

**E. F. HILL'S SPEECH TO  
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ON  
CHINA'S PROLETARIAN  
CULTURAL REVOLUTION**

~~~~~  
~~~~~

**I**N response to many requests, E. F. Hill's  
Speech to University Students on China's  
proletarian cultural revolution, given in March  
this year, is reproduced here in booklet form.

~~~~~  
~~~~~

# E. F. Hill's Speech To University Students —

MARCH 22, 1967

What I have to say will proceed on certain assumptions. I shall not argue the case for socialism against capitalism. Rather shall I proceed on the problems of the development of socialism. I do this because I am a confirmed socialist and I would believe that many of you accept socialism as preferable to capitalism.

It is necessary to look a little at capitalism. Socialism grows out of capitalism. That is to say before there can be a revolutionary change from capitalism to socialism the pre-requisites for socialism must be present. Capitalism develops the working class. The capitalists must have workers. The whole history of the development of capitalism is the history of an ever increasing number of workers and an ever decreasing number of monopoly capitalists.

Capitalism socialises the process of production so that no one individual ever makes the complete product of industry. Each one's labour is dependent upon another's labour from start to finish of the process of production. Whether one takes a pair of shoes or a motor car, that socialised production holds. But the products so socially produced are individually appropriated. They are owned by the handful of monopoly capitalists. In Australia the names of these giants are too well known to need repetition. Suffice it to say that today they are nearly all either

directly U.S. monopolies or joined up with U.S. monopolies. This then is the great contradiction of capitalism — socialised production and individual appropriation. It is the resolution of that contradiction that socialists aim for so that socialised production is extended into socialised appropriation. The working class seizes the means of production for itself. It replaces private ownership of the means of production by social ownership. But before capitalism has developed socialised production, the conditions for resolving the contradiction simply do not exist.

In order to carry through the change certain other conditions are required. In the first place there must be a revolutionary political party capable of leading the working class to political power, secondly the people must be prepared for a social change, and thirdly the existing ruling class must be in a state of disintegration, demoralisation, unable to govern. Then the workers can seize political power, dispossess the capitalists from political power. The workers establish their own political power — the dictatorship of the proletariat. For the first time in history the vast majority rule and the tiny minority are suppressed. Now the question is what will happen to the political power of the proletariat. Can it be consolidated? Can it win?

These are the underlying questions of the socialist proletarian cultural revolution in China. They are the questions that must be examined.

Allow me to try to illustrate. Let us assume that the seizure of political power is somewhat sudden, dramatic, as for example, it was in the October revolution in Russia in 1917.

Let us picture it in Australia. One day the capitalist class holds the state power and the next day it doesn't.

One day the capitalist class is the oppressor of the working class and the next day the tables are turned.

This is an oversimplification. But it lays the foundation for what I want to say.

The thinking of people on the day after the revolution is not going to be **fundamentally** changed from what it was on the day before. He who was a Communist will remain that. He may even be self satisfied — complacent. He who was a reactionary will remain so — he will almost certainly be more furiously reactionary. He who was a Communist sympathiser will probably be a more ardent sympathiser. He who was a reactionary sympathiser will probably be undecided. And in between is the vast mass of people who were politically indifferent but have been prepared to make a change. Their immediate thinking will change but the question is — is their **fundamental** thinking changed. You can answer the questions. Picture it happening in Australia. It is an oversimplification but it serves to make the point.

The seizure of political power is but the beginning. It is only the beginning of an immensely complicated process. The relations of production have to be changed. That is, the working class must consolidate its ownership of the means of production. That complicated process includes the process of changing men's minds. Their minds must be wrested away — wrenched away from capitalist ideas. Capitalist ideas place self first — selfishness, exploitation, survival of the fittest. Their minds must be won to service of the workers, service of the people — self last.

You cannot destroy an idea by physical force. You may kill or imprison the owner of the idea but you cannot kill or imprison his ideas. They will continue to exist even

after he is killed or imprisoned. All ideas are class ideas. Fundamentally they are capitalist class or working class ideas. Thus you may kill the capitalists but you will not kill their ideas.

