

# For Marxism-Leninism, Against the "Three Worlds" Theorists

In Response to the "RCP,USA's"  
Anti-Communist Tirades Against  
the Party of Labor of Albania

## Introduction

The publication of Comrade Enver Hoxha's exciting and powerful new book, Imperialism and the Revolution, is a great event in the world Marxist-Leninist movement. This revolutionary work exposed to progressive world thought the roots of the reactionary theory of "three worlds" in Mao Zedong Thought. It shows how the "three worlds" theory and Mao Zedong Thought are adapted to the strategy of turning China into a social-imperialist superpower. The book is truly a breathtaking work in the depth and brilliance of its analysis, the correct orientation and direction it gives to the struggle against Chinese revisionism, and in its far-ranging subject matter. This book lets the clear daylight of Marxism-Leninism shine on those questions which fashionable opportunism has sought for years to obscure. It not only demolishes Mao Zedong Thought and the "three worlds" theory, but also exposes the world strategy of imperialism and modern revisionism. Furthermore it sets out the Leninist strategy of the revolution and gives important guidance on many burning questions of the strategy, forms, and tactics of the revolutionary struggle. This is not to mention its elaboration of the present-day features of imperialism in the light of Lenin's great work Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. This book will be studied over and over for many years to come.

Yet ever since the very announcement of this book's publication, the "RCP,USA" has gone into a frenzy. Revolutionaries around the world are cheering and hailing this new book, while the "RCP" leadership is snarling and licking its wounds. Starting in the January 1979 issue of the "RCP's" journal Revolution, even before the

"RCP" leadership had read the book or seen anything but the briefest of publication announcements, they began to curse Comrade Hoxha and denounce the shining beacon of socialism, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. Nothing is too low for those without principles. The "RCP" leadership claims to be communists, "revolutionary communists" at that, but they find their greatest enemy in the bastion of world revolution, socialist Albania, and in the glorious Party of Labor of Albania. Following in the footsteps of the arch-renege Khrushchov and of the Chinese revisionist leaders, the "RCP" shamelessly gave what amounted to a call for the overthrow of the leadership of the Party of Labor of Albania. In their "theoretical" writings, the "RCP" leadership is following the gangster principle of repeating over and over again as many lies and slanders as possible against Comrade Hoxha and the Party of Labor of Albania in the hope that something or other, no matter what, will stick in the reader's mind and "discredit" Comrade Enver Hoxha and the great science of Marxism-Leninism. In this way the "RCP" has admitted that its real fight isn't against Chinese revisionism or the Klonskyite Pentagon-socialists with their social-chauvinist thesis of "directing the main blow at Soviet social-imperialism". On the contrary, all the "RCP's" ire is directed against Marxism-Leninism, which they call "dogmatism", "mechanical materialism", "direct-line thinking" and "dogma-to-revisionism". The "RCP" leadership is not interested in upholding the immortal teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but in following Khrushchov and Mao in sneering at Marxism-Leninism under the banner of discarding the alleged "mistakes of Stalin". The "RCP" is utterly op-

posed to the fight against Chinese revisionism and the theory of "three worlds". They even openly defend the present-day ultra-revisionist Chinese leadership. They vehemently deny that the revisionist China of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping is social-imperialist and engaging in incitement to inter-imperialist war. They shamelessly echo Klonsky and Deng Xiaoping and denounce the struggle against "three worlds-ism" as "indirectly... promot(ing) the political view and needs of the Soviet imperialists to a great degree" (Revolution, Sept. 1979, p. 45, c. 1). With their attacks on socialist Albania and the principles of Marxism-Leninism, with their cursing, squirming and lying, the "RCP" leadership has come out to do the dirty work for the Klonskyites and the present-day Chinese leadership. The "RCP" has revealed itself as a "left" phrasemongering command squad for "three worlds-ism" and Chinese revisionism. This shows the complete political bankruptcy of the "RCP,USA".

Why has the "RCP,USA" gone wild after the publication of Imperialism and the Revolution? It is because this book marked a deepening and intensification of the struggle against Chinese revisionism and the "three worlds" theory. Imperialism and the Revolution is not only a powerful elaboration of Marxism-Leninism on a wide range of burning questions of world revolution, but also is particularly timely in going into the longstanding roots of Chinese revisionism and in exposing the revisionist essence of Mao Zedong Thought. And every step of the struggle against Chinese revisionism has spelled disaster for the "RCP".

