

Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist)

The Theory of "Three Worlds" Is Not Consistent with Marxism-Leninism but with Opportunism

First Published: *Red Patriot* August 17, 1977

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards

Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the [Creative Commons Common Deed](#). You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proofreaders above.

The theory of the world being divided into three worlds, the first world -- the two superpowers, U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the second world -- the "lesser" imperialist powers, i.e. the European imperialist powers, etc., and the third world -- Africa, Asia and Latin America -- is a theory not consistent with Marxism- Leninism but is in line with opportunism.

Red Patriot hails the Report of the Central Committee to the National (Internal) Conference of Party Activists in which the Central Committee issued a clear-cut denunciation of the theory of the three worlds and the associated line of advocating support for the EEC as part of the struggle against the two superpowers.

The theory of three worlds is a very pernicious theory aiming its attack at the proletarian socialist revolution in all countries. Its introduction into the world at this time of intensified revolutionary struggles by proletarians all over the world, a time of severe economic crisis in the imperialist system and imperialist war preparations is nothing short of an attempt to lull the world proletariat into class collaboration, reactionary national alliances with their own bourgeoisie and the

desertion of proletarian revolution under the threat of impending imperialist war.

This is in precisely the same mold as the line of the Second International in the course of the first inter-imperialist world war, which advocated unity of the workers with their own bourgeoisie, and thus opposed the line of revolutionary civil war at home, instead advocating that the workers of Europe should go out to murder their class brothers of other countries.

According to the theory of the three worlds, the basic division in the world is not between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a division that splits the world into two opposing camps -- the camp of the proletariat of all countries in the world headed by the Socialist proletariat and the camp of the bourgeoisie of all imperialist, revisionist, social-imperialist, "first", "second" or "third" world countries and their revisionist and opportunist fellow travelers.

According to the theory of three worlds the world is divided between the "underdeveloped countries" and the "developed" countries, between the two superpowers alone, and the colonially oppressed countries.

This theory one-sidedly singles out the two imperialist chieftains -- U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism -- and makes them out to be the only enemy, negating all the other imperialist powers and negating the bourgeoisie of each country (whether in America, Europe, Africa or Asia). The two superpowers are then held to be enemies purely because of their hegemonic and oppressive activities. The conclusion of this point of view is that if the two superpowers were not such bullies, they would be acceptable to the people of the world. This departs from the needs of the class struggle throughout the world, that the proletariat in each country can only be emancipated by defeating its own bourgeoisie, any invading bourgeoisie and participate in the worldwide struggle for the complete defeat of the bourgeois system.

The effect of the opportunist line is to promote the national struggles for independence and liberation being waged by nationally oppressed people as being separate from and above the class struggle of the proletariat in these countries, which is against wage slavery and capital.

The theory promotes the falsification of "economic independence" separate from "political independence" claiming that the people of colonial countries which are now neo-colonial, have won "political independence", but have yet to achieve "economic independence" which must be approached gradually. This is nothing but an attempt to encourage people in nationally oppressed countries to give up proletarian socialist revolution and to place their faith in their own "national" bourgeoisie. We hear this nonsense from the Irish bourgeoisie who claim that Ireland achieved political independence in 1922 and is now developing economic independence. This mischievous theory applied to Ireland shows its bankruptcy.

The 1920 Government of Ireland Act was not an act of political independence, but the signing of an alliance against the Irish workers and small farmers by the British imperialists and the Irish bourgeoisie. These two signed the alliance to replace British imperialism's exploitation of Ireland through a colonial legislature with a new neo-colonial "Irish" legislature.

Thus in return for making a truce with the British bourgeoisie against the Irish workers and small farmers, the Irish bourgeoisie were allowed to become the ruling class and run the British imperialist exploitation of Ireland themselves. This was how they got their own lust for profit and power satisfied. This was not political independence. Neither has the last fifty years of continual sell-out of Ireland to the British and other foreign imperialists by the treacherous bourgeoisie been the development of economic independence.

