

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the October Socialist revolution in Russia. For the first time a state was established and kept power that represented the interests of the majority and suppressed the minority, the exploiters. It was a dictatorship of the proletariat who had as a close ally, the poor peasantry.

The Soviet Union was not only a tremendous achievement for the people of its own territory, but was an historic advance for the oppressed and exploited of the entire world. Lenin and Stalin stressed repeatedly the international significance of the first Soviet state. They held that the Soviet Union could not exist as a Socialist state without the support of peoples oppressed by capitalism in its imperialist stage and by the revolutionary sector of the working class in oppressor nations. Lenin and Stalin warned repeatedly that Socialism would turn into its capitalist opposite unless the Soviet peoples gave full support to the oppressed and exploited of the world.

Lenin and Stalin placed the universal before the particular, the whole before the part. Because the CPSU upheld and developed Marxism-Leninism under the leadership of first Lenin and then Stalin, the international Marxist-Leninist movement was able to defeat the internal and external enemies of Socialism--the imperialists and their various running dogs such as Trotsky, Radek and the traitor generals.

The great victory over Japanese, Italian and German imperialism in WW II further weakened the capitalist world. The working class and their allies, led by Marxist-Leninist Parties, achieved the upper hand over the imperialists in Eastern Europe, in Albania and in China. The oppressed peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America launched fierce struggles for liberation from imperialism. When Stalin died in 1953 imperialism, having just received an important setback in Korea, was on the defensive tactically as well as in the strategic sense.

But imperialism could not and did not automatically disappear. Before Hitler's defeat, imperialist pressures and influence were reflected in the Marxist-Leninist movement by the distortion of the correct and effective W' II United Front policy. Browderism and Titoism were examples of the rightist distortion of the united front line which existed in latent form in all countries including the Soviet Union. Browderism and Titoism in the post war period were in practice capitulation to U.S. imperialism. Imperialist pressures and propaganda also encouraged petty-bourgeois nationalist tendencies which were an inevitable result of W' II, as was pacifism, a reactionary weapon of the class enemy.

Stalin and the CPSU leaders around him fought for a correct Marxist-Leninist line in the international movement against Titoism, Browderism, bourgeois nationalism and pacifism. Three years after his death, however, the 20th Congress of the CPSU, in 1956, adopted a line which was in essence Titoism. In the same year, the 8th Party Congress of the CPC endorsed the 20th Congress, CPSU and had kind words for Titoism. This action contributed to a prolonged, complex struggle within the CPC which continues to this moment.

In 1957, Khrushchev, utilizing armed forces and violence imposed his line of capitulation to imperialism, of betrayal of the oppressed peoples of reverting to capitalism in the S.U., on the CC, CPSU. Khrushchev did not openly state his reactionary aims in 1956 and 1957. He accomplished them in part by talk of peace, of Communism in 20 years, of security with our Soviet H-bomb. Playing on pacifist and bourgeois nationalist tendencies he negated the universal in Marxism-Leninism and betrayed international solidarity. Later the Soviet revisionists unveiled their Lieberman profit plan for industry, openly encouraged capitalism in the countryside, welcomed cultural degenerates from U.S. imperialism and sent their renegades to slander Stalin and aid imperialist rule in the U.S.

The 1957 Declaration of the 12 CP's evaluated the S.U. as a Socialist nation, as did the 81 Party statement of 1960. The test of M-List theory is practice. The government of the present Russian state has collaborated with U.S. imperialism in the Congo, made imperialist demands on Albania, refused to discuss the question of Chinese territory it holds,

united with U.S. imperialism in behalf of the state of Israel, welcomed the Indonesian butchers for U.S. imperialism to Moscow, signed nuclear agreements aimed at prolonging imperialist domination in Asia, Latin America and Africa, denied support to Afro-American demands for self-determination, insisted that Cuba keep a one crop agricultural economy for payments to Russia and done everything possible to keep the world Marxist-Leninist movement from giving leadership on Vietnam.

The present state in Russia is a capitalist state. But a capitalist state in today's world, particularly one that produces large amounts of consumer goods, cannot be only capitalist. Russia competes in the world market not simply as a capitalist state, but as an imperialist power. Russian imperialism seeks to hide its real nature with talk of Marxism.