Recently the Indonesian fascist generals have killed a lot of Communists. But they have not killed the ideas of Communism. However, capitalist ideas are older than Communist ideas. For some centuries the capitalists have constituted the ruling class. Their culture has been dominant, virtually unchallenged, they have controlled the system of education. They have owned the newspapers. In recent times the radio, television. But even more important their way of life is the accepted way. Anything contrary to it is criminal, bizarre, odd. The Communists are bandits, outlaws, criminals. The capitalists enforce their property interests by violence. The law is their law. The army, the decisive organ of power, is their army. The way of life is theirs. Morality is theirs. It is lawful, honorable, to make money by ruthless exploitation, by thieving on a huge scale, and it is unlawful to criticise it or to engage in petty thieving. The law in its majestic impartiality punishes alike the rich and the poor for stealing bread. The man of success is the man of property. The magnates of industry run the whole of society. They condition everyone to their own ideas. He gets on who is ruthless, selfish, destroys his competitors. The picture is clear every day, every minute in Australia. Amongst the capitalists themselves there is great and destructive competition. But it extends into the whole of society. People disparage each other. Selfishness is the keynote. The unselfish person always stands out as unusual. Habits of getting on, selfishness, have been developed over centuries. The novels, paintings, music, all are shaped in the interests

of the capitalists. They all serve to perpetuate capitalist society.

Do then those ideas get knocked over and thoroughly destroyed in the conquest of physical political power by the working class? Not at all. What is required is an active struggle to defeat them, to replace them by better ideas, by ideas of selflessness, of serve the people. That battle of ideas is an active desperate battle. It is a struggle for power. It cannot be passive. Passivity must of necessity mean the older established ideas assert themselves, defeat the newer ideas. Lenin once said that the force of habit was a terrible force. He was quite correct. Apply this to yourself. But even more strikingly apply it to a whole society. It is indeed a terrible force. It is not so difficult to achieve physical revolution given the prerequisites. It is far more difficult to win the battle of ideas. Of course ideas must have a material basis. Ideas just do not emerge. They must have an origin.

Capitalist ideas arise from the capitalist mode of production. The ideas of any society arise from the mode of production. Slavery gave rise to ideas of the beneficence, permanence of slavery, to slave religions. Feudalism gave rise to ideas of the permanence and beneficence of the feudal overlords and agricultural production. Capitalism we have spoken of. But capitalism grew in the womb of feudalism. The victory of the capitalists did not mean the automatic defeat of feudal ideas. Even today in Australia derived from British capitalism, the oldest of all capitalisms, there is a feudal monarchy, the system of landholding is feudal in form. In socialism, necessarily remnants of capitalist production remain. Particularly is this so in small production, individual production. It daily, hourly, as Lenin said,

generates capitalism and capitalist ideas. So even after the victory of working class power there remain remnants of capitalist production. That is fertile soil for capitalist ideas and their generation. The capitalist elements try to recapture political power.

The vital question, central question of all revolutions is the question of state power — which class holds state power. This is always a desperate struggle. It is a material and an ideological struggle. In addition to the material struggle and as part of it, these capitalist ideas, capitalist ideology, have a life of their own. Because of its age, its unchallenged sway, because the people have been subject to it, this ideology persists for a very long time.

Thus within socialism there are —

- (1) Material, physical remnants of capitalism, and
- (2) Capitalist ideas well entrenched.

Both of them contend with socialism for power.

That was and is true of China. The genius of Mao Tse-tung has subjected that very process to the most careful and far-reaching analysis. He has recognised that it exists: **that it is**. He has worked out **what to do about it**. Accordingly he is spoken of as the initiator and organiser of the great proletarian cultural revolution. But did Mao Tse-tung invent this? No he did not. He could not. But he observed the facts of China, Chinese socialism. He observed the remnants of capitalism and the regeneration of capitalism and the force and strength of capitalist ideas. On the other hand he observed the growth and development of the socialist mode of production, the birth and growth of socialist ideas, socialist culture. Every idea is a class idea. The struggle of classes occurs not only physically but it expresses itself pre-eminently in ideas. So

in China the old contended with the new: the new with the old. Which would win — that is the question. Outside China capitalist ideas reigned and reign. Did this leave the Chinese people unaffected? Not at all. Let us think of the invasion of Australia by U.S. imperialist “culture.” Does it pass any of us by? No it couldn’t. Moreover the soil here is fertile for it. True in China there is not fertile soil but there is some soil. There are people too who get frightened and want to surrender to U.S. threats. But no one can deny the encirclement of China by capitalist ideas backed, of course, by capitalist guns. It is with the ideas that for the moment we must be concerned.

