



STATEMENT ON THE 'THIRD WORLD'

Almost a year ago, the Marxist-Leninist Collective (MLC) adopted a position on the concept of the "third world" which remained internal to the organization. We did not publish this view earlier because we did not want to lend support to the revisionists and opportunists who take every opportunity to attack China. At the same time, we did not want to isolate ourselves from other revolutionaries. We now recognize that this was neither a scientific approach nor an application of proletarian internationalism. We see how we have been affected by slavishness and liberalism, and how these weaknesses have affected the communist movement in general. Dogmatically adopting the viewpoint of the Peking Review, without independent analysis and regardless of changes within it, is just one example of the slavishness that characterizes much of the communist movement in this country. Communists must take up the weapon of criticism and self-criticism and must engage in active ideological struggle as the method for ensuring unity and resolving contradictions among the people. Mao Tsetung had a profound grasp of these ideas and cautioned comrades to guard against slavishness and liberalism. In the spirit of correcting these mistakes, we present our understanding of the "third world" concept.

We see the "third world" concept as a reflection of intense ideological struggle within China. The "third world" view has implications other than those we discuss here, but without a more thorough and extensive analysis, no further conclusions can be drawn. We want to emphasize that we have not concluded that the Communist Party of China is a revisionist party, nor are we criticizing the entire foreign policy of the People's Republic.

One last point. The Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labor have provided staunch and correct leadership in the world-wide revolutionary struggle of the peoples of the world against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. Yet presently these two parties stand in contradiction around the question of the "third world". Our view is close to that of the Albanian Party of Labor. All comrades should investigate, study and analyze the complex questions involved, paying particular attention to the need for independent thinking.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TERM

On April 10, 1974, Teng Hsiao-Ping presented a speech to the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly in which he said:

"...judging from the changes in international relations, the world today actually consists of three parts, or three worlds, that are both interconnected and in contradiction to one another. The United States and the Soviet Union make up the First World. The developing countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions make up the Third World. The developed countries between the two make up the Second World." 1

In various speeches and statements the Chinese use the term "third world":
"The numerous third world countries are the main force in the fight against imperialism and particularly against superpower hegemonism" 2

"They (countries of the "third world"--ed) constitute a revolutionary motive force propelling the wheel of history and are the main force

combatting colonialism, imperialism and particularly the superpowers" 3

"...the third world is rapidly awakening and has become the main force in the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the people of the world". 4

Further, the Chinese consider China to be a member of the "third world". And since Mao's death, the Chinese have attributed the strategy of "three worlds" to him. We think this question needs more investigation.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TERM

Past investigation shows that the idea of the "third world" was originally devised by the US, acting in collusion with British and French imperialism in 1955. It was their intention to use this political line to mobilize several anti-communist blocs; one headed by Tito of Yugoslavia, which would try to organize a "third force" among socialist countries to destroy the unity of the socialist camp, and one to be organized around Nehru of India consisting of "non-aligned" nations that were supposedly neither capitalist or socialist. Stalin exposed the Titoite bloc; the bloc of "non-aligned" nations made some headway and convened the 1955 Bandung Conference of Non-Aligned Nations. Originally planned without China's participation, the Conference took up the question of the "third world". The Chinese attacked the idea and maintained that the world was divided into two camps -- capitalist-imperialist and socialist -- and the only way the new nations would be completely free from imperialism would be through socialist revolution. In place of the "third force" idea, the Chinese put forward the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence which were to be guidelines for the relations between states with differing social systems. The Five Principles were adopted at Bandung and the "third force" movement sponsored by US imperialism was defeated.

