Now of course regional conferences **after** a world conference are another matter. The Berlin conference was in effect a world congress with this difference: that all who did not attend, all who were not included, were ipso facto put in the position of either approving, disregarding, or opposing it. Above all, it deprived the others of participation and of deliberation on precisely those matters which were the subjects of this conference.

In the 19th century, the revolutionary center of gravity was at one time in France, at another time Germany; it was in Britain during the Chartist period, and later on passed to the Russian proletariat which achieved the great breakthrough in establishing the first successful proletarian revolution.

Aside from determining the center of revolutionary gravity from the point of view of struggle, there is also the theoretical and political center of revolutionary ideas, of the development of the strategic road to proletarian revolution and the advancement of revolutionary Marxist and Leninist theory in general.

By no stretch of the imagination could the European CP conference possibly lay claim to such leadership. On the contrary, if anything the conference was merely a referendum on reformism (revisionism). From the point of view of militancy and sheer ability to struggle, one would have to of necessity look elsewhere—to those continents where the struggle is actually being conducted and has been conducted ever since the Second World War.

This is not to lessen the significance of the European working class, not at all. But overlooking this can be the source of bitter antagonisms. And this is precisely what this conference did.

In its presentation of the conference, the bourgeois press was merely concerned with discrediting the Soviet leadership. It is certainly not concerned with where and how best to effectuate a genuine revolutionary community of proletarian solidarity, in the light of the entire global class struggle.

As we said, convening a European conference after a world conference is one thing. Convening a European conference which is bound to have the objective effect of a world conference carries with it innumerable dangers, aside from its programmatic character. Those CP leaders who so loudly proclaimed their "independence from Moscow" are least of all concerned that they infringed upon the "independence," the really revolutionary independence, of others on the continents of the oppressed.

The conference was of course not a legislative body and didn't pass

a single, solitary resolution on any of the current world problems. Despite all the florid language and platitudinous repetitions on detente and peace, there was nothing specifically denouncing the U.S.-Israeli aggression in the Middle East or the U.S.-encouraged Phalangist and Syrian war of annihilation against the Palestinian people—practically on the doorstep of Europe.

ROLE CHINA MIGHT HAVE PLAYED

Of course, this conference would never have taken place if the Chinese leadership had not surrendered its progressive struggle against revisionism in the first place. The struggle against Soviet revisionism and the attempt, in a limited way, to revive revolutionary Marxism was begun by the Chinese CP openly in well-known polemics such as the "Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us," and others.

But for all its progressive and revolutionary character, the attempt of the Chinese CP to carry out a world revolutionary line fell short of the requirements for its success. This is seen particularly clearly when one compares the way Lenin opened the guns against Kautsky in the days following the betrayal of the Social Democracy in the first imperialist world war, as compared with the way Mao began his struggle against Khrushchev.

In the first place, Mao missed the psychologically opportune moment: the CP Congress in 1956 when Khrushchev delivered his denunciation of Stalin and literally shook the Communist movement to its foundations. But Mao did not begin the struggle publicly until several years later. Nor did he attempt a reevaluation of the entire post-Lenin line of the Communist parties.

But aside from that, the Chinese leadership never seems to have seen fit to convene a world congress in the way Lenin fought for the convening of a new International (even before the victory of the Bolshevik Revolution). Lenin's congress had as one of its fundamental objectives the exposure of the betrayal by the Social Democracy and the need for a new world organization.

The Chinese leadership has confined itself to rallying those inspired by the Chinese Revolution or those who espouse Mao Tse-tung thought, which is an altogether different approach and indicates an unwillingness to come to grips with an all-out revolutionary struggle against reformism. Instead, the course taken by the Chinese leadership has led them on an altogether different path, one so far to the right in international affairs that it is scarcely believable.