The same holds true for the peoples of African and Asian countries who suffer the double bondage of the reactionary rule of their native

bourgeoisie, and the imperialist subjugation of other powers. This is not "halfway to liberation" by any means. Just because it is true that British imperialism and other such powers replaced their direct colonial rule with neo-colonial rule in many of their colonies because of the revolutionary opposition of the people, this does not turn the betrayal of the native bourgeoisie of these countries and their direct alliance with imperialism into an "act in the path of liberation" as the advocates of the three worlds theory would lead us to believe.

The opportunist theory of three worlds further tries to take revolution off the agenda of the proletariats of the European countries, of the so-called "second world". This is an added treachery. According to this reactionary theory the bourgeoisie of the second world is "not so bad" as the two superpowers and so the proletariat of Europe should unite with their own bourgeoisie against the two superpowers. The advocates of this bourgeois-revisionist theory have developed their rhetoric further to say that even in the case of the two superpowers, one is worse than the other and they are treacherously suggesting that the people of the world can unite with U.S. imperialism against the Soviet social-imperialists. In the so-called "Second World" -- as in all other countries of the world under the control of the bourgeoisie -- the proletariat must develop its class struggle to oppose its own bourgeoisie. This is the most vital way to advance the proletarian revolution and to weaken the international alliance of imperialist powers and their entire system. But according to some neo-revisionists who uphold this reactionary logic, the struggle in such established monopoly capitalist countries as Britain, is primarily for national independence from the two superpowers. This can only create the ground for a reactionary alliance with sections of the bourgeoisie against big power bullying. As many bourgeois parties put "opposition to multi-nationals and big-power hegemony" on their agendas, including both the British and Irish Labour parties, the Fianna Fail party and others, it is clear that nothing revolutionary can come out of this.

Another pernicious feature of the three worlds theory is to divide the proletariat of Europe and the advanced countries from the peoples struggling for national independence and liberation in Africa, Asia and Latin America. By presenting these struggles as separate, the theory makes a serious attack on proletarian internationalism and the class solidarity of the people of the world.

The three worlds theory is a complete departure from Lenin's thesis on imperialism. Lenin pointed out that in the era of imperialism, the national liberation movements of the peoples colonized by the capitalist powers are nothing short of being part of the proletarian socialist revolution. This is a fundamental truth of the present era. The struggles for national independence and complete liberation being waged by nationally oppressed peoples are part of the world proletarian socialist revolution:

- a) Their success means a weakening of the imperialist system.
- b) Their target of attack is precisely the imperialist capital that exploits the workers in the home country as well.
- c) The bourgeoisie in these countries have without exception formed such strong economic links with foreign imperialism that their economic well-being is dependent on continued imperialist domination of their countries (as Stalin predicted).
- d) They have thus entered into a political alliance against their own people and with the imperialists.
- e) The national independence struggles of the peoples must also therefore defeat these reactionary native bourgeoisie in order to win national emancipation.
- f) The people of the nationally oppressed countries do not desire capitalism under a native flag, but they in the main desire a complete

end to exploitation. In other words, the main content of the national struggle in this era is that of opposition to monopoly capitalism.

g) Only the working class as a class provides the necessary backbone and leading force in the national liberation struggles of today in order to carry out the tasks of national emancipation without compromise to foreign imperialism.

The pernicious theory of three worlds is against those facts and suggests that all the people of the so-called third world desire is an end to superpower bullying and that they can be content to ally with their own bourgeoisie in order to achieve this. In other words, the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, do not desire proletarian revolution according to these opportunists!

Meanwhile for the proletariat of Europe, the specter of an inter-imperialist world war fought out over their countries is raised by these opportunists, not as a serious possibility that the imperialists may well engage in to try to dampen the economic crisis and prevent the revolution, but is raised as a threat to try to intimidate the European proletariat. According to this view, the proletarians of Europe should remove revolution from their agenda and base their strategy and tactics on the "avoidance of war" which is a sell-out of the class struggle.

Red Patriot condemns this pernicious three worlds theory. It is the clear truth of the Irish revolution today that only the path of class struggle led by the working class against British imperialism and the Irish monopoly capitalist class can solve the remaining questions of national independence and reunification and establish socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat -- the deep desire of all workers and small farmers of Ireland.

End.