Indeed, it is Mr. Avakian and co. who are trying hard to make an international reputation for themselves as the heavyweight theoreticians of Chinese revisionism (which shows how poverty stricken the Chinese revisionist trend is). Mr. Klonsky and co. may have official recognition from Beijing, but it is Mr. Avakian and co. who write the books elaborating Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought and who take upon themselves the vanguard role in throwing mud at heroic Albania. The "RCP" differs from Klonsky and

the social-chauvinist "CP(M-L)" not on fundamentals, but only in shade, on interpretations, on such secondary issues as whether the "three worlds" theory is "part of" or the "entire" international line and strategy, on whether or not there are one or two versions of the "three worlds" theory, etc. The "RCP" has consistently tried to soften, blunt and misdirect the struggle against Chinese revisionism. They differ from Mr. Klonsky in wanting to drop some of the more blatant, exposed and discredited social-chauvinist formulations, such as "directing the main blow against Soviet social-imperialism", while preserving the whole theoretical basis behind it. They know that arousing burning indignation and hatred for the "three worlds" theory is indispensable in combating Chinese revisionism and in showing that Chinese revisionism and American social-chauvinism are not just wrong on this or that formulation, but are counter-revolutionary, fascist forces. They know that once the masses of activists are aroused on the issue of the "three worlds" theory, they are bound to ask questions about the origins of this theory and about the whole history of the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism, and they are bound to take up serious study of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. So the "RCP" holds that the issue of fighting the "three worlds" theory isn't important, it is only the "international line" and so forth. They admit that Mao made "mistakes" in advancing the thesis of the "Soviet main danger" and in the direction of "three worlds-ism", but according to Mr. Avakian and co. such matters aren't very important, they are hardly worthy of mention. For Mr. Avakian and co. the question of whether or not one has sold out to U.S. imperialism or not is hardly worth mentioning at all. Their whole policy is to blunt the struggle against the "three worlds" theory.

But this policy of the "RCP" has been going steadily bankrupt under the struggle of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists. The "RCP" was forced from one position to another. At first they

## NO UNITED FRONT

Continued from page 10

date, the article shows that "Trotskyite tendencies are deep-rooted in Bettelheim." It is also clear from this article that the political economy of this "anti-revisionist" is in fact anti-Marxist-Leninist to the extent that Bettelheim has been hired out to the bourgeois-feudal government of India and other reactionaries as an economic advisor!

Nevertheless, such "small matters" as these don't stop the "RCP,USA" from turning around and lavishing Bettelheim with praise. The "RCP" assures the reader that while Bettelheim's line is not a "thorough-going revolutionary line" (p. 233) at the same time, "Bettelheim can be said to programatically stand with those who oppose revisionism!" (More precisely, it is the "RCP" that can be said to "programatically stand" with those who support Trotskyism and oppose Marxism-Leninism!) And furthermore: "Marxist-Leninists should welcome his positive contributions" (p. 173); that "There is much that is positive about what Bettelheim has written" (p. 173), and that "for their time" Bettelheim's Trotskyite ideas "were in a sense pathbreaking and what he wrote helped many understand much better the true nature of the class struggle for socialism" (p. 219).

According to the "RCP,USA" this openly Trotskyite and Khrushchovite element, this imperialist ideologue with a lifetime of work against the science of Marxism-Leninism, should be forgotten in his ideological "weaknesses". And moreover he should even be united with and welcomed by the Marxist-Leninists because this "prominent friend of China", like the "RCP", writes profusely in support of Mao and against Stalin and besides this he is critical of the present regime in China, as well. In fact, "RCP,USA's" only real criticism of Professor Bettelheim is that he lacks consistency in his Trotskyite arguments in defense of Mao Zedong's revisionist distortions of Marxism-Leninism.

As this example shows, in their struggle against Marxism-Leninism and to defend "Mao Zedong Thought" and the entire arsenal of Chinese revisionism, the neo-revisionists are more than willing to reach into the sewers for the slimeiest allies, even for such inveterate Trotskyites as Charles Bettelheim.

