe."[44] This actually means that the Soviet Union has decided to employ an offensive strategy to encroach on the sovereignty of all other countries and weaken and supplant U.S. influence in all parts of the world in its attempt to establish its own world hegemony.

Second, because comparatively speaking Soviet social-imperialism is inferior in economic strength, it must rely chiefly on its military power and recourse to threats of war in order to expand. Although economically the Soviet Union has far surpassed the second-rate imperialist countries, it still compares unfavourably with its powerful

---

[43] L. I. Brezhnev, Speech at the Meeting in Celebration of the 250th Anniversary of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., October 7, 1975.

[44] L. I. Brezhnev, Report to the Twenty-fifth Congress of the C.P.S.U.

rival and its economic strength falls short of its needs for world hegemony. Therefore it feverishly goes in for arms expansion and war preparations in a bid to gain military superiority so that it can grab the resources, wealth and labour-power of other countries to compensate for its economic inferiority. This is the beaten path trodden by tsarist Russia and fascist Germany, Italy and Japan in the past. At present, the Soviet Union's armed forces are double those of the United States, and it has over 400 strategic nuclear weapon carriers more than the United States.[45] It has vastly more tanks, armoured cars, field guns and other items of conventional weaponry. It now boasts an "offensive navy" with a total tonnage close to the U.S. navy's. According to a Western estimate, Soviet military expenditures have been rising in recent years at an average annual rate of 4 to 5 per cent and they absorb approximately 12 to 15 per cent of its GNP (U.S. military expenditures account for roughly 6 per cent of its GNP). Soviet military spending for fiscal year 1976 has been estimated at 127 billion dollars, which is about 24 per cent more than the projected U.S. outlay of 102.7 billion.[46] All this shows that the Soviet Union will inevitably adopt an offensive strategy and resort chiefly to force and threats of force in its contention with the United States for world hegemony.

Third, the Soviet bureaucrat monopoly capitalist group has transformed a highly centralized socialist state-owned economy into a state-monopoly capitalist economy without its equal in any other imperialist country and

[45] From "The Military Balance 1977-1978" published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, London.

[46] Ibid.

has transformed a state under the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state under fascist dictatorship. It is therefore easier for Soviet social-imperialism to put the entire economy on a military footing and militarize the whole state apparatus. The Brezhnev clique has appropriated 20 per cent of the national income for military expenditures and is clamouring for getting "ready at any time to switch the economy to the military programme."[47] The clique is continuing to strengthen the state apparatus and is striving to fasten the Soviet people to its war chariot. The K.G.B., the Soviet secret service organization, has become a sword hanging over the heads of the people of the Soviet Union and of many other countries. The Soviet authorities exert every effort to poison the minds of the people with militarism and to fan great Russian chauvinism through the media, literature and art, education and other channels. They systematically extol the military and political chieftains and adventurers of tsarist Russia who performed "meritorious services" in carrying out aggression abroad, and openly call for carrying on the old tsars' expansionist "tradition" so that at a minute's notice millions of people can be driven to serve as cannon-fodder for their new wars of aggression.

Fourth, Soviet social-imperialism has come into being as a result of the degeneration of the first socialist country in the world. Therefore, it can exploit Lenin's prestige and flaunt the banner of "socialism" to bluff and deceive people everywhere. U.S. imperialism has been pursuing policies of aggression and hegemonism for a long period and has time and again met with resistance and been subjected to exposure and denunciation on the part of the

---

[47] V. D. Sokolovsky, *Military Strategy*.

proletariat and oppressed people and nations throughout the world and of all fair-minded people including those in the United States. Progressive world opinion is already familiar with its true nature and will go on fighting against it. Soviet social-imperialism is a new and rising power and wears the mask of "socialism." The struggle to resist, expose and denounce it is consequently far more exacting. Arduous efforts are called for to help the people of the world to recognize its true features. Although more and more people have come to see the Soviet Union's policies of aggression and hegemonism in their true colours and the paint on its signboard of "socialism" is peeling day by day, it must not be supposed that the Soviet Union has completely lost its capacity to deceive. In carrying out aggression, intervention, subversion and expansion, it always dons the cloak of "fulfilling internationalist obligations," "supporting the national liberation movements," "combating old and new imperialism," "safeguarding the interests of peace and democracy," and the like. It takes some time to recognize its essence, and China has had its own experience in this respect. It must be admitted that this duplicity peculiar to the Soviet Union increases the special danger it poses as an imperialist superpower.

These objective historical features of the Soviet Union undoubtedly make it more dangerous than the United States as a source of world war.

U.S. imperialism has not changed as far as its policies of aggression and hegemonism are concerned, nor has it lessened its exploitation and oppression of the people at home and abroad. Therefore, the two hegemonist powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are both common enemies of the people of the world. There is no doubt

about this. But if, despite what has been said above, we should still undiscriminatingly put the two superpowers on a par and fail to single out the Soviet Union as the more dangerous instigator of world war, we would only be blunting the revolutionary vigilance of the people of the world and blurring the primary target in the struggle against hegemonism. Therefore, in no circumstances must we play into the hands of the Soviet Union in its deception and conspiracy and give the green light to its war preparations and acts of aggression.

The Countries and People of the Third World Constitute the Main Force Combating Imperialism, Colonialism and Hegemonism

The countries and people of the third world constitute the main force in the world-wide struggle against the hegemonism of the two superpowers and against imperialism and colonialism. In a message dated October 25, 1966, Chairman Mao said: **"The revolutionary storm in Asia, Africa and Latin America will certainly deal the whole of the old world a decisive and crushing blow."** This is Chairman Mao's scientific prediction and high evaluation of the role of the Asian, African and Latin-American people as the main force in the world-wide anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle.

What are the grounds for our saying this? Since the end of World War II, the revolutionary people of Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions, standing in the forefront of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggle, have waged one revolutionary armed struggle after another and scored a series of magnificent victories

that have changed the face of the world. This has greatly inspired and supported the international proletariat and the people of all countries in their anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles. The victorious Chinese revolution in 1949, the victory in the Korean war of resistance against U.S. aggression and for the defence of the fatherland in 1953, the Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian Countries in 1955, the Egyptian people's victory in the war over the Suez Canal in 1956, the victories in a series of national democratic movements in Latin-America from the Cuban revolutionary war of 1959 to Chile's struggle for democracy in the early 1970s, the victory in the Algerian national liberation war in 1962, the world-shaking heroic struggles waged by the people of many Asian and African countries to win and safeguard their independence in the 1960s, the restoration of China's legitimate seat in the United Nations in 1971, the victories won by the people of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos in their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation in 1975, the victorious wars of independence in Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique and the progress of the wars of independence in other countries in the 1970s, the powerful blows dealt by Egypt, the Sudan and other countries to Soviet schemes for control and subversion, the Zairian people's success in repelling invasion by Soviet mercenaries in 1977, the persistence of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people in waging wars and other forms of struggle against aggression over the past two decades, the African people's mounting resistance to white racism, the deepening of the national democratic movements of the people of Southeast Asia despite all obstacles, and the independence won by more than 80 countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other

parts of the world over the past three decades — all these magnificent victories constitute a powerful force promoting revolutionary change in the post-war world. The colonial system has fallen apart at the seams. U.S. imperialism, the superpower that emerged first, has suffered a historic setback, and Soviet social-imperialism, the other superpower coming onto the scene immediately after, is landing itself in the same quandary as the United States.