Throughout the 17 years of China’s liberation there has been this acute struggle of two systems — capitalism and socialism, capitalist ideas and socialist ideas, capitalist power and working class power. To think that in one blow in the final liberation victory of 1949, capitalism and capitalist ideas were both destroyed, would be naive in the extreme.

In one form or another the struggle has been waged — now open, now hidden, now half open. It never ceased. It could never cease. It is of the essence of all development that it occurs by the resolution of contradiction. Without contradiction nothing would exist. The contradiction in China was socialism and capitalism, socialist ideas and capitalist ideas, the old and the new, old habits, old customs, old ideas, old culture against new habits, new customs, new ideas, new culture. Without understanding the importance of contradiction the basic law of dialectical materialism, it is difficult to understand China’s proletarian cultural revolution. Dialectical materialism is at the very centre of the question. It is the world outlook of Com-

munism. All development is matter in motion and that motion proceeds by contradiction and its resolution. Thus Chinese society has its material base in the social ownership of the means of production and its contradiction in that between the old method of production and the new (new relations of production, the class structure where now the ruling class is the working class), old factories and new factories, old methods of production and new, the dominance of nature and man's ever developing mastery over nature, and many others. All this is reflected in men's minds. Their ideas are the reflection of this world. So there is the conflict, contradiction in men's minds of the old and the new, the developing and the receding, the good and the bad, the self and the non-self, i.e., the community, or selfishness against service to the workers and working people. Every idea has on it the brand of a class. The selfish idea has on it the capitalist class brand. The unselfish idea has on it the brand of the working class. Specifically in China the old has on it the brand of feudalism or capitalism: the new has on it the brand of socialism. The self in China has on it the brand of capitalism: the serve the people idea has on it the brand of the working class.

An article entitled "Serve the People," by Mao Tse-tung is amongst the three most read of all of his works in China. In practice Mao Tse-tung has recognised the factual existence of these contradictions of which I have spoken. That they exist in reality, in real life is a simple matter of fact, of observation. That they are in continuous movement, development, is a simple matter of fact, observation. If man understands that, understands the direction of that movement and development, he can profoundly influence it.

If he is passive, neutral, reactionary, the old will get great sway. If he is active, energetic, understands, the new will be victorious. For though the old has great sway momentarily, it is at the same time dying while the new, though momentarily weak, is growing and developing. This is a law of history. In China men are conscious of it and therefore play an immense part in its own and their own development.

All right then, let us look at some working out of this in the actual reality of China. I referred earlier to three conditions that must exist before the working class can take power. Critical to them is a Communist Party armed with dialectical materialism, the kernel of Marxism-Leninism. The Chinese Communist Party was such a party just as Lenin's Bolshevik Party was such a party. It was the revolutionary party which was essential to the victory of the Chinese workers and peasants. But did the law of contradiction pass the Chinese Communist Party by? Not at all. Just because it exists outside the Communist Party, the struggle between proletarian ideology and capitalist ideology necessarily was reflected in the Chinese Communist Party. It always was and always will be so long as the Communist Party exists. Again the genius of Mao Tse-tung recognised and affirmed this as a fact and recognised and affirmed that there must always be a **struggle**, a fight, for the supremacy of proletarian ideology. When the Chinese Communists speak about remoulding they mean just this. When they affirm the notion of serve the people they mean just this. Unless continually Communists brush the dirt and dust of capitalism from their minds the old will triumph, self will triumph, they will degenerate to capitalism. It must be said immediately that since 1949 (and in-

deed long before that) this process has expressed itself in the Chinese Communist Party. Always the person who led the struggle against capitalist ideology, or putting it positively, the struggle for remoulding to proletarian ideology, was Mao Tse-tung. He included himself in the process. There are many "experts" on the thought of Mao Tse-Tung today. They know all about him. They have him dead, dying, held captive now by this one or that one, now mad, now sane, now a thousand things, now a thousand other things. But none of them bother to study the thought of Mao Tse-tung. History determines that some men will arise in whom are concentrated the whole wisdom of an arising class. In modern times such men were Marx and Lenin. Another such man is Mao Tse-tung. His writings are freely available. On every question of Communism, of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung has written. Whether or not you agree with him is not the question. Everyone should read him, study him. In my opinion there is no more brilliant exposition of dialectical materialism than Mao Tse-tung's two pamphlets, "On Practice" and "On Contradiction." On the nature of the revolutionary party he has made a unique contribution. On the understanding of contradictions in socialist society similarly. He is a person who sees further than his contemporaries. His genius sees the development of history, and shapes it. Lenin too. Is it correct to see and understand this? Yes it is. The little red book, "Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung," contains the quintessence of working class wisdom. But we may go on. Mao Tse-tung's thought concentrates into its very essence the new ideas, new habits, new culture, new customs. It concentrates the wisdom of the working class, of socialism. Naturally enough it caused a furious assault upon it by the capitalists throughout the