In the Chinese formulation in 1972, the superpowers and the socialist countries were acknowledged to be in contradiction. This is how it was stated:

"Thus, between these two overlords (US and Soviet Union--ed) and the socialist countries there exist two broad intermediate zones. The first intermediate zone includes the Asian, African, and Latin American countries which have suffered from colonialist and imperialist aggression and oppression in the past and are today carrying on a valiant struggle against imperialism and colonialism and especially against the two superpowers. The second intermediate zone includes the major capitalist countries both in the West and in the East except the two superpowers. These countries, too, are subjected to the control, intervention and bullying of the two overlords to varying degrees and the contradictions between these countries and the two superpowers are daily developing." 5

The "two broad intermediate zones", later to be known as the "third" and "second" worlds, was a formulation used to unite all who could be united. It was basically a compromise with the national bourgeoisies in order to isolate the superpowers. In putting forth this concept, the Chinese were always clear to point to genuine models for these nations, genuine national liberation movements (See Chiao Kuan-Hua's speeches to the UN).

CRITICISM OF THE TERM

Teng Hsiao-Ping's speech of 1974 is more than a tactical compromise. It implies that the contradiction between imperialism and social-imperialism on the one hand, and the socialist countries on the other, has been eliminated. While the socialist camp may have disappeared, certainly there are at least two socialist countries which provide a reliable base area for the forces of national liberation and socialist revolution. Teng's speech does not acknowledge this. China is put into the "third world" and is also considered a socialist country. A qualitative distinction is not made between socialist China and the "third world". The inevitable deviation follows -- the "third world" is

considered the leading force in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism. What happened to the world significance and leadership of the dictatorship of the proletariat? When the Chinese stated, in 1963, that "*the international proletariat must and can unite all the forces that can be united...and establish the broadest united front against the US imperialists and their lackeys*", 6 or "*this general line is one of forming a broad united front, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus...*" 7 they grasped well the leading role of the socialist countries.

From at least 1954 to 1973, and perhaps later, the Chinese always pointed to the importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, even in the course of uniting with the national bourgeoisies. This has not prevented these countries from uniting behind China, because it has been in their interests to do so. There is no reason to suppose that it would keep them from doing so now. There is no reason why the Chinese should refrain from acknowledging the leading role of the proletariat, and abandon a Marxist-Leninist analysis. Teng's speech robs Marxism of its revolutionary essence by negating, omitting and belittling the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is quite true that all socialist countries are developing countries. This is one aspect, the aspect of unity in the world-wide united front against imperialism and social-imperialism. But the other aspect is that there *are* socialist countries, *different* from non-socialist ones, and to ignore this aspect, the aspect of struggle within the united front, is to practice *all unity and no struggle*, a right opportunist error.

The Report to the Seventh Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, 1976, clearly grasps the errors in the terms "third world", "second world", "non-aligned" countries, etc. It exposes how these concepts obscure the class character of political forces and class struggle, create illusions, conceal the real situation, give false impressions, and mislead people. They point out that countries are grouped according to the social system prevailing in them, into bourgeois-capitalist countries and socialist countries. Unlike the Chinese, the Albanians see "*the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, the great intensification of the liberation struggle of the peoples, the victories of socialism, all taken together*" as the main force in the struggle against imperialism, not simply the "third world". 8

CONCLUSIONS

First, the concept of a "third world" is unscientific. [There is no such thing as a "third force" in the world. ?]

Second, the stand by the Chinese in 1972, where they referred to two intermediate zones between the "two overlords and the socialist countries" was a necessary and correct compromise with the vacillating national bourgeoisies in order to isolate imperialism and social-imperialism.

Third Teng's speech of 1974 is a deviation from Marxism-Leninism, excluding the "world" of socialist countries and thus liquidating the leadership role of the socialist countries in the struggle against imperialism, social-imperialism and modern revisionism, and in representing the true interests of the proletariat. Instead, the "third world" is put in the leadership of the proletariat.

Fourth, we need not and should not use the term "third world" when referring to oppressed nations and colonies in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But we do not reject the concept of uniting all who can be united against imperialism and social-imperialism.