The third world has become the main force in the world-wide struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism, and this has ushered in a new and unprecedented situation. How are we to evaluate it?

First, the roughly 3,000 million enslaved people who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population have shaken off or are freeing themselves from the fetters of colonialism. This means that a radical and historic change has taken place in the balance of world class forces.

Ever since nations were first oppressed, they have put up resistance to such oppression. But over the centuries, this resistance was, with few exceptions, sporadic and isolated. A tremendous change came about after the October Revolution. In quite a few countries Communist Parties were built, and large-scale anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles were waged under the leadership of the proletariat and with the worker-peasant alliance as the mainstay. Big victories were won and valuable experience accumulated. But from an overall point of view there was as yet no world-wide movement embracing all areas. World War II greatly accelerated the revolutionary tempo of history. Today, although the third world, composed as it is of oppressed nations, oppressed countries and socialist countries, still

accounts for over 70 per cent of the world's population, the situation is vastly different from that facing Lenin in 1920. As a world-wide anti-imperialist force, they are today in the mainstream of the world revolutionary struggle. In scope and depth, in achievement and experience, today's struggle has far surpassed those of the past. A large number of third world countries now have their own armies and in varying degrees have shed the influence of colonialism. China, which comprises one-fifth of humanity, has been transformed from a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country into a great socialist state. Along with other socialist countries which persist in opposing imperialism and hegemonism, she stands resolutely with other third world countries, and they have become a stalwart force in the third world.

Second, subjected as they were to the most ruthless oppression, the countries and people of the third world have been the most resolute in their resistance. Lenin said, **"Colonies are conquered with fire and sword."**[48] Similarly, it is only with fire and sword that the colonial people can win complete emancipation. World imperialism cannot develop or survive without plundering colonies, semi-colonies and oppressed nations and countries. The liberation struggles of the colonial people have shaken and will finally destroy the foundation on which imperialism depends for its survival. It is natural that imperialism will put up a desperate struggle.

In the early post-war years, most of the third world countries had not yet won their independence and some

[48] V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21.

were in a semi-independent position. At that time their struggle was aimed at winning national liberation and independence, and it primarily took the form of revolutionary armed struggle. It was then universally acknowledged that they constituted the main force in combating imperialism. Today, the people in some parts of the third world are still carrying on armed struggle for liberation and independence, still fighting in the forefront of the world-wide struggle against imperialism and colonialism. It is the sacred duty of both the international proletariat and the revolutionary people of the world to render resolute support to their struggle.

Now a new question arises: Will the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America which have won independence continue to be the main force in the struggle against imperialism for a fairly long historical period? Our answer is yes. It must be realized that though they have declared their independence, they are still faced with the grave task of winning complete political and economic independence. For in the raging tide of national liberation most of the imperialists have been forced to "pull out" of their former colonies and accord these new countries recognition of their independence, but whenever the opportunity presents itself, they will use every new device or tactics to preserve their influence, and then there are new imperialists or hegemonists waiting to take their place. Economically, the imperialist countries, and the superpowers in particular, not only go in for large-scale penetration of the third world, but ruthlessly exploit it by using their monopoly position in the world market to control the products of those developing countries with a monoculture economy, force down the prices of primary products and raise the prices of

manufactured goods. Politically, they resort to a variety of methods to subject the newly independent countries to their control, subversion and interference, flagrantly infringing on the latter's independence and sovereignty and doing their utmost to foster obsequious yes-men. Militarily, with a view to subjugating the third world countries and seizing strategic resources, strategic areas and strategic routes, they try by every possible means to control the supply of arms to these countries and the training and commanding of the latter's armed forces. Moreover, they brazenly threaten to use force, stage armed invasion and even unleash wars of aggression. In order to be independent, to survive and to develop, the countries and people of the third world have no choice but to wage a sustained and fierce life-and-death struggle against the aggressive and expansionist activities of imperialism, and above all of the superpowers. New national liberation wars are bound to break out. These inevitable contradictions and struggles between the third world on the one hand and imperialism and the superpowers on the other determine the long-term role of the third world as the main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism.

Third, the countries and people of the third world have immensely enhanced their political awareness and strengthened their unity in the course of struggle. In the 30 years or so since World War II, many countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere have come to realize a profound truth through prolonged and arduous struggle against imperialism, namely, that a weak nation can defeat a strong and a small nation can defeat a big. This has meant a great emancipation of the mind and a big political leap for the entire third world. In his well-

known statement of May 20, 1970, Chairman Mao said: **"Innumerable facts prove that a just cause enjoys abundant support while an unjust cause finds little support. A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history."** This statement of Chairman Mao's is as much a scientific summing-up of the main experience gained by oppressed nations in their anti-imperialist struggle over the past decades as it is a tremendous inspiration to all the people of the third world. The basic historical trend of the world today shows that it is no longer the countries and people of the third world that are afraid of imperialism and hegemonism, but imperialism and hegemonism that are afraid of the countries and people of the third world.

Before World War II, the anti-imperialist struggle of the oppressed nations often lacked strong, sustained world-wide support. Things are different today. Mutual support among the third world countries, including the socialist countries, and among the forces opposed to aggression, including the international proletariat, has made it possible for the third world countries and people to play an even more effective role as the main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. By exercising the state power in their hands the independent third world countries have gained broader arenas and more means to carry on the struggle than in the past, and they can steadily enhance their co-operation and take joint action. The third world countries have turned major international forums into the bar of public opinion

before which the imperialist superpowers are arraigned. They have set up international organizations for regional purposes or as specialized agencies through which they join forces to safeguard their common rights and interests. The non-aligned movement has become an important world force in co-ordinating the interests of its numerous member countries and in jointly combating hegemonism, a force that has to be reckoned with. Growing unity in struggle has made it possible for the third world countries to broaden their anti-hegemonist struggle, wage it on a higher level and achieve more striking results. For example, the struggle initiated by the Latin-American countries against superpower maritime hegemony, the struggle waged by the Arab and other oil-exporting countries in the third world to defend their oil rights and the struggle of other raw material producers have inflicted unexpected and severe defeats on imperialism and hegemonism. The fact that the Asian, African and Latin-American countries, which were hitherto held in contempt, have boldly taken their destiny into their own hands and wrested back the rights due them would have been inconceivable before World War II.