world and that includes within China and within the Chinese Communist Party. That is purely natural. It is what is. If it did not happen it would defy the law of contradiction. Observation shows the law of contradiction is universal. The working class is the target of this assault; therefore it must retaliate and retaliate vigorously. Lenin said that the capitalists had tried to strangle Marxism now by silence, now by an endless number of experts, priests, social theoreticians, professors, now by killing its exponents, now by emasculating it even in the name of Marxism. Exactly similar is the case of Mao Tse-tung. Within China and within the Chinese Communist Party efforts were made by a few people to suppress Mao Tse-tung's ideas, to hamper publication of his works, to distort them in the very name of Mao Tse-tung's thought and so on. This, too, is perfectly natural. It is the weapon of the capitalist class. This class never sleeps.

Nor can the working class ever sleep. It must fight, counter attack. The Chinese students particularly, felt the weight of capitalist repression. Again that is in the nature of capitalism. The institutions of learning peculiarly carry over the old. It takes a long time to develop new proletarian teachers, new proletarian text books and so on. On the other hand, the young people burn with the fire of the new. So Chinese students revolted. At first they were suppressed by the authorities. Mao Tse-tung encouraged their revolt. The very first salvo was a big character poster in the Peking University which criticised the University authorities. That was the genesis of the proletarian cultural revolution. What was the contradiction — revolt for the new — revolution for the new against suppression of the new in favor of the old. Who were the shock troops



of revolution? The students. Their opponents — the old authorities — supported by a few conservative elements in the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. These were the facts. The question was what to do. Mao Tse-tung's view was that revolution, rebellion, must be fully encouraged and developed: his opponents that it must be suppressed, contained, "supervised," lest it get out of hand. Mao Tse-tung's view was that the people themselves make history and make their own revolution: his opponents that this was anarchy, dangerous, full of horror, that the "authorities," i.e. they themselves, must do it for the people.

It was the promotion of a huge struggle by the Chinese people, mass debate. Universities and schools were closed so as to give the students and teachers direct experience of struggle. Mao Tse-tung's view prevailed. The proletarian revolution developed. It developed under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the chief arm of which is the People's Liberation Army.

And now a word on that army. It is an army of a special kind — a fighting force, a production force, a cultural force. Unlike any other army in the world it is fully integrated with the people. It takes full part in production and in cultural activities. When the capitalist or revisionist commentators pose it against the Chinese people they simply think in terms of a capitalist army. Of necessity a capitalist army is a weapon against the people. But of equal necessity the People's Liberation Army is an army of the Chinese people. It has always acted for them and with them. Indeed it has been the outstanding example of service to the people. It has developed politically and ideologically tremendously. Thus the three rules of discipline and eight points for attention. I quote —

The three Main Rules of Discipline are as follows:

1. Obey orders in all your actions.
2. Do not take a single needle or piece of thread from the masses.
3. Turn in everything captured.

The eight points for attention are as follows:

1. Speak politely.
2. Pay fairly for what you buy.
3. Return everything you borrow.
4. Pay for anything you damage.
5. Do not hit or swear at people.
6. Do not damage crops.
7. Do not take liberties with women.
8. Do not ill-treat captives.

This army was and is a leading force in the proletarian cultural revolution. It assisted and assists at every step. The Red Guards, whose origin was in the rebelling students, acted at all stages supported by the Liberation Army. They developed the new proletarian culture against the old. A proletarian cultural revolution it is called. That's what it is — a **proletarian cultural** revolution. A revolution to establish the supremacy of proletarian culture against capitalist, feudal, decadent, reactionary, culture. A struggle for power. How does it operate? The Red Guards and revolutionary rebels, workers and peasants, have seized power. That is they have displaced some few people who championed capitalist ideas or who had become conservative. They did it themselves. They found the opponents of socialism. They displaced them. They took their own action. No one did it for them. The reactionary capitalist commentators expressed great surprise that the big character posters were so frank, so democratic and so on. But