It should be noted in passing that Professor Bettelheim has been, in reality, a "prominent friend of China" — that is of the Chinese revisionist leadership. To serve their dirty alliances with revisionism and imperialism the Chinese established an entire international network of bourgeois, revisionist, Trotskyite and anti-communist, so-called "friends of China". In the name of the solidarity movement with China and under the hoax of "people to people friendship" the Chinese leadership linked up not with the genuine friends of China and the people but with the most reactionary, imperialist and revisionist elements such as the Trotskyite Charles Bettelheim, who was the chairman of the France-China Friendship Association and with the modern revisionists including the Italian revisionist party through its society for "friendship" with China.

This brings us to another clear-cut example of the neo-revisionist practice of unity and alliance with the modern revisionists and opportunists of every stripe: that is their disruptive activities in the anti-imperialist solidarity movements. According to the neo-revisionists, what it means to build a broad front of support for the national liberation movements is to give all the pro-Khrushchovite, "three worldist", Trotskyite and

similar dogs their place inside this "broad front", inside the coalitions, etc. But how can the pro-Khrushchovites, the ardent firefighters of the revolution and the liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples and lackeys of imperialism and social-imperialism, "broaden" the solidarity movement? Or, how can the advocates of the anti-Leninist theory of "three worlds" — the theory that justifies "solidarity" with U.S. imperialism and the butchers of the oppressed people such as the fascist criminal Richard Nixon, the medieval Shah of Iran and the bloodstained dictator Pinochet of Chile — "broaden" the solidarity movement? These characters have not and will not lift a finger to support the liberation struggles but infiltrate the support movements for the sole purpose of subverting them in the interest of the Soviet, Chinese and other revisionists and imperialists and social-imperialists.

The truth of the matter is that in every case that the so-called "broadening" of the solidarity movement has pursued this course of unity with the revisionists and opportunists it has meant the real liquidation of the actual solidarity work. The solidarity movement can only be broadened by organizing the masses. However, lacking faith in the masses, the neo-revisionists instead open the doors only to the most rotten elements. And a tea party of assorted revisionist, "three worldist" and Trotskyite elements is the furthest thing from developing broad support for the anti-imperialist struggles. And to restrict the modern revisionists, "three worldists" and Trotskyites from the solidarity movement does not mean restricting the breadth and scope of the movement in the slightest. To the contrary, building the solidarity movement through dirty alliances with the opportunistic jackals means necessarily to restrict, curtail and to do great damage to developing the support of the broadest sections of the people for the anti-imperialist and national liberation struggles.

The solidarity movement, like the entire revolutionary movement, can only be built and strengthened on the shoulders of the proletariat. It is only the revolutionary proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party which can develop the solidarity movement on the sound basis of proletarian internationalism, which can ensure that it is truly anti-imperialist and revolutionary and is not undermined and turned into a plaything in the hands of the revisionists and imperialists. Likewise, based on the working class and the vanguard party of the working class, the anti-imperialist solidarity movement can be a truly broad movement, brought deep and wide among the working masses and to all the genuinely progressive and anti-imperialist sections.

Thus the Chinese revisionist line of unity and alliance with modern revisionism and opportunism is a line of cowardly retreat from the battlefield against modern revisionism which is to betray Marxism-Leninism and to desert the revolution and the working class. All revolutionary Marxist-Leninists have the duty to persevere on the road of Lenin who taught the proletariat that "The fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism." Today, the great struggle of the international proletariat against U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism and all reaction; the struggle which is being led by the Marxist-Leninist parties for the triumph of the revolution and socialism, can only advance without the Khrushchovite, "three worldist", Titoite and other revisionist and social-chauvinist traitors and their merciless struggle against them. □

## WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE!

The July/August 1979 issue of Revolution contains in the article "A Wrong Phrase" a challenge to the COUSML to publicly demolish the "RCP,USA's" shameless, gangster-style article "Beat Back the Dogmatist-Revisionist Attack on Mao Tsetung Thought; Comments on Enver Hoxha's Imperialism and the Revolution." We accept the challenge. We consider it our duty as revolutionary Marxist-Leninists to publicly denounce the anti-communist, "three worldist" poison coming from Mr. Avakian and co. We call on all progressive people to do the same. The "RCP" leadership is nothing but a bunch of diehard "three worldists". They are serving as the front men for the Chinese social-imperialists in their attacks on the bastion of world revolution, heroic socialist Albania. In this issue of The Workers' Advocate there are several major articles ripping to shreds the theoretical absurdities and conscious confusion-mongering of the foul-mouthed "RCP" leadership and of its theoretical basis, Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought. The introduction to the article "For Marxism-Leninism, Against the 'Three Worlds' Theorists" shows that on fundamental issues Mr. Avakian and Mr. Klonsky are twin brothers. The article "Mao Zedong Thought Cannot Dull the Brilliance of the Great October Socialist Revolution" exposes that the Chinese revisionists put forward Mao Zedong Thought in order to negate the most fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism and replace them with the so-called "Yenan way". The article against the "united front with 'three worlders'" exposes some of the crimes of the Chinese revisionists in undermining the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism and denounces the path of allying with one faction of "three worlders" against the other faction of "three worlders". And in this article we shall proceed to point to the "RCP's" negation of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the party, which leads them to defend the Trotskyite formula of the "dictatorship of the party".

Actually, the COUSML has been publicly refuting the "three worldist" monstrosities of the "RCP" leadership in the pages of The Workers' Advocate since early 1978. Our articles included "Why Did the 'RCP,USA' Split?", "Does the 'RCP,USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?", "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism" and others. It is Mr. Avakian and co. who have stayed miles away from even attempting an open reply to these powerful articles. In challenging us to reply to them, the "RCP" leadership is knocking at an open door.

In their article "A Wrong Phrase", the "RCP" finally makes its first feeble attempt at an open reply to our polemics. This article is in fact a particularly pathetic example of attempting to avoid the serious issues at stake. "A Wrong Phrase" is in fact a comment on our article "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism, Part 3" (The Workers' Advocate, July 1, 1979). Our article shows in great detail and with many convincing proofs that the "RCP"

neo-revisionists always negated the Party concept and the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the Party, counterposed "building the mass movement" to "building the party", opposed the vital task of party-building with such theses as that of the "pre-party collectives", and so forth. Unable to give any serious argument in favor of their anti-Marxist theses, the "RCP" leadership reduces everything to being allegedly only a question of a single "wrong phrase". The "RCP" says that their use of the Trotskyite phrase "the dictatorship of the party" was simply a typographical error, and that they meant to say "the party must exercise leadership (rather than all-round dictatorship) in every sphere of society..." And that settles everything, according to the "RCP".

But when the article "A Wrong Phrase" is read through to the end, it turns out that the article actually justifies the use of the phrase "dictatorship of the party". The article says that it is the same as talking about "Marxist-Leninists who have come to power", which is clearly untrue. The article even quotes from Comrade Stalin's writings denouncing the phrase "dictatorship of the party" in order to prove that the "RCP" is correct in its use of this phrase. This is amazing, but it is true. In the very article in which the "RCP" tries to wash its hands of this Trotskyite rubbish, it finds it impossible to dissociate itself from it. This is because, irrespective of whether or not this phrase occurs in any particular place in "RCP's" writings or not, the ideas behind this phrase are deeply embedded in the "RCP's" whole ideological and theoretical outlook. It follows from the fact that, as we pointed out in "U.S. Neo-Revisionism, Part 3", the "RCP's" negation of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the party has led it to the most mechanical, bureaucratic, administrative and bourgeois dictatorial teachings on the leading role of the party. It is not a matter of "a wrong phrase", but of the whole outlook and practice of the "RCP" leadership.