The murder of the first Socialist state was plotted at the 20th Congress in 1956. It was carried out in 1957. The 81 Party Statement which endorsed the 20th Congress' slander of Stalin and Leninism failed to indict the murderers of the first Socialist state. The 81 Party statement included many fine phrases and formulations, but its essence was compromise on Marxist-Leninist principles on the class nature of the state, the national question, the leading role of Marxist-Leninist Parties and the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

Many forces who have criticized the CPSU on aspects of its betrayal continue to support its view on the present relationship of forces in the world. The unity reached at the 81 Party conference still predominates on this question. According to this view, Russia has slipped back a bit but is apt to become Socialist again at any moment; the relationship of forces remains overwhelmingly favorable to the anti-imperialist and Socialist forces in the tactical sense, for the present.

In our opinion, the relationship of forces in the world is favorable for the anti-imperialist and Socialist forces in the strategical sense. The basic reason for this is that capitalism is in its moribund dying stage--imperialism.

But it is a major error to underestimate the tactical setback of the imperialist victory in Russia and its results--to do so disarms the peoples and aids the U.S.-Russian imperialist alliance to prolong its reactionary existence.

Since imperialism does not voluntarily disappear it is necessary that Marxist-Leninists have a realistic and self-critical view of past policies in order to lead the peoples in anti-imperialist struggles. In other issues we have attempted self-critical examination of our role since the 20th Congress. We found this was necessary to develop our struggle against modern revisionism. We ask the questions below for the same reason--to strengthen the struggle against revisionism and imperialism.

On The Arab Liberation Struggle and the State of Israel:

In our opinion, the state of Israel performs the same function that the states in Rhodesia and South Africa perform. It plays a similar role to that of the Southern state governments in the Black Belt and the Australian government in East Irian. The state of Israel serves as an oppressor of peoples in a semi-colonial status. It is the main bulwark for the U.S.-Russian imperialist alliance in Western Asia and North Africa. After sham disagreement on recent Israeli aggression, the U.S. and Russian imperialists united on the question of joint defense for the boundaries and existence of the puppet state--Israel. This unity of the two largest imperialist powers in defense of Israel is a denial of the right of the Palestinian Arabs to self-determination.

In our country, the CPUSA (ML) group, which has received support in Chinese and New Zealand publications, echoed the U.S. imperialists stating the immediate reason for the struggle in June, 1967 was Nasser's 'bid for power. Progressive Labor, which has been upheld as Marxist-Leninist by periodicals in China, Belgium and Australia reprinted criticism from other sources concerning the state of Israel, but has taken no editorial stand, no principled position on this question.

The Party of Labor of Albania and the Communist Party of China signed the 81 Party statement in 1960. Since then, while not repudiating their support, they have made many efforts to correct some of the worst compromises on Marxist-Leninist principles in that document. We have read the CPC's policy statements on the Arab liberation struggle and the PLA's statements including the U.N. speeches and the foreign minister's report to the State Council in July. Why do not the PLA and the CPC spokesmen support the just demand of the Arab peoples for the destruction of the state of Israel? Is it possible to struggle effectively against the U.S.-Russian alliance without destroying their main weapon in Western Asia?

The PLA and the CPC, both of whom have given ideological and organizational support to forces in other countries trying to break with revisionism, do not emphasize the need for an international Marxist-Leninist movement which will unite on policy and give support to the Arab peoples. Nor is the need for strong Marxist-Leninist Parties in the Arab countries stressed or even mentioned in the articles.

Can the Arab peoples smash the state of Israel and its imperialist sponsors without a powerful Marxist-Leninist international movement, without their own influential Parties of the Lenin type, without developing Marxist-Leninist leaders who can lead as Mao Tse-tung and Hoxha led in the national democratic revolutions?

We believe it is correct for the CPC to urge the Arabs to reject Russian 'aid' as suggested in "Lessons of the Arab War Against Aggression" by ChouTian-chih, Peking Review, Sept. 8, 1967. But is it correct Marxist-Leninist policy for China to sign a new trade agreement with Russian imperialism shortly after Kosygin and Johnson plotted against the Arab people in Glassboro?

On The Question of Vietnam:

The epic struggle in Vietnam is a focal point in the focal struggle in today's world--the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples versus imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism. The outcome in Vietnam will be a major factor in determining the course of world events for many years. It will be a major factor in deciding whether Socialist construction in Albania and China can advance or whether imperialism will win temporary victories there as in Eastern Europe.