Fourth, from an over-all viewpoint, not only are there limits to the imperialist countries' capacity for suppression in the vast areas of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania where the 120 or more countries of the third world are located, but their interests in these areas clash in one way or another. This provides the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces of the third world with a favourable condition in which to grow in strength over the long period. Europe, which is the focus of contention between the two hegemonist powers, has drawn and

pinned down the bulk of their strength. They are not likely to maintain tight control over many third world countries, for it is very often the case that they cannot grab at one without losing hold of another. The countries and people of the third world, who have enhanced their political consciousness and strengthened their unity in protracted struggle since World War II, have begun to make conscious use of this weakness of their enemies, exploit the contradiction of the two hegemonist powers with the second world countries and the contradiction between the two hegemonist powers themselves, turn their own strong points to account and surmount every obstacle so as continually to push forward the revolutionary movement against imperialism and hegemonism.

The workers' movements in the countries of the first and second worlds and the anti-imperialist struggles of the third world support each other. The working class and revolutionary masses of the developed capitalist countries have scored many signal victories in their heroic struggles, dealing imperialism and social-imperialism telling blows and rendering powerful support to the people of the world in their fight against imperialism and hegemonism. As the situation develops, they will bring about new upsurges in the revolutionary movement and grow in strength in their fight to repulse the attacks of monopoly capital, win economic and political rights for themselves and the people of various strata, oppose the ruling class policy of aggression and support the struggle of the third world against imperialism and hegemonism. But generally speaking and for the time being, as a result of the Soviet ruling clique's betrayal, the spread of revisionist ideology and the splits in the ranks of the working class, the workers' revolutionary

movement in the developed capitalist countries cannot but remain at the stage of regrouping and accumulating strength. In these countries there is as yet no revolutionary situation for the immediate seizure of state power. Such being the case, the more actively the third world countries and people play their role as the main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism, the more important will be the support and impetus they give to the workers' movement in the developed countries.

Does recognition of the third world as the main force in combating imperialism and hegemonism mean any reduction of the responsibility or role of the international proletariat in this struggle? The struggle against the two hegemonist powers, which is an essential component of the world proletarian socialist movement, is extremely arduous and complex. The proletariat of all countries must make an effort to study and disseminate Marxism-Leninism, play the exemplary role of vanguard in this struggle, fulfil their internationalist obligations and give all-out support and assistance to the people of all countries in their fight against imperialism and hegemonism so that this struggle can advance along the correct path and win final victory. Thus the fact that the third world has become the main force in combating imperialism and hegemonism in no way reduces the responsibility and role of the international proletariat in this struggle. When Lenin founded the Red Army of workers and peasants, the poor peasants formed its mainstay. Did this lighten the Russian proletariat's responsibility towards the Red Army? When Stalin stated that the question of the peasantry is the basis and essence of the national question and that **"the peasantry**

constitutes the main army of the national movement,"[49] did he forget the proletariat's role in this movement? When Chairman Mao pointed out that the poor peasant masses in China are **"the natural and most reliable ally of the proletariat and the main contingent of China's revolutionary forces,"**[50] didn't he simultaneously stress the role of the Chinese proletariat in the revolutionary cause as a whole? In the historical conditions of today, if anyone should try to use the leading role of the international proletariat as a pretext to form a so-called centre to order the people of various countries about in their anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle, or even try to subordinate this struggle to the private ends of one country, this would only damage and undermine the struggle of the people of the world and go diametrically against the interests of the international proletariat, as experience has shown time and again. The social-imperialists describe the organization of armed intervention and invasion of other countries by mercenaries as "fulfilling the internationalist duty of the proletariat." This is a barefaced fraud which can only end in dismal failure.

In affirming that the third world countries are the main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism, do we mean to deny the differences among these countries with respect to their social and political conditions and their conduct in the international struggle? Their social and political systems differ, the level of their

---

[49] J. V. Stalin, "Concerning the National Question in Yugoslavia," *Works*, Vol. 7.

[50] Mao Tsetung, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. II.

economic development is not uniform, and there are constant changes in the political situation in each country. Hence it is often the case that the authorities of these countries adopt different attitudes towards imperialism and the superpowers and towards their own people. Owing to certain historical causes, and especially owing to the fact that the imperialists and social-imperialists keep sowing dissension among the third world countries, certain disputes have arisen and even armed conflicts have occurred between some of them. But taken as a whole, the majority of these countries are for struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. There are of course struggles between different political forces within the third world countries themselves. Some people are revolutionaries who firmly stand for carrying through the national democratic revolution. Others are progressives and middle-of-the-roaders of various descriptions. A few are reactionaries. And there are even some agents of imperialism or social-imperialism. Such phenomena are inevitable so long as there are classes, so long as there is a proletariat, a peasantry and a petty bourgeoisie and a variegated bourgeoisie and landlord and other exploiting classes. However, this complex situation does not affect the basic fact that the third world countries are the main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. When we look at a question, we must first grasp its essence and its main aspect and see the actual results as shown by the general balance sheet. Whatever the differences in the political conditions of the third world countries, they cannot change the fundamental contradiction between imperialism and hegemonism on the one hand and the countries and people of the third world on the other. Nor can these

differences change the irresistible historical trend that countries want independence, nations want liberation, and the people want revolution. Judging from their deeds and general orientation in international political struggles over the last 30 years or so, the oppressed nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America are revolutionary and progressive as far as their essence and main aspect are concerned, and they are indisputably the main force in the world-wide struggle against imperialism and hegemonism.

Socialist China is part of the third world. Chairman Mao stated, **"China belongs to the third world. For China cannot compare with the rich or powerful countries politically, economically, etc. She can be grouped only with the relatively poor countries."**[51] China suffered from imperialist oppression for a long time and waged struggles against it. Now the socialist system has been established in China, but, like other third world countries, she is still a developing country and faces the task of waging a prolonged and determined struggle against the imperialist superpowers. Common experience, common tasks in struggle and community of interests past, present and future, determine that China belongs to the third world.

China has proclaimed that she belongs to the third world. This is precisely an indication that China adheres to the socialist road and upholds Leninist principles. When Lenin put Russia and the oppressed nations in the colonies in the same category, could he possibly have forgotten that Russia was already a socialist country? Can it be said that Lenin had thus altered the socialist

[51] From a talk by Chairman Mao in February 1974.

orientation of Russia's development? Nothing of the kind. His stand completely accorded with the interests of the cause of the international proletariat and he truly upheld the socialist orientation of Russia's development. Today, China and other socialist countries stand together with the rest of the third world countries, and they support and help each other and are advancing shoulder to shoulder in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. In so doing they have faithfully inherited this great concept of Lenin's and are carrying it forward.