Footnotes:

- 1 Speech by Chairman of the Delegation of the People's Republic of China, Teng Hsiao-Ping, At the Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1974
- 2 Speech by Chiao Kuan-hua at Plenary Session (29th) of U.N. General Assembly,

- October 2, 1974, Foreign Languages Press, Peking.
- 3 *op. cit.* Teng Hsiao-Ping Speech
 - 4 Speech by Li Chiang at Seventh Special Session of U.N. General Assembly, October 2, 1975, see Peking Review 37, 1975
 - 5 *On Studying Some History of the National Liberation Movement*, Peking Review 45, November 10, 1972
 - 6 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, p. 12
 - 7 *ibid*, pp 5-6
 - 8 *Report Submitted to the Seventh Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, Section V The International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the PRA*, Tirana, 1976

Additional Readings:

- Speeches by Chiao Kuan-Hua at Plenary Sessions of the U.N. General Assembly, October, 1972, 1973, 1974, September, 1975, 1976*
- Report to the 9th National Congress, April, 1969*
- Report to the 10th National Congress, August, 1973*
- Albania's Foreign Policy, Speech to the U.N. by Foreign Minister, 27th Session, October, 1972*
- Our Policy is an Open Policy, The Policy of Proletarian Principles, Speech by Enver Hoxha, October 3, 1974*
- Report to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, 1971*

LABOR TRAITORS IN THE SHIPYARDS

The labor traitors in the San Francisco shipyards have left an unprecedented trail of blunders, bad faith and broken promises in the wake of contract negotiations this year. This is consistent with their role as bought-and-paid-for agents of the bourgeoisie in the unions.

Shipyards contracts from Seattle to Long Beach expired July 1, with drydocks full, more ships on the way, and workers both glad to be at work and ready to fight for a good contract. Instead of the usual massive lay-offs at contract time, we were finally in a position to press for better working conditions, safety equipment, job training and seniority clauses, as well as wages and benefits.

What was the response of the union hacks? Boilermaker bureaucrats Campbell and Co. consistently ignored rank and file demands for a strike committee, failed to keep the membership informed about negotiations, and tried to cancel the August union meeting. Joe Mazzola, the pipefitters' friend, scheduled no meetings between June and September -- with a three-year contract expiring July 1! But the real prize goes to I.A.M. (machinist) officials, super-sell-out Stan Jensen, the little man with the inflated ego and a voice to match, and his comic sidekick Bob Vegas, the incompetent ex-cop with a \$150,000 house. They not only let a chance for a successful strike slip through their fingers, they actively stifled rank and file participation, rejected a petition for a special meeting, red-baited active union members, and turned so-called trouble-makers in to the companies. And these traitors have a reputation for running the best and cleanest union in the West Coast shipyards!

Of course, by stalling, delaying, and generally making sure the membership of the unions would be uninformed and unorganized in case of a strike, the union bureaucrats demoralized many rank and file workers and diminished the chances of a good settlement.

This is what the labor traitors can always be expected to do during negotiations. Bribed with imperialist superprofits, their role is to serve as social props for a tottering capitalist system. Here we have been working for over a month without a contract -- after extensive public promises that this would never happen and after completing many jobs that would have tied up the yards if we had walked out in July -- and now Triple A among others, doesn't even want to meet the minimal settlement of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Association, which has no substantial changes concerning health and safety or seniority, and provides a meagre \$.50 an hour per year increase. If we strike now, it may well be on the companies' terms, not ours.

This outrageous behavior has met with spontaneous resistance. Boilmakers are struggling for by-law changes to elect their shop stewards and cut the union bureaucrats' salaries and expense accounts, and members have mounted campaigns to get rid of the corrupt sell-out Campbell in next June's union elections. The Machinists for a Decent Contract have won wide-spread support in exposing the treachery of these capitalist goons. These rank and file movements are good things, they are signs of upsurge in the militancy of the working class. But they don't go far enough.

We communists stand firmly for any move to restore democracy in the unions, to strengthen the workers' position against the bosses, to throw the thugs and traitors out of office. This is essential if we are to turn the unions into instruments of class struggle that will truly represent our interests.