The Khrushchev-Breshnev-Kosygin policy is to aid U.S. imperialism by negating the importance of Vietnam. They negate Vietnam by pretending that Socialism can be built without victory for anti-imperialist forces in Vietnam. Compare the international support given by the CPSU with Stalin's leadership for Spain, for China, for Korea, with the international support given Vietnam today. Where are the demands and mass movements for boycotting U.S. goods, for breaking diplomatic relations with U.S. imperialism? The modern revisionists influence is seen when the question is posed as 'the aid given to Vietnam' rather than the Marxist-Leninist line of the aid Vietnam is giving the Socialist nations and anti-imperialist forces.

Is it correct to claim that struggle on the cultural front in China can be Marxist-Leninist unless its primary concern is Vietnam? Can it be that what is known as the 'Cultural Revolution' in China, often described as the most important revolution in history, is more important than the battles of Vietnam? Could Communism be built in Russia, as Khrushchev claimed, or now built in China, as some claim, without an anti-imperialist victory in Vietnam?

Is it possible to break thoroughly with modern revisionism on Vietnam without polemicizing against the smugness and self satisfaction which permeates many policy statements? Are not some 'anti-revisionist' authors prepared for articles on Vietnam which will feature

the 'defeats are inevitable' phrase which was their 'profound' explanation for Indonesia, Iraq and Western Asia? Is it possible to break with modern revisionism and not stress the need for an international conference of anti-revisionist forces on Vietnam? What is the concrete ideological difference on Vietnam between 'anti-revisionist' forces who speak in this manner and Kosygin? Is not the compromise and harmony of the 81 Party statement still practiced widely on Vietnam?

On The Afro-American Question:

One of the important accomplishments of the CPUSA and the Third International was defining the Afro-American question as a national question. This means the right of the Afro-American people to self-determination in the Black Belt region of the U.S.A., an area approximately 1300 miles long and 300 miles wide with seaports, transportation and features of a restricted economy typical of an oppressed nation. This territory will be liberated by an anti-imperialist coalition based on an alliance of Black workers with sharecroppers and farm laborers. The alliance will include students, professionals and that section of the national bourgeoisie who oppose U.S. imperialism. Millions of Afro-American people who have been driven from the Black Belt to urban ghettos in the North and West by land stealing and terror are an oppressed national minority whose ability to defeat L.B. Johnson's genocidal plans depends on liberation the Black Belt.

Khrushchev's line at the 20th Congress initiated a serious revision on the Afro-American question in the CPUSA and the entire revolutionary movement. The 81 Party statement put the seal of approval on this revision of Marxism-Leninism. Two years later the CPC, thru its Chairman, upheld the 81 Party line in a statement on the Afro-American question. The essence of the Afro-American question was described as class when it is actually a national democratic revolution of an oppressed people involving all classes.

Furthermore, the CPC statement denied Lenin and Stalin's teachings that sections of the working class in the imperialist countries are bribed to support their imperialists in the oppression of other peoples. In our view, the long-range interests of all white workers can only be achieved by supporting the right of the Afro-American people to self-determination. The CPC's claim that no white workers presently participate in the oppression of the black people, that important sections are not bribed by the ruling class, does not conform to the reality of Meany, Reuther and opportunism in the labor movement. It is a principled task of a Marxist-Leninist Party in the U.S., particularly its white membership, to fight against white and great power chauvinism among the white working class, the white students and the white middle class.

Since 1956 the right of Afro-American people to self-determination has received no international support from those who have criticized certain aspects of modern revisionism. On several occasions representatives of H&S have traveled tens of thousands of miles, spent hours and days in discussion and submitted not a few letters and articles on the Afro-American question to other forces seeking to break with modern revisionism. How can the indifference to the history of the Marxist-Leninist movement in the U.S. on the Afro-American question be explained? How can one explain the lack of interest in Lenin and Stalin's view on this question? Or explain the vicious attacks by L.B. Johnson, Walter Lippman, Governor Romney on those Afro-American leaders who raise the question of self-determination in one way or another? Should not one who has broken decisively with revisionism feel a little uncomfortable in the company of the CPUSA leaders, Governor Romney, L.B. Johnson and Walter Lippman who also maintain that the Afro-American question is mainly a question of class or of poverty? Is one serious about destroying U.S. imperialism while studiously avoiding the question of breaking up its imperialist boundaries?

Lenin wrote in 'The Socialist Revolution & the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', 'The proletariat must demand freedom of political secession for the colonies and nations that are oppressed by 'its' nation. Unless it does this proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase; neither mutual confidence nor class solidarity

between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be possible; the hypocrisy of the reformist and Kautskyist advocates of self-determination, who maintain silence about the nations which are oppressed by their nation and forcibly retained within their state, will remain unexposed.