Chairman Mao repeatedly admonished us: **"In international relations, the Chinese people should rid themselves of great-nation chauvinism resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely,"**[52] **"treat as equals all small foreign countries without exception and never be arrogant"**[53] and **"never seek hegemony."**[54] This is a categorical requirement of China's socialist system and Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. Today, China is a developing country, and she belongs to the third world and stands together with the oppressed nations. In the future, when she is economically developed and has become a powerful socialist country, she will still belong to the third world and will continue to stand together with the oppressed nations. On April 10, 1974, at the Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping solemnly declared on behalf

---

[52] Mao Tsetung, "In Commemoration of Dr. Sun Yat-sen," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. V.

[53] Speech by Chairman Mao at the enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in April 1956.

[54] Quoted in Comrade Chou En-lai's "Report to the Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China."

of the Chinese Government and the Chinese people, "If one day China should change her political colour and turn into a superpower, if she too should play the tyrant in the world, and everywhere subject others to her bullying, aggression and exploitation, the people of the world should put the label of social-imperialism on her, expose it, oppose it and work together with the Chinese people to overthrow it." We would like to ask: Is there any other power today that dares to make such a candid and honest statement?

However, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique had the cheek to revile China as a country "seeking hegemony" in the third world. Such shameless slander is ludicrous. In China's relations with other third world countries over the years and in the provision of aid to them within her capacity, is there a single instance to indicate that she is seeking hegemony? Has China ever sent a single soldier to invade and occupy any country? Has she ever demanded a single military base from any country? Has she ever extorted a single penny from any country or held any country to ransom? Has she ever, in giving aid, ordered any recipient country about, requiring it to conduct itself towards China this way and that? Chairman Mao always held that **the people of the world support each other in their just struggles.**[55] There is never a one-way street from donor to recipient. In her relations with other third world countries, China has initiated and faithfully observed the well-known Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the eight principles of economic aid to other countries. This is plain

[55] From a talk by Chairman Mao at a reception for public figures and delegates from twelve African countries and regions, May 7, 1960.

to all. The vain attempt by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique to confound the friendly ties between the Chinese people and the people of the third world only serves to expose once again its reactionary features. Clearly, in the eyes of the hegemonists, there are only two categories of people on earth, those who exercise hegemony and those who submit to it. How pitiable and myopic these unworthy descendants of Lenin's are! They cannot even get this simple fact into their heads: the great solidarity between the Chinese people and the people of the other third world countries is cemented with the blood and sweat they shed in fighting and working together, and this no renegade can destroy.

The Second World Is a Force That Can Be United with in the Struggle Against Hegemonism

In dealing with the world political situation in recent years, Chairman Mao always regarded the second world countries as a force that could be united with in the struggle against the two hegemonist powers. He said, **"We should win over these countries, such as Britain, France and West Germany."**[56]

How is it that the second world countries constitute a force which can be united with in the struggle against hegemonism? The reason is that an important change has taken place in their role in international political and economic relations during the last thirty years.

Through twenty to thirty years of struggle against U.S. control and simultaneously through taking ad-

[56] From a talk by Chairman Mao in October 1970.

vantage of the severe world-wide setbacks suffered by the United States in its policy of aggression, the West European countries have succeeded in altering the situation prevailing in the early post-war years when they had to submit to U.S. domination. Japan is in a similar position. The establishment of the Common Market in Western Europe, the independent policies pursued by France under De Gaulle, the passive and critical attitude taken by the West European countries towards the U.S. war of aggression in Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, the collapse of the dollar-centred monetary system in the capitalist world and the sharpening trade and currency wars between Western Europe and Japan on the one hand and the United States on the other — all these facts mark the disintegration of the former imperialist camp headed by the United States. True, the monopoly capitalists of the West European countries, Japan, etc., have a thousand and one ties with the United States and, in face of the menace posed by Soviet social-imperialism, these countries still have to rely on the U.S. "protective umbrella." But so long as the United States continues its policy of control, they will not cease in their struggle against such control and for equal partnership.

But today Soviet social-imperialism obviously represents the gravest danger to the West European countries, for Europe is the focal point in the Soviet strategy for seeking world hegemony. The Soviet Union has massed its military and naval forces in Eastern Europe and on the northern and southern European waters, which are deployed to encircle Western Europe. At the same time it has stepped up its seizure of strategic areas along the line running from the Red Sea through the Indian Ocean via the Cape of Good Hope to the eastern shores of the

South Atlantic, endeavouring to outflank and encircle Europe and seriously menacing the main lines of communication vital to Western Europe. This poses a grave threat to the security of the West European countries and compels them to strengthen their defences, coordinate their relations with each other and maintain and enhance their unity economically, politically and in defence. In the Far East, Japan is also faced with a serious threat. The massive Soviet military build-up in the Far East, aimed at China as it is, is directed primarily against the United States and Japan. The Soviet Union has forcibly occupied Japan's northern territories and territorial seas, and it is posing a growing threat to Japan and intensifying its infiltration of the latter. This has aroused strong indignation and resistance on the part of all Japanese patriotic forces. Australia, New Zealand and Canada too have heightened their vigilance against Soviet expansion and infiltration.

In recent years, new changes have also taken place in the relations between the West European countries, Japan, etc., on the one hand and the third world on the other. Although Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, etc., have been striving to maintain their control and carry on their exploitation of many third world countries by political, economic and other means under new circumstances and in new forms, on the whole they no longer constitute the main force dominating and oppressing these countries. In certain cases, their own interests even compel them to make certain concessions to third world countries or to give some support to the third world's struggle against hegemonism or to remain neutral. For instance, after the 1973 struggle over the oil

embargo, the West European Common Market countries called for dialogue instead of confrontation with the oil-producing countries and offered some reasonable suggestions for a settlement of the Middle East question. This year, when Zaire was repelling the armed invasion masterminded by the Soviet Union, France rendered it some logistic support.

The East European countries have never ceased waging struggles against Soviet control. Since the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, the people's resistance has continued to grow. In 1976 the Polish people repeatedly launched widespread movements to protest the inclusion of a provision on the Polish-Soviet alliance in the new Constitution, and there were workers' strikes and demonstrations in which slogans like "We want freedom," "We want no Russians" were raised. The governments of some East European countries have also shown a more perceptible tendency to oppose Soviet control. There have been open complaints in some articles in their press, for example, "principles of . . . mutual benefit have been violated partially and in varying degrees";[57] there have been statements that the relationship of the East European countries to the Soviet Union "cannot be built on the basis of one socialist country constantly making sacrifices for the benefit of another,"[58] and that the attempt to " 'co-ordinate everything' can in practice only lead to 'nothing can be co-

[57] "Some Problems in the Price-Formation in the Socialist Market," the Bulgarian quarterly *Mezhdunarodni otnoshenia* (*International Relations*), No. 4, 1974.