We stand for this and more. We stand for the political power of the working class. We stand for the overthrow of the rotten capitalist system and its phony democracy and phony freedom (you have one vote, Nelson Rockefeller has one vote, therefore you are equal). We stand for the creation of a socialist society, where workers will rule in the interest of the whole society, instead of profit for a few at everyone else's expense.

To do this we need more than honest unions, more than good business agents, more than just an active rank and file. We need a genuine communist party, made of the most class conscious, most dedicated, and best workers to lead us in the overthrow of capitalism.

The task of forming a genuine revolutionary party is not easy. We know because we're in the midst of trying to link up with groups of Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary-minded workers across the country. The movement to build a party needs more workers who are trained in Marxism-Leninism, the science of revolution, who can help develop our political line and give communist leadership to the class struggle. As Lenin said of times like ours, *"Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."*

We invite class-conscious workers from the shipyards and other industries to join us in studying and applying Marxism-Leninism. If this interests you, please contact us at P.O. Box 24116, Bayview Station, San Francisco, Calif. 94124.

The Marxist-Leninist Collective is a communist organization that was formed in the spring of 1975, and is based in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area. We adhere to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung, and recognize the leading roles of the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania in the international communist movement. We are presently attempting to carry out the central task of building a genuine Marxist-Leninist communist party in the US by seeking to unite with other Marxist-Leninists on the basis of common theoretical and practical work, basing ourselves among the lower stratum of the industrial proletariat, and conducting

propaganda and agitation with the aim of winning advanced workers to communism.

Up to now our work has been limited to the Bay Area. We feel that it is vital to make contact with and exchange literature and experiences with other Marxist-Leninists, advanced workers and progressive people throughout the US. We hope you will contact us and arrange to buy some of our publications and/or handle them on a regular basis at your bookstore or through your organization or by subscription.

PUBLICATIONS

WORKERS' PRESS: Monthly political organ of the MLC; aimed at uniting Marxist-Leninists and winning advanced workers to the ideas of communism and the need to build a communist party in the US. We try to advance communist ideas and analyze important events and struggles from a clear communist standpoint. Articles deal with major theoretical and political questions, including party-building, the international situation, the national question, split in the working class, women's oppression, capitalist crisis, etc.

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESTORATION OF CAPITALISM IN THE USSR, PART II: Reprinted from a document written and published in August, 1974, by the old League for Proletarian Revolution. Some of the members of the MLC were in the old LPR and participated in writing this paper. It includes a factual analysis of how capitalist relations of production have been restored in the USSR, how the dictatorship of the proletariat has been transformed into a social-fascist state, and what this means for the world-wide struggle against imperialism. Also included are polemics against the Communist League (now part of the Communist Labor Party), valuable in understanding the present revisionist line of the CLP.

INTERNATIONAL REPORT (MARCH, 1976): A relatively detailed overview of the world situation. Major focus is placed upon the contention and collusion between US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, and the revolutionary struggles of the international proletariat and peoples against them. It includes an analysis of the basis for the threat of a third world war, noting the deepening of the economic and political crisis of the capitalist world.

PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE SPLIT IN THE WORKING CLASS (December, 1976): An analysis of the split in the US working class, between a bribed "aristocracy of labor" and the mass of workers, most of whom receive only relative and temporary privileges. As the Preface states, "The question of the split in the working class, its relation to imperialism and to the temporary victory of revisionism and opportunism in the US working class movement, is a question that is fundamental to the communist movement." Includes a history of the development of the US labor aristocracy, analyzes the material basis for the split in the working class today, compares England and the US historically and in their decline, shows the relation of the split to the national question. The appendix includes a special issue of the Workers' Press devoted to the San Francisco city crafts workers' strike in the Spring of 1976.

Please send criticisms, correspondence, articles, requests for publications or subscriptions to:

WORKERS' PRESS
P.O. Box 24116
Bayview Station
San Francisco, Calif. 94124