Comrades--who should have state power in the Black Belt? U.S. imperialism or the Afro-American people? Comrades--do you believe the working class can unite for a Socialist U.S. unless large sections of white workers are won in support to the right to self-determination for Black people, for state power in the Black Belt and the right of a national minority in the North and West? Can an effective coalition be built against imperialism unless white workers support Afro-American liberation?

\* \* \* \* \*

In the view of H&S, we who have criticized aspects of modern revisionism have a difficult ideological, political and organizational struggle facing us before the break with revisionism is complete and decisive. The Russian-U.S. imperialist alliance is the most powerful vicious enemy ever faced by the world's people. Its influence will not be smashed without harsh and bitter struggle in all fields. To respect this enemy tactically is essential if it is to be despised strategically and smashed in the future.

Some forces who have been close to H&S and who have opposed modern revisionism in the past maintain that the failure to break completely with modern revisionism is a matter solely of subjective intent. They denounce Parties and leaders who have failed to break completely with modern revisionism in almost the same way as Marxist-Leninists denounce the CPSU leaders, traitors to the revolutionary cause. These forces claim that H&S is opportunist because we do not lump comrades with whom we have disagreements together with the CPSU leaders. It is left opportunism not to face the difficulties and complexities of contributing to a collective, common Marxist-Leninist line. To avoid this

Struggle by underestimating the many important contributions against Khrushchevism made by the PIA and the CPC is to commit left opportunism in practice: it is to ignore our own experience and what we have learned from the CPC and the PIA. Not only have we rejected this left dogmatic view, but other supporters and sympathizers have also rejected it.

An even more dangerous tendency is expressed in the right opportunist concept that the break with modern revisionism is complete -- that all theoretical problems are solved. H&S has, since our founding, shown our high regard for the writings and contributions of Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the CPC leadership. We do not think Marxism-Leninism can be strengthened by hiding the fact that the line of the CPC, since 1956, has not been clearly and consistently Marxist-Leninist. It has reflected, and contributed to, right opportunist errors in the international movement. The endorsement of the 20th Congress CPSU by the CPC's 8th Congress, the CPC's role at the 81 Party conference, the failure to lead and unite the anti-revisionist forces on Vietnam are not the exclusive property of only one man or a handful of people. They are reactions to the pressures exerted (on all of us, in every country) by the U.S.-Russian imperialist alliance on China, the CPC and its leadership.

Those who shout loudest their faith in the thoughts of Mao Tse-tung in capitalist countries are considered by some to be automatically capable and honest Marxist-Leninists. Not only are the thoughts of Mao to be accepted without question, but the thoughts of those who shout their devotion to Mao are immune from discussion or criticism. In 1962 Progressive Labor's leader, Milt Rosen, flatly rejected H&S's insistence that upholding the main line of Mao's teachings was a principled important question. We had sent a delegation to NYC to discuss this and other questions with Rosen and other PL representatives. Ironically, PL, without explanation of its past errors, is now recognized in China as a Marxist-Leninist organization, as true disciples of the 'Thought of Mao Tse-tung.' How does support for such maneuvers by PL serve the people?

Those who believe in dialectical materialism, in change resulting from contradiction, that the struggle of opposites predominates over the unity of opposites, will not substitute the thoughts of any individual for collective discussion and collective decisions. For the thoughts of man change and every major change in the objective situation is a new test of leadership's ability. The classics of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin were demands on the international movement for discussion and actions in new situations. Marxism-Leninism is neither dogma nor chance, but a living science where every individual and organizations thought, resulting from experience in struggle under varied conditions, contributes.

The 40 years (1917-1957) of the Socialist Soviet Union are great positive lessons to Marxism-Leninism. The temporary defeat of Socialism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe has also provided many negative lessons. One is that Socialist countries have provided theoretical and organizational leaders and leadership they cannot consistently and correctly lead without collective discussion with Marxist-Leninists from oppressed and capitalist nations. The enrichment of Marxist-Leninist theory, the defense of Socialist construction cannot be the sole obligation of Marxist-Leninists in Socialist countries. Bi-lateral discussions between comrades in Socialist and non-Socialist countries, often valuable in themselves, cannot be substituted for collective discussions with forces from as many nations as possible--the practice and policy of Lenin and Stalin.