[58] "The International Socialist Relations of Production and the Principle of Distribution According to Work," the Bulgarian journal *Ekonomicheska Misl* (*Thoughts on Economics*), No. 8, 1975.

ordinated' ";[59] and there have been demands such as those for "considering the specific interests of each CMEA country"[60] and for maintaining an "independent national economy."[61] As the Soviet Union steps up its contention for world hegemony, East Europe becomes a forward position in Soviet preparations for war against West Europe and the United States. Soviet control and interference in the East European countries through the Warsaw Treaty Organization has become increasingly intolerable. Thus uneasiness is growing among the East European people and the struggle to defend their independence, security and equal rights is gathering momentum.

Of course, it must be realized that some second world countries will not easily relinquish their deep-rooted exploitation of and control over many third world countries. For the third world to establish relations of equality and mutual benefit with the second will involve a long and arduous struggle. However, as already indicated, the second world is being subjected to interference, control and bullying by the two hegemonist powers and to their war threats, particularly on the part of the Soviet Union. This has become a grim reality and will become more so. In explaining the policy of the Chinese Communist Party with respect to imperialism during the War of Resistance Against Japan, Chairman

---

[59] "The CMEA Countries on the Road to Economic Integration," the Hungarian journal *Közgazdasági Szemle* (*Economic Review*), No. 9, 1974.

[60] "Theoretical Problems of Deepening the Socialist Economic Integration of the CMEA Countries," *Wirtschaftswissenschaft* (*Economic Science*), GDR, No. 4, 1977.

[61] Op. cit.

Mao said: **"The Communist Party opposes all imperialism, but we make a distinction between Japanese imperialism which is now committing aggression against China and the imperialist powers which are not doing so now, between German and Italian imperialism which are allies of Japan and have recognized 'Manchukuo' and British and U.S. imperialism which are opposed to Japan, and between the Britain and the United States of yesterday which followed a Munich policy in the Far East and undermined China's resistance to Japan, and the Britain and the United States of today which have abandoned this policy and are now in favour of China's resistance."**[62] For the same reason, drawing the distinction between their chief enemies at present —the two hegemonist powers — and the second world countries is an important question which the countries and the people of the third world must take into account in the course of their struggle. In the common struggle against the Soviet Union and the United States, it is both necessary and possible to ally with the second world under given conditions.

Since the Soviet Union regards Europe as the strategic focal point, countries in both East and West Europe will have to bear the brunt of its attack. They face a grave problem of safeguarding their national independence.

Is it correct in principle today to put forward the slogan of defending national independence in such developed countries as those of the second world, particularly of Europe?

---

[62] Mao Tsetung, "On Policy," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. II.

At different periods in modern European history, classical Marxist-Leninist writers explained and proved that, under given conditions, wars in defence of national independence were not only permissible but necessary and revolutionary even with regard to the developed countries of Europe, and even when the opportunists were being denounced for making use of the slogan "defence of the fatherland" to cover up their betrayal of proletarian internationalism.

In 1891 when Germany was confronted with an immediate threat of aggression from Russia, Engels wrote: **"Russian tsarism is the enemy of all Western nations and even the enemy of the bourgeoisie of these nations."**[63] **"Should the danger of war become greater, we can tell the government that we are ready, given a square deal making it possible for us to do so, to support it against the foreign foe, on the assumption that the government employs all means, including revolutionary means, to wage the war relentlessly. . . . It would be a question of national existence, and for us it would also be a question of maintaining the position and the prospective opportunities we have gained."**[64]

In 1916, while opposing the opportunists of the Second International for supporting one or the other side in the imperialist war, Lenin stressed the absolute correctness of the above-mentioned thesis of Engels'[65] and maintained that national wars against imperialism were still

---

[63] F. Engels, "Socialism in Germany," *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Vol. 22.

[64] "Engels to A. Bebel, October 13, 1891," *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Vol. 38.

[65] See Lenin's three letters to Inessa Armand, December 18, 23 and 25, 1916, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35.

possible in Europe: **"Even in Europe national wars in the imperialist epoch cannot be regarded as impossible. . . . This 'epoch' . . . by no means precludes national wars on the part of, say, small (annexed or nationally-oppressed) countries *against* the imperialist powers, just as it does not preclude large-scale national movements in Eastern Europe." "National wars *against* the imperialist powers are not only possible and probable; they are inevitable, *progressive* and *revolutionary*. . . ."**[66] Lenin again pointed out, **"The characteristic feature of imperialism is precisely that it strives to annex *not only* agrarian territories, but even most highly industrialized regions."**[67] He also said, **"I am not at all opposed to wars waged in defence of democracy or against national oppression, nor do I fear such words as 'defence of the fatherland' in reference to these wars or to insurrections."**[68]

The above statements of our revolutionary teachers show that provided a country, developed or otherwise, becomes a victim of invasion and annexation by an imperialist power, the national war it wages against such invasion and annexation is a just war and ought to enjoy the support and assistance of the international proletariat.

In the 1930s when the forces of fascism were running amuck and the threat of wars of aggression was looming larger and larger prior to their actual outbreak, the Communist International called upon the working

---

[66] V. I. Lenin, "The Junius Pamphlet," *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

[67] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

[68] V. I. Lenin, "An Open Letter to Boris Souvarine," *Collected Works*, Vol. 23.

class of all countries to build a broad united front against fascism and war. When the war of aggression finally broke out, the working class in all lands played an active part in defending national independence and combating fascism and heroically contributed to the victory in the war.

Today, the European countries are faced with the grave threat of invasion and annexation from the Soviet social-imperialists. Chairman Mao told the political leaders of West European countries more than once, **"The Soviet Union has wild ambitions. It wants to lay hands on the whole of Europe, Asia and Africa."**[69] If West European countries were to fall under the iron heel of the new tsars, they would be reduced to dependencies and their people to the status of second-class citizens, who would be doubly oppressed by the foreign conquerors and domestic capitulationists. Engels once observed that if tsarist Russia were to defeat Germany where the working-class movement was then more advanced, **"the socialist movement in Europe would be kaput for twenty years."**[70] Engels' grave warning must arouse our most earnest attention today! Engels' and Lenin's observations several decades ago concerning national wars inexorably compel us to draw similar lessons today! Many European countries are once again faced with the question of safeguarding their national independence, and the working class in Europe is once again faced with the question of maintaining the posi-

---

[69] From a talk by Chairman Mao in September 1973. Chairman Mao made similar remarks in his talks in November 1973 and in April 1975.