what is surprising about this? Nothing at all. Mao Tse-tung's writings from the very beginning have urged people to speak out and have urged the Communists to listen to the people whether they favoured or didn't favour Communism. Only by arguing things out can the truth emerge. You cannot suppress the truth. You cannot ram ideas down people's throats. You cannot destroy ideas by killing or imprisonment. Therefore you must argue things out. The big character posters were one way of doing that. Then there were many discussions, formal and informal. Exchanges of experience. It all had as its motive serve the people — abolish selfishness, end capitalism, end old habits, old customs, old culture, old ideas. The Chinese Red Guards and revolutionary rebels say "everyone of us must destroy self-interest and foster devotion to the public interest, become truly 'noble minded and pure, a man of moral integrity and above vulgar interests, a man who is of value to the people'" (In Memory of Norman Bethune). Let the new ideas fight with the old. Develop the fight into every nook and cranny of China and every nook and cranny of every Chinese man and woman's mind. Let ideas clash because the new is bound to defeat the old provided the fight is waged, provided the people are aroused. Coercion will never do it. Coercion is self defeating. Coercion can and must be used to defeat the physical force of capitalism. In accordance with all historical experience, the capitalist elements in China resorted to force, to deception, trickery, divide and rule, and so on. But the new is defeating the old. The target of the great proletarian cultural revolution is the old habits, old customs, old culture, old ideas and those few people in authority who in one way or another uphold them. But of equal importance as a target is the mind of man himself.

In this case the minds of each of the 700 million Chinese people. Let us pause. At this very moment in my mind, your mind is a struggle between the good and the bad (in a class sense) the old and the new, the selfish and the unselfish. That is in the nature of things. So it is in China. The proletarian cultural revolution is aimed by the Chinese people at their own minds too. They aim to revolutionise their own thinking. In their own thinking they aim for the victory of the good over the bad, the new socialist ideas over the old capitalist ideas. Unless that struggle is waged in everyone's thinking, their view is that there is bound to be retrogression to capitalism.

Very frequently I have been asked about the Red Guards in China and what is going on there. I have replied — I say it here again — if you want to see a mass display of human unselfishness go to China. It has to be seen to be believed. And why? Because our minds are warped by capitalism with its insistence on selfish interests. It is difficult to comprehend selfless people.

Of course there are some bad people in China. Do not be under any misapprehension. Moreover China still has remnants of being a poor and backward country. During the proletarian cultural revolution there have been excesses and there has been some violence. But that is quite incidental to the main stream of the battle of new ideas against old ideas. Those capitalist elements about whom I spoke have resorted to violence. A few of the young Chinese have committed excesses. Again it is quite incidental to the mainstream. The Chinese Communist Party has insisted on no coercion in imposing ideas. The Liberation Army has insisted on no coercion in imposing ideas. (Of course, coercion is necessary to suppress counter-revolutionaries.

Here it is a question of physical power, a question of the dictatorship of the proletariat exercising class-violence. This is an important side of the question). But still it happens occasionally. Very little but it must be affirmed that it happened. But if you believe the daily papers and the various other "experts," China was a sea of violence, hooliganism, civil war and heaven knows what else. That is simply laughable. It didn't happen. No one who has been to China in recent times whether Communist or opposed to Communism has supported such stories. Just because such stories were untenable they had to be watered down. Today's capitalist press is a pale reflection of what it was six months ago, yet the proletarian cultural revolution is far more advanced than it was six months ago.

Furthermore, comments about all this so-called violence and lack of democracy and so on come a little ill from capitalist spokesmen. Every day they are making a song and dance about actual thuggery in Australia, about mob violence, about murder, motor car accidents and so on. They piously denounce the very violence their own social system creates. They should pay more attention to their own backyard before they venture into other countries. Their democracy is a little sick too. They suppress anti-Johnson, anti-Ky, anti-hanging demonstrations. They refuse people the right to distribute anti-hanging material in Melbourne's streets.