Under present circumstances, when collective discussion is not being implemented, those who break with modern revisionism in the U.S. must state honestly their views on basic questions regardless of status or fear of disfavor by influential forces abroad. This will help unite Marxism-Leninism and the peoples struggle into a powerful force. An example is the Afro-American question. Recent developments in Detroit, Newark and Mississippi are dealing heavy blows at the line of class question only. HRS has made a modest contribution to the Afro-American liberation struggle by defending the policy of Lenin and Stalin on self-determination.

Will not the international forces breaking with modern revisionism sooner or later review their position and make a qualitative break with modern revisionism on the Afro-American question?

We have always sought public criticism of our views by forces abroad and at home. Is it not clear that the set-backs in Indonesia and Western Asia plus the need for multiplying support to Vietnam will sooner or later result in more discussion, more comradely constructive criticism among anti-revisionist forces? Won't this contribute to a qualitative leap forward for the Marxist-Leninist movement here and abroad? The Socialist revolution in Russia could never have achieved success without Lenin's persistent struggle for Marxist principles in the difficult years from 1905-1917.

U.S. imperialism has let loose an unprecedented campaign of slander against J.V. Stalin, the great Leninist who led the first Socialist revolution to victory after victory. Their hatred and fear of Stalin is no accident. For the teachings and practice of Stalin are the weapons, when grasped firmly and developed correctly by U.S. Marxist-Leninists, that will lead us to victory. Let us, like Stalin, be bold in fighting revisionism and imperialism. To be bold means organizational methods which do not expose every revolutionary force to the enemy as is practiced by PL, CPUSA (More or Less) and the CPUSA (Revisionist). To be bold means building a Marxist-Leninist Party which will lead the anti-imperialist coalition.

The efforts of U.S. and Russian imperialists to conquer the world endangers the lives of hundreds of millions. This means that Russian and U.S. imperialism will meet even greater defeats than imperialism in WW II. For the struggles of today and tomorrow will produce a M-List movement which will lead the world's peoples in the destruction of the common enemy, the liberation of the oppressed people and the eventual victory of Socialism thruout the world. The 40 years of the Socialist Revolution of the Soviet Union was a great and glorious event which will live forever in the hearts and minds of the world's peoples.

ISSUED BY: HAMMER & STEEL P.O. BOX 101, NATTAPAN, MASS. 02124

Oberlin, Ohio  
October, 1967

To The Editors, Hammer & Steel:

We realize that your facilities for printing are limited. Nevertheless we would appreciate an effort on your part to distribute this letter, providing you consider it generally correct, to as many students and young people as possible:

There are two important traditions in the history of Oberlin. John Brown, son of a college trustee, set an example of white support for the national liberation of the Afro-American people. Oberlin missionaries in China set an example of working closely with U.S. imperialism to keep the Chinese people under foreign domination. Today, we Oberlin students must decide: which tradition should we follow?

John Brown's struggle inspired the Union soldiers, white and black who, supported by Northern capitalists, ended slavery in the South. Over 300 years, the Afro-American people had built the wealth of the South. They developed into an oppressed nation, with their language, culture and psychological makeup, under the feudal economy.

After Appomattox, Afro-Americans waged a bitter struggle to finish off the feudal system in the Black Belt area of the South. The valiant efforts by the former slaves and their poor white allies to achieve a new democratic South were weakened by errors in their policy. They were too lenient with the former slaveowners; failed to fully implement the demand of the masses for "forty acres and a mule", and failed to establish their own armed forces capable of standing up to the Klan and federal government.

The Black people and their allies were defeated mainly because the Northern industrialists, driven by their need for ever-larger profits allied with their former foes, the slaveowners, to re-establish a plantation system in the South. These partners in crime stole huge amounts of land rightfully belonging to the Black people and smashed political Reconstruction. After the Hayes-Tilden compromise of 1876, the federal government worked closely with the Southern land

owners in setting up the system of white supremacist terror which rules the Black Belt to this day.

The big profits sweated out of the colonial Afro-American people in the Black Belt strengthened U.S. capitalism for takeovers in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines and for imperialist adventures in China. When Oberlin missionaries went to Asia in the late 1800's, the problems of the Chinese people were similar to those of the oppressed Afro-American nation today. Foreign capital had grabbed the key areas of the economy. The imperialist powers propped up the great feudal landholders. Whatever their personal motives, missionaries' support for the status quo in China was actually support for U.S. imperialist super-profits, support to the starvation of the Chinese people.