## THE NATURE OF THE FORMULA "THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PARTY"

What is the nature of the formula of "the dictatorship of the party" and why does the "RCP" defend it? The article "U.S. Neo-Revisionism, Part 3" explained it as follows:

"For years the neo-revisionists denigrated the Marxist-Leninists as sectarians and dogmatists for working for a single Marxist-Leninist center. But it is now proven for all to see that it is the neo-revisionists, those who lack all sense of party concept, who conceive of party leadership and proletarian hegemony in the most sectarian and factionalist manner. While it is the Marxist-Leninists who uphold the interests of the class and who use the Marxist-Leninist organization to uphold the revolutionary unity of the fighting masses. This the 'RCP,USA' in their gangster-style article '... Dogmatist-Revisionism...' fume up and down about how such concepts as the 'party'

Continued on next page; see QUALITATIVE

## FOR MARXISM-LENINISM

Continued from page 11

tried to stop the struggle against the "three worlds" theory with silence. Then they came out to write on this issue in the July 1977 issue of Revolution ("On the Three Worlds and the International Situation") where they explicitly defended the "three worlds" theory, only specifying that it should be taken as "part of" rather than the entire international line. In November 1978 they elaborated the same view further in the article "Three Worlds' Strategy: Apology for Capitulation", which concocts the thesis of two different "three worlds" theories. In this way the "RCP" leadership hoped to have its cake and eat it too. They could denounce the "bad" "three worlds" theory while upholding the "good" one, and the only difference between the two theories was whether or not one called it a "strategy" or not. All this time the "RCP" leadership was given no rest by Albanian publications such as Comrade Hoxha's Report to the Seventh Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, the Zeri i Popullit editorial "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution" (July 7, 1977), and the Letter of the CC of the Party of Labor and the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China (July 29, 1978), and by the COUSML publications against social-chauvinism including the pamphlet Why Did the "RCP, USA" Split? and such series of articles as "Does the 'RCP, USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?" and "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism". And now, with the publication of Imperialism and the Revolution, the "RCP's" policy has gone completely bankrupt. There was nothing left for them but to come out openly as defenders of Chinese revisionism and "three worlds-ism".

The very frenzy of the "RCP" is a vivid confirmation of one of the many brilliant Marxist-Leninist theses developed in Imperialism and the Revolution. This book shows that the roots of the theory of "three worlds" lies in Mao Zedong Thought, and that Mao Zedong Thought constitutes the ideological basis for Chinese revisionism and all its reactionary variants, offshoots and factions. The "RCP", against its own will, has all but admitted the truth of this important thesis of Comrade Hoxha's through the "RCP's" own concoction of the thesis of two different "three

worlds" theories and through its nonchalant "criticism" of Mao Zedong's allegedly minor and unimportant "mistakes". The "RCP" has defended the "three worlds" theory to the bitter end because it shares with the "three worlds" theorists the basic premises of Mao Zedong Thought and Chinese revisionism. The "RCP" admits that Mao Zedong indeed held to the theories of the "Soviet main danger", to the division of the world into three, and to the "opening to the West". The "RCP" must defend Nixon's trips to China in 1972 and 1976 because Mao was the author of these disgraceful extravaganzas. It was Mao who in 1972 made a point of giving an especially warm and intimate welcome to Nixon and of prostrating himself before Nixon while the U. S. bombs fell like rain in Viet Nam. It was this first visit of Nixon in 1972 that opened the floodgates for the sordid march to a U.S.-China warmongering alliance (what the "RCP" so delicately calls the "opening to the West"). Mao indeed went so far as to invite the fascist hangman Nixon back to China for a warm reunion in 1976 after Nixon had fallen in disgrace from power in the U.S., and thus Mao and the Chinese leadership demonstrated for all to see that they didn't just greet Nixon from alleged motives of diplomatic necessity, but actually relished Nixon's company and regarded this bloodstained mediocrity as a "great man". With Nixon's third visit to China in September 1979, the Chinese leadership is simply continuing along the well-trod path. The "RCP" knows something of the stand of the former Chinese leadership on these questions. Indeed they had made various trips to China and had firsthand contact with the Chinese revisionist leaders. Therefore, their testimony on Mao Zedong's responsibility for the elaboration of the "three worlds" theory bears some weight. All those who are still unclear on Mao's role and who are still investigating this burning question of international significance should take the evidence unwillingly provided by the "RCP" into account.