Then there are those who say the Red Guards have smashed the old cultural heritage. This is simply not true. What all Marxists, including Mao Tse-tung, have said is that all that is good in the past must be carefully preserved and developed. All that is bad must be discredited and smashed. It is a task for socialists to develop new drama,

new novels, new poetry, new culture. If socialists don't do that, what remains — only capitalist culture. If you simply leave the old, it portrays a totally unreal situation. Its heroes are kings, members of privileged classes, leisured people. And that in a society where now the useful working people are supreme. It is a complete anachronism. The other day the Chinese criticised severely Tchaikovsky's ballet, Swan Lake. It is a case in point. Many times in the Soviet Union I have seen it. I have admired it. It is a brilliant piece of fantasy and a great spectacle. But what use is it. As art for art's sake it may interest a few connoisseurs. What use is that? Yet you can use the form and the spectacle to portray the magnificence of ordinary working people — not princesses and princes, fairies and what have you. That is what is done with the Peking Opera. At the present time in Australia the Chinese revolutionary epic, "The East is Red," is being shown. It portrays in song and dance the Chinese people's protracted liberation struggle. It is of immense value and of immense artistic merit derived from its revolutionary content. Anyone who has seen it will not quarrel with this, I am sure.

There you have illustrated one aspect of revisionism and Marxism-Leninism. Revisionism is the stripping from Communism, from Marxism-Leninism, of its revolutionary essence. In the Soviet Union the Soviet Communist leaders have done that. They have a policy which is in all its essence capitalist. They collaborate with Johnson; the Fiat Company is opening up in Russia, likewise the Japanese monopolists, the Soviet Union advertises in U.S. newspapers. In their culture they have simply taken over the old. They show U.S. films and U.S. type films. All this is the regeneration of capitalism. And why? Because in the Soviet Union the proletarian

battle for men's minds was not waged sufficiently. There was no adequate combating of capitalist ideas, nor of the tendency for capitalism to regenerate. Self became dominant particularly in the higher paid. Privileged managers, professors, artists, politicians, arose to represent the upper classes. These people support capitalism, they support the status quo, they ally themselves with U.S. imperialism to the cost of the people of the world. Fundamentally self has become dominant and non self — unselfishness subordinate. Had the thought of Lenin been propagated with the same vigor in the Soviet Union as that of Mao Tse-tung in China, things would have been different. Everyone in China is today armed with the little red book, "Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung." Everyone tries to live according to Mao's thought. It is not sterile, holy writ, but a guide to actual conduct, actual human relations. It teaches people to hate with righteous hatred that small handful of people who insist on placing class — capitalist class — interests first and to love with equally burning fervour the vast number of human beings. Serve the people. There could be no more splendid concept.

People say to me, "You are a hopeless idealist — you can never change human nature." I use the term idealist not in its philosophic sense but in its ordinary sense. And my reply is "Yes, I have infinite confidence that the good in mankind can be victorious." It is nonsense to say people are born bad, that you can't change them. This is the religion of slaves, of despair. People are bad only in so far as a given social system makes them bad. It is capitalism that breeds exploitation, selfishness, greed, crime, and a lot of other things. Take it away and promote the battle in people's own minds for the supremacy of the good.

Only socialist society and the individual in a socialist environment can do it. He can only do it effectively in a proper environment — a working class environment. I can't do it for you and you can't do it for me. The proletarian cultural revolution in China exemplifies this. Mao Tse-tung insists that the people themselves must reform, revolutionise society and themselves. He has shown them how. But neither he nor anyone else can do it for them. It is theirs to do and theirs alone. Of course Marxism-Leninism guides them, it gives a clear world concept. It is a guide to action. But you must think out all these things for yourself. I have talked a long time but I cannot, even if I wished to, ram down your throats my views. It is for you to form your own views. You can only do that by considering every side of the problem. You cannot embrace Communism without studying the case against it, you cannot understand Christianity without studying the case against it or the case for other religions, you cannot understand anything without knowing the case against it. By this I mean you may purport to accept things, may vow that you do. But unless your innermost being goes with it and it is correct, it is of nought. You must as the Chinese say of their cultural revolution, be touched to your own soul — not someone else's soul — yours. You can serve the people — easy to say — just three words, but it is another matter to win the victory in your mind really to serve the working people. That is one of the supreme targets of the Chinese proletarian cultural revolution.

A final word. I have said I cannot ram my views down your throats. But what I can do is to ask you to consider it all carefully. I have referred to the Soviet revisionists. You must read their case and read their Australian fol-

lowers' cases. Study it. Think about it. You must read Mao Tse-tung and Marxism-Leninism. You will come to the conclusion that Marxism-Leninism is the science of the liberation of mankind by waging class struggle to the end of capitalism and then waging it through socialism to the victory of Communism — a completely selfless society.