[70] "Engels to A. Bebel, September 29-October 1, 1891," *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Vol. 38.

tions and the prospective opportunities already gained. In present-day Europe, national wars against large-scale aggression, enslavement and slaughter by a superpower are not only possible and probable; they are inevitable, progressive and revolutionary. Therefore, while rallying the broad masses in the sharp struggle against oppression and exploitation by domestic monopoly capital and for democratic rights and a better life, the proletariat in the second world countries must hold high the banner of national independence, stand in the van of resistance to the threats of aggression from the two superpowers, and especially from Soviet social-imperialism, and under certain conditions unite with all those who refuse to succumb to superpower manipulation and enslavement and actively lead or take part in the struggle. This will also help promote the revolutionary situation in these countries.

Marxism-Leninism has always stressed the enormous significance of winning over the middle forces in the fight against the enemy. Efforts by the third world to establish varying degrees of unity with the second world countries will deal a direct blow to the policies of aggression, expansion and war of the two hegemonist powers, and especially of Soviet social-imperialism. In wilfully slandering the anti-hegemonist forces of the second world as "jingoists" and "nationalists" who are against "internationalism," Soviet social-imperialism is purposely confusing the issues and covering up its true features as the most dangerous instigator of world war. Isn't that clear enough?

Of course, when we refer to the second world as a force that can be united with in the struggle against hegemonism, we certainly do not mean to write off the

contradictions between the second and third world countries and the internal class contradictions in the former, nor do we in the least mean that the struggle of the oppressed nations and people against oppression and exploitation should be abandoned. The world can only advance in the course of struggle, and it is only through struggle that unity can be achieved. If unity is sought through struggle, it will live; if unity is sought through yielding, it will perish. This unity can be achieved and enhanced step by step only in the course of the struggle against national betrayal, appeasement and neo-colonialism and in the course of countering the attacks of the reactionary forces against the progressive forces.

Since the second world countries are faced with the superpowers' growing threat of war, it is necessary for them to strengthen unity among themselves and their unity with the third world and other possible allies, so as to advance in the struggle against the common enemy. United struggle is the only correct path for them to take in defence of their national independence and survival, even though this path is strewn not with roses but with thorns.

Build the Broadest International United Front and Smash Superpower Hegemonism and War Policies

The current fight of the people of the world against the hegemonism of the two superpowers and the fight against their war policies are two aspects of one and the same struggle. Hegemonism is their aim in war as well as their means of preparing for it. The danger of war resulting from Soviet-U.S. contention for hegemony is

a growing menace to the people of the whole world. What attitude should we take towards this problem?

The people of China and the people of the rest of the world firmly demand peace and oppose a new world war. Faced with the gigantic task of speeding up our socialist construction and modernizing our agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology, we in China urgently need a long period of peace. Like us, most countries in the world are against war. Except for a few war maniacs who vainly attempt to dominate the world, nobody wants a new war, which undoubtedly will bring humanity widespread disaster. As Chairman Mao consistently stated, our attitude towards a world war is: **first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it.**[71] We say we are not afraid of war not because we like it or fail to see the devastation it will cause but because fear solves no problem whatsoever. Moreover, we firmly believe that man will definitely eliminate war rather than the other way round.

What are our tasks then?

First of all, we must warn the people of the danger of war. The two superpowers are making frenzied efforts to muster all their strength for war. Why? Lenin gave the answer long ago: War arises out of the very nature of imperialism. **"The content of imperialist politics is 'world domination' and the continuation of these politics is imperialist war."**[72] In his talk with the leader of a third world country in 1974 Chairman Mao pointed out: **"Imperialism does exist in this world. In our opinion,**

---

[71] Mao Tsetung, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. V.

[72] V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and 'Imperialist Economism,'" *Collected Works*, Vol. 23.

Russia may be called a social-imperialist country, and this system engenders war. Not that you or we or the third world want a world war. Nor do the people in the rich countries want a world war. This sort of thing happens irrespectively of man's will."[73] While we are not fatalists, we hold that history progresses in accordance with certain laws. Since modern war is a product of imperialism, we can eliminate world war only by making a revolution to overthrow the imperialist system. World war can definitely be eliminated if a social revolution takes place in the homelands of the two superpowers and transforms them into socialist countries. Such a revolution will come sooner or later. Since it has not yet done so, we have no reason whatsoever to relax our vigilance against a world war.

Since the rivalry between the two hegemonist powers is intensifying and especially since Soviet social-imperialism is on the offensive, the conflict between them cannot possibly be settled by peaceful means, when the chips are down. In the course of their fierce rivalry, these two superpowers may sometimes come to some agreement or other for a specific purpose. Chairman Mao said: **"They may reach some agreement, but I wouldn't take it as something solid. It's transitory, and deceptive too. In essence, rivalry is primary."**[74] Such rivalry inevitably leads to war. At present, the factors for war are visibly growing. The two hegemonist powers are stepping up their war preparations while harping on the shopworn theme of "detente" and "disarmament." Why don't they simply stop it and destroy their huge

[73] From a talk by Chairman Mao in February 1974.

[74] Ibid.

arsenals lock, stock and barrel? Instead, they are spending huge sums of money on further research into new nuclear weapons and missiles and their manufacture, and on the development of still more efficient and still more lethal chemical, biological and other weapons. Their armed forces are so deployed that they can swiftly go into action, and they are constantly holding various kinds of military exercises. Each has massed hundreds of thousands of troops in Central Europe. Their fleets keep each other under surveillance as they prowl the oceans. Spies are sent out on new assignments, submarines embark on new missions, and new military satellites orbit in outer space. They are gathering military intelligence and readying themselves to wipe out each other's war potential. All this makes it abundantly clear that the two superpowers are actively preparing for a total war. In the present historical circumstances, there is no possibility for a lasting peace, and a new world war is inevitable.

Secondly, we should make every effort to step up the struggle against hegemonism, that is, we should fight to put off the outbreak of war and in the process strengthen the defence capabilities of the people of all countries.

Both hegemonist powers are actively preparing for a new war to dominate the world. They will never change this policy and no one should cherish any illusion about that. However, it will not be so easy for them to achieve their aim. They are bound to come up against serious difficulties and roadblocks. Compared with wars in the past, a large-scale modern war is even less a purely military question. Its preparations cannot but be closely interwoven with such factors as domestic, financial and

economic affairs and external relations. As each frenziedly strengthens its costly war machine, the Soviet Union and the United States are bound to intensify their oppression and exploitation of the people at home and thus aggravate contradictions in their economies and the internal contradictions between the different classes and between the different nationalities. In carrying out aggression and expansion everywhere and stepping up their global strategic deployment, they are bound to encroach upon the sovereignty and interests of other countries and thus aggravate their contradictions with these countries and people. Therefore it is only natural that, as they prepare for war, the Soviet Union and the United States should experience a sharpening of their internal and external crises. All this will inevitably upset their timetable for launching a war.