Since it was kicked out of China in 1949, U.S. imperialism has been forced to squeeze its other colonies harder, including the Black Belt. Millions of Afro-American people have been driven to the slums of the cities and forced to take low-paid jobs or welfare. As an oppressed national minority in the North and West, their condition is primarily a result of imperialist oppression of the Black Belt. Their conditions are similar to those of Vietnamese peasants and the Palestinian Arabs. Millions of Vietnamese and Arabs have been forced off their land by U.S. imperialism and its stooges into strategic hamlets and desert camps which resemble the U.S. 'ghettoes'.

In their resistance to landstealing, exile and genocide, Afro-Americans call for Black Power. The slogan 'Black Power' is a step toward the demand for the right of self-determination of the Afro-American nation in the Black Belt, an area approximately 1300 miles long and 300 miles wide with seaports, transportation, and features of a restricted economy typical of an oppressed nation. Self-determination means Afro-American ownership of the land; the right to set up an independent Black state with a Black army; the right to secede from the U.S. Such a state would be a powerful supporter of Afro-American national minority rights in the cities of the North and West. Recent rebellions in these cities are a step forward in the fight for a Black state in the South.

The oppressors of the Afro-American people, giant U.S. corporations and their imperialist government are forced into an ever-widening battle to maintain and extend their control over the world's wealth. They get powerful support from the imperialist rulers of the Soviet Union who have reversed the policy of Lenin and Stalin--a Socialist policy which upheld the right of the Afro-American nation to self-determination.

Yet, despite the aid of the Russian revisionists and their U.S. pseudo-Marxist followers, who stand in opposition to the Afro-American fight for land in the Black Belt, despite its own superior firepower, U.S. imperialism cannot win. This country does not have enough power to suppress people's wars and maintain imperialist rule simultaneously in Vietnam, the Congo, the Dominican Republic and the Black Belt. Such a top capitalist spokesman as Walter Lippman has admitted this.

As they become more desperate in their drive to squeeze super-profits out of a narrowing territory, "our" imperialists are forced to use the most brutal tactics against the Vietnamese and Afro-American peoples. U.S. imperialism is the main enemy of the world's peoples. It is impossible to reform GM and its government of war criminals. U.S. imperialism must be destroyed!

The purpose of our college education should be to serve the people. But Ford and Rockefeller and their government sponsor colleges to train servants for U.S. imperialism. Our education prepares us to aid in the oppression of colonial peoples and to further the exploitation of workers in the U.S. We cannot be "neutrals" serving both the the people and "our" imperialists. We either go to the wall with U.S. imperialism or use our education to help destroy it. Support to the oppressed peoples who are striking the main blows against U.S. imperialism is support for building a new society in which all intellectuals can truly serve the people. As Marx pointed out as far back as John Brown's time, "A people which enslaves others forges its own chains".

The destruction of U.S. imperialism requires an anti-imperialist coalition of all forces which can be united against our common enemy. In order for this coalition to develop in our country, it is absolutely

necessary for whites to support Blacks in their fight for self-determination, because the Afro-American and Puerto Rican peoples constitute the main anti-imperialist force in our country.

The influence of white supremacist ideas and great power chauvinism over whites is a very important prop of U.S. imperialist rule. The fight against this influence is the key to linking our struggle with that of the main force opposing U.S. imperialism--the oppressed peoples fighting for national liberation.

Because U.S. imperialism oppresses the whole of the Afro-American nation, sections of all its classes and especially the working class and the Southern rural poor are intensifying their fight against U.S. imperialism and are tying up its troops. Every force which strengthens the chances for self-determination in the Black Belt deserves our support. The experience of all successful national liberation struggles indicates that a Marxist-Leninist Party will develop to lead the struggle.

STAND UP FOR BLACK POWER AT OBERLIN!

FIND WAYS TO STUDY AND PRACTICE THE JOHN BROWN TRADITION!

DEMAND AN END TO ARBITRARY EXPULSION AND INTIMIDATION OF BLACK STUDENTS!

SUPPORT AFRO-AMERICANS' RIGHT TO FREE ASSEMBLY INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE ALL-BLACK GROUPS!

SELF- DETERMINATION IN THE BLACK BELT! SUPPORT POLITICAL AND ARMED STRUGGLE TO FREE THE BLACK BELT--FOR STATE POWER, INCLUDING THE RIGHT OF THE BLACK BELT TO SEPARATION!

LET JOHN BROWN'S SOUL MARCH ON!

--A Group of Oberlin Students.

Issued By: HAMMER & STEEL, P.O. Box 101, Mattapan, Mass. 02126