One such monumental work as Imperialism and the Revolution would be enough to make 1979 a most memorable year. Yet already another outstanding work of Comrade Hoxha's has appeared. This work is volume one of Reflections on China. Reflections on China consists of excerpts from the political diary of Comrade Hoxha. Volume one covers the years from 1962 to 1972. This book is essential reading for any serious study of the history of the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism. It pulls away the veil of

mystery that the Chinese revisionist leadership has cynically cast over this period. It exposes the vacillations and zigzags of the unprincipled Chinese stand and denounces such centrist and even out-and-out capitulationist and utterly revisionist Chinese theses as: the "anti-imperialist front including even the modern revisionists"; "they take the first step, we take the second" (i. e. that one should tone down the anti-revisionist polemic, only reply when directly attacked, and even live in a blissful ideological "peaceful coexistence" with opportunism); the Chinese contempt for the new Marxist-Leninist parties; the united front with the Titoites, Roumanians, "Eurocommunists" and other revisionist scoundrels allegedly against the Soviet revisionists; and finally the open abandonment of the struggle against U.S. imperialism and the linking up with the war criminal Richard Nixon. This book provides a full and convincing documentation many times over of the points first made earlier in the Letter of the CC of the Party of Labor and the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China (July 1978). As well, it shows the manner of approach of the Party of Labor of Albania and Comrade Hoxha to relations between Marxist-Leninist parties, to the working out of Marxist tactics on state-to-state relations, and to many complex problems. This book will have lasting value.

Reflections on China also utterly demolishes the filthy slanders of the "RCP, USA" and other mongrels that the Party of Labor of Albania allegedly "changed" its line on China. No, "three worldist" dogs, it is you adherents of Chinese revisionism who are notorious pragmatists and waverers and who even ridicule as "direct-line thinking" the very idea of having a monolithic party with a consistent line that remains steady and principled over whole decades. Your "three worldist" lie was already refuted in the July 1978 Letter. And now Reflections on China provides a veritable mountain of documentary proof that the Party of Labor of Albania followed a consistent, principled, patient and mature stand with respect to China and Mao. It shows entry by entry how Comrade Hoxha and the Party of Labor of Albania opposed the vacillations and errors of Mao for whole decades. The "Foreword" to Reflections on China points out that: "Loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism, the Party of Labour of Albania has defended the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China both when the Khrushchovite,

Titoite and other modern revisionists attacked them, and during the Cultural Revolution, when the Chinese ultra-revisionists, headed by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, posed a serious threat to the CP of China and Mao Tsetung. At the same time, our Party has followed with concern the anti-Marxist stands and actions taken by the Chinese leaders on many occasions, and to the extent that this was realistically possible, has expressed critical opinions about what was going on in China. It has also expressed these opinions at the proper time to the Chinese leadership in the hope that it would put itself on the right course. ... Unfortunately, however, revisionism in China grew steadily stronger day by day." The Albanian Marxist-Leninists threw themselves into the fire for China at a time when many of today's "friends of China" were feverishly attacking it. Even the "RCP" leadership is forced to admit the obvious, that "Hoxha had united with Mao and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution at a time when it was under attack from revisionists everywhere" (The Communist, Number 5, "Dogmatic-Revisionism", p. 1). The world's Marxist-Leninists hoped that China would find its way to the true path of Marxism-Leninism, but it turned out that China, and Mao, preferred the path of "three worlds-ism", the path of turning China into a social-imperialist power, the path of wheeling and dealing in the blood of the oppressed masses. Now that Chinese revisionism has fully crystallized and that their alliance with imperialism and split with communism is fully consummated, it is the duty of all Marxist-Leninists to wage a stern and open struggle against Chinese revisionism in order to uphold the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

In this polemic, we will denounce the "three worlds-ism" and anti-communist stands of the "RCP, USA". There will be four basic sections. One, the exposure of the gangster-like methods and utter confusion-mongering that the "RCP, USA" leadership tries to pass off as "theoretical work". Two, the demonstration that the "RCP" defends Mao Zedong Thought from the standpoint of a fervent advocate of the "three worlds" theory, which is only natural as the "three worlds" theory is based on Mao Zedong Thought. Three, the examination of the history of the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism. And four, the denunciation of the anti-Marxist-Leninist and revisionist basic theses of Mao Zedong Thought and their contrast with the living truths of Marxism-Leninism. □