Chairman Mao said, **"The United States is a paper tiger. Don't believe in it. One thrust and it's punctured. Revisionist Soviet Union is a paper tiger too."**[75] The U.S. imperialist policy of world domination has long since met with the courageous resistance of the people of all countries. Today, the United States is still doing its utmost to protect its vested interests in every continent. It has so much to protect and its battle fronts are so far-flung that it is **"trying to catch ten fleas with ten fingers,"**[76] as Chairman Mao put it. As a result it has landed itself in a passive position strategically. Today Soviet social-imperialism is on the offensive, but **"in its offensive lies defeat."**[77] When the tentacles of its ag-

[75] From a talk by Chairman Mao in January 1964.

[76] From a talk by Chairman Mao in October 1975.

[77] From a talk by Chairman Mao in September 1975.

gression claw a place for long, Soviet social-imperialism will be exposed and struggles against it will unfold. In its fight for the control of Europe's flanks it has in recent years been devoting much of its resources to the Mediterranean, the Middle East, the Red Sea area, the eastern and western seaboard of Africa and the coastal areas of the Indian Ocean, and yet in the end it has only met with a succession of ignominious defeats. Its naked power politics and gunboat diplomacy have met with growing and widespread opposition among the people of the world. Going all out as it does for arms expansion and war preparations, the Soviet Union finds that **"its strength falls short of its wild ambitions,"** and it is **"unable to cope with Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, China and the Pacific Region."**[78]

The difficulties and setbacks suffered by the two hegemonist powers make it clear that in the excellent world situation obtaining today it is not only the common wish of the people of the world to put off the outbreak of war by stepping up the struggle against hegemonism and spiking the war plans of the Soviet Union and the United States, but it is also practical and possible to do so. World war, though inevitable, can be postponed. To guard against surprise attack by the war instigators, our defence work has to be based on the possibility of fighting a major war sooner rather than later. By that, however, we do not mean that war will break out tomorrow. The key to putting off war lies not in holding talks and concluding agreements, as is vociferously preached by some people, but in the united struggle of the people of all countries against hegemonism.

---

[78] From a talk by Chairman Mao in May 1974.

History has repeatedly shown that unity in struggle forged by the people of all countries is the main force in defeating the war instigators. The people of every country must work hard and step up their preparations materially and organizationally against wars of aggression, closely watch the aggressive and expansionist activities of the two hegemonist powers and resolutely defeat them. The people must see to it that these two superpowers do not violate their country's or any other country's sovereign rights, do not encroach on their country's or any other country's territory and territorial seas or violate their strategic areas and strategic lines of communication, do not use force or the threat of force or other manoeuvres to interfere in their country's or any other country's internal affairs; moreover, both powers must be closely watched lest they resort to schemes of subversion and use "aid" as a pretext to push through their military, political and economic plots. The people must also see to it that they do not establish, enlarge, carve up and wrest spheres of influence in any part of the world. So long as all this is done, it will be possible to hold up the timetable of the two hegemonists for launching a world war, and the people of the world will be better prepared and find themselves in a more favourable position should war break out. To this end, all the countries and people of the third and the second world that are threatened by the two hegemonists must first of all foster a dauntless spirit and strengthen the conviction that no matter how the superpowers huff and puff, they can be defeated. They must not give in to intimidation and never allow themselves to be taken in. They must persist in safeguarding their independence, interests and security mainly by relying on themselves, redouble

their efforts to support each other on the basis of equality and unite with all the forces that can be united to carry the struggle against hegemonism through to the end.

Third, we must redouble our efforts to oppose the policy of appeasement because it can only bring war nearer. There are people in the West today who in fact adopt a policy of appeasement towards the Soviet Union. In striving to work out an "ideal" formula for compromise and concessions in the face of Soviet expansion and threats, some people have dished up such proposals as the "Sonnenfeldt doctrine" in the fond hope of assuaging the aggressor's appetite or at least gaining some respite for themselves. Others intend to build a so-called "material basis" for peaceful co-operation and the prevention of war by means of big loans, extensive trade, joint exploitation of resources and exchange of technology. Still others hope they can divert the Soviet Union to the East so as to free themselves from this Soviet peril at the expense of the security of other countries. But aren't all these nostrums just a revamping of what was previously tried and found totally bankrupt in the history of war? Did the Munich agreement to sacrifice Czechoslovakia, cooked up by Chamberlain, Daladier and company, stop or slow down the march of the voracious Hitler? True, Hitler did go east and overrun Poland, but didn't he follow this up by turning west to occupy France? The United States, Britain and France gave Germany and Japan a shot in the arm by extending aid and loans to them and selling them war materials. And did they succeed in saving themselves? Today's activities are indeed far more hectic than those before World War II, what with the SALT talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, the talks on the reduction of forces in

Central Europe and the conference on European security and co-operation. But hasn't the war crisis in Europe worsened rather than abated despite the intensified efforts to keep these conferences going and to make deals? Haven't the weapons of all kinds installed on both sides of the European front grown in number rather than diminished? The more high-falutin the talk of detente and the more intense the efforts at appeasement, the greater the danger of war. This is not alarmist talk. It is a truth repeatedly borne out by history. It is high time that these appeasers woke up.

If war does finally break out, the result will definitely turn out to be just the opposite of what the war instigators wish. At present, each hegemonist power intends to spring a surprise attack on the other to destroy its war capabilities at one blow. However, this aim is very difficult to attain because they are both making intensive preparations to forestall just such an attack. As the war drags on, many changes beyond the calculations and control of the two hegemonist powers will take place in various parts of the world. In the meantime the people of all countries will surely avail themselves of the many opportunities that will arise to organize wars against aggression. And these raging wars against aggression cannot be stamped out. In the end, through prolonged and concerted efforts the people will definitely be able to wipe out the war instigators. As Chairman Mao pointed out, **"If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more [people] will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will**

completely collapse."[79] In a word, if anyone should dare to provoke a world war, he will find himself most resolutely opposed and rebuffed by the people of the whole world, including the people of his own country, and complete destruction will await him.

In 1968 Chairman Mao stated that the Soviet revisionists and the U.S. imperialists **"have done so many foul and evil things that the revolutionary people the world over will not let them go unpunished. The people of all countries are rising. A new historical period of struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism has begun."**[80] Today, the world forces fighting the hegemonism of the two superpowers are growing in strength, building as they are the broadest international united front. In the van of this united front the socialist countries stand shoulder to shoulder with the international proletariat. They resolutely expose and oppose the two hegemonists' policies of aggression and war and support the joint efforts of all countries and people subjected to superpower threat and aggression. The countries and people of the third world are waging tit-for-tat struggles against the superpowers in order to safeguard their independence, sovereignty and security. The political awareness of the people of the first and second worlds is growing, and they are unfolding a struggle in diverse forms against the two hegemonists. The countries of the second world are unfolding their struggle against Soviet and U.S. control, and particularly against the Soviet Union's threats of war, and they have shown a stronger

---

[79] Mao Tsetung, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. V.

[80] From Chairman Mao's telegram to the Albanian leaders, September 17, 1968.

and stronger tendency to get united among themselves and with the third world. All this points to the fact that the main trend in the development of the present international situation is unity for stepping up the struggle of all the forces in the world against the two hegemonist powers. As time passes, this main trend increasingly testifies to the correctness of Chairman Mao's theory of the differentiation of the three worlds and to its power as the guiding concept for the international proletariat and the people of the world in building the broadest possible international united front against hegemonism.

It has been the consistent revolutionary policy of the international proletariat to form the broadest possible united front in world-wide revolutionary struggles to strike at the chief enemy. Lenin taught us: **"The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and most thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully making use** ***without fail*** **of every, even the smallest, 'rift' among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who fail to understand this, fail to understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern Socialism** ***in general.***"[81] The revolutionary experience of the proletariat and the oppressed nations has time and again shown that those who correctly apply this policy can

[81] V. I. Lenin, "'Left-Wing' Communism — An Infantile Disorder," *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

muster a mighty revolutionary army of the masses in their millions upon millions to concentrate the attack on the chief enemy and triumph in the revolution. Going against this policy can only drive to the side of the enemy those forces which could have been won over, swell the enemy's ranks, isolate oneself and consequently condemn the revolution to failure.

The formation of an international united front against the two hegemonist powers has been viciously maligned by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique as "forming military-political blocs and alliances with the imperialists and all the other reactionaries."[82] Such calumny only goes to prove the correctness of this policy in an indirect way. This clique are mortally afraid that the people of the world will wield the revolutionary magic weapon of the united front to deal with them. So they vainly resort to pseudo-revolutionary phraseology in order to entice the revolutionary people into practising closed-doorism. This practice of rejecting allies is nothing new to the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people. On the eve of the War of Resistance Against Japan, it was sharply criticized by Chairman Mao. He pointed out: **"The tactics of closed-doorism are, on the contrary, the tactics of the regal isolationist. Closed-doorism just 'drives the fish into deep waters and the sparrows into the thickets,' and it will drive the millions upon millions of the masses, this mighty army, over to the enemy's side, which will certainly win his acclaim."**[83] Chairman Mao's criticism of closed-doorism was warmly supported by the whole Chinese people. But the

---

[82] The Soviet journal *Kommunist*, No. 12, 1975.

[83] Mao Tsetung, "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. I.

Trotskyites came out and attacked it, slandering the Chinese Communist Party's policy of the anti-Japanese national united front as "a 'united front' with bureaucrats, politicians, warlords and even butchers of the people," as "giving up the class stand," and so on. Our great thinker Lu Hsun hit the nail on the head when he denounced them by saying, "Your 'theory' is indeed much loftier than that of Mr. Mao Tsetung and others, and, what's more, yours is high up in the sky, while theirs is down-to-earth. But admirable as such loftiness is, it will unfortunately be just what the Japanese aggressors will welcome. Hence I fear that it will tumble from the sky and slip to the filthiest spot on earth. . . . I want to remind you that your lofty theory will not be welcomed by the Chinese people and that your behaviour runs counter to the Chinese people's present-day standards of morality."[84] Today when we re-read these incisive statements by Lenin, Chairman Mao and Lu Hsun, don't we feel that they are sharp swords piercing the Soviet revisionist renegades to the heart?

Much importance is attached to Chairman Mao's theory of the differentiation of the three worlds by the forces ranged against the superpowers throughout the world. Why? Because, first, this theory gives immense confidence to the international proletariat and the people of the socialist countries and enables them to see clearly the essential relationships between the three forces — ourselves, our friends and our enemies — in the present-day world and visualize their eventual victory in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism and the triumph of communism. Second, this theory gives

[84] Lu Hsun, "Reply to a Letter from the Trotskyites," *Collected Works*, Vol. 6.

immense confidence to the masses and countries of the third world and enables them to realize their own gigantic strength; it enables them to see that in their struggle they not only enjoy the sure support of the socialist countries and the international proletariat and the solidarity of the people of the first and second worlds, but they can to a certain extent also obtain co-operation from the countries of the second world and take advantage of the contradictions between the two superpowers. Third, this theory not only holds out high hopes to the people of the first and second worlds, but shows the way ahead for all the political forces of the second world striving to safeguard state sovereignty and national survival under the menace of aggression by the two superpowers. In a word, this theory is powerful because it accords with the objective realities of world politics and illuminates the bright future of mankind.

Chairman Mao always pinned high hopes on the people of all countries. He said that **"the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long."**[85] On another occasion he said, **"I place great hopes in the American people."**[86] With regard to the Japanese people Chairman Mao said, **"Tortuous as is the road of struggle, the prospects for the Japanese people are bright."**[87] In a talk with personages from Africa and Latin America he pointed out: **"We all stand on the same**

---

[85] Mao Tsetung, Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Working Conference of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, January 30, 1962.

[86] From a talk by Chairman Mao in December 1970.

[87] From a talk by Chairman Mao with friends from Japan, *People's Daily*, October 8, 1961.

front and need to unite with and support each other." "The people of the world, including the people of the United States, are our friends."[88] Obviously, by the people of the world Chairman Mao meant, first and foremost, the international proletariat.

More than a century ago, Marx and Engels, the great teachers of the world proletarian revolution, pointed out in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: **"What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers."**[89] To accomplish its historic mission of burying the capitalist system which engenders world wars, the international proletariat must do its utmost to build, consolidate and expand an international united front against the Soviet and U.S. hegemonists and play to the full its role as the core of the united front. Marx and Engels said, **"The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement."**[90] Victory in the world-wide struggle against hegemonism and victory in the international proletariat's struggle for socialism and communism are identical as far as fundamental interests are concerned. Capitalism has reached the stage of imperialism which is moribund and decaying, and the two superpowers, their hands dripping with blood, are already inextricably caught in the net they themselves have cast

---

[88] From a talk by Chairman Mao with trade union and women's delegations and representatives from fourteen Latin-American and African countries and regions, *People's Daily*, May 4, 1960.

[89] K. Marx and F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Vol. 4.

[90] Ibid.

over the world. The day is not far off when the international proletariat, the grave-diggers of the bourgeoisie, together with their close ally, the oppressed people and nations, will shake off their chains and win the whole world for themselves.

Proletarians and the oppressed nations of the world, unite! All countries subjected to aggression, interference, control, subversion and bullying by the two hegemonist powers, unite! Victory belongs to the people of all countries fighting the two hegemonist powers, the Soviet Union and the United States!

毛主席关于三个世界划分的理论
是对马克思列宁主义的重大贡献

外文出版社出版（北京）
1977年（32开）第一版
编号：（英）3050—2786
00040
3